OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

8-9 GEORGE V, 1918

IN TWO VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1192 Volume II: Pages 1193-2560

VOLUME CXXXII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF MAY, 1918, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1918

A—1

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1918

THE CABINET

First Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs	Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
*Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, P.C., K.C.M.G., B.A., D.C.L.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. Sir William Thomas White, K.C.M.G., B.A.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Minister of Overseas Military Forces from Canada in the United Kingdom	Hon. Sir Albert Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Hon. Sir James Alexander Lougheed, K.C.M.G. K.C.
Secretary of State and Minister of Mines	Hon. Martin Burrell.
Postmaster General	Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. Arthur Meighen, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue	Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
Minister of Immigration and Colonization	Hon. James Alexander Calder.
President of the Privy Council	Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, K.C.
Minister of Militia and Defense	Major-General Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn, K.C.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. Frank Broadstreet Carvell, K.C.
Minister without Portfolio (Acting Minister of Finance)	Hon. Alexander Kenneth Maclean, K.C.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. Gideon Decker Robertson.
Solicitor General	Hon. Hugh Guthrie, K.C.
Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	F. B. McCurdy, Esq.
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs	Lt.-Col. Hugh Clark.

*Created a G.C.M.G. 3rd June.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker ..... Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, B.A., LL.B.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees... George H. Boivin, B.A.

Clerk of the House..... W. B. Northrup, M.A., K.C.
Sergeant-at-Arms..... Major H. W. Bowie.

Editor of Debates..... Thomas P. Owens.
Associate Editor of Debates..... A. C. Campbell.

Official Reporters of Debates :—
English : George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, C. S. Blue, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver, W. H. Dickson.
French : J. O. Marceau, Marcel Gabard.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES :

Messieurs : Ballantyne, Burnham, Chabot, Devlin, Elkin, Foster (Sir George), Kay, Lemieux Marcil, Mowat, Munson, McKenzie, Nickle, Richardson.

Chairman : R. L. Richardson.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session, Thirteenth Parliament.

1918

ALLAN, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg, S. Riding.
AMES, SIR HERBERT BROWN, Kt.—St. Antoine.
ANDERSON, ROBERT KING—Halton.
ANDREWS, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg Centre.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Verchères.
ARGUE, IRA EUGENE—Swift Current.
ARMSTRONG, JOHN A. MACDONALD—York, N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH EMMANUEL—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead
BALLANTYNE, HON. CHARLES COLQUHOUN—St. Lawrence-St. George.
BALL, ROBERT JAMES—Grey, S.E. Riding.
BÉLAND, Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BEST, JOHN—Dufferin.
BLAIR, WILLIAM JOHN—Battle River.
BLAKE, MATTHEW ROBERT—Winnipeg, N. Riding.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.
BOLTON, FERRIS—Lisgar.
BONNELL, SAUL—Kootenay, E. Riding.
BORDEN, RIGHT HON. SIR ROBERT LAIRD, G.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, N. Riding.
BOYCE, GEORGE—Carleton.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRIEN, JOHN WESLEY—Essex, S. Riding.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BROUILLARD, JOSEPH OVIDE—Drummond & Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASHBURY—Lethbridge.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN HAMPDEN—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, HON. MARTIN—Yale.
BUTTS, ROBERT H—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

CAHILL, FRANK S—Pontiac.
CALDER, HON. JAMES ALEXANDER—Moosejaw.
CAMPBELL, J. A—Nelson.
CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.
CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARVELL, HON. FRANK BROADSTREET—Victoria and Carleton.
CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANÇOIS—Charlevoix-Montmorency.
CASSELMAN, ORREN D.—Dundas.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln,
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, WILLIAM A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Alberni.
COCHRANE, HON. FRANCIS—Timiskaming.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
COOPER, RICHARD CLIVE—Vancouver, S. Riding.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmorland.
COWAN, WALTER DAVY—Regina.
CRERAR, HON. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.
CRONYN, HUME—London.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CROWE, SANFORD JOHNSTON—Burrard.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

d'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.
DAVIDSON, AVARD LONGLEY—Digby and Annapolis.
DAVIS, FRED LANGDON—Neepawa.
DÉCHÊNE, AIMÉ MIVILLE—Montmagny.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.
DENIS, JEAN J.—Joliette.
DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.
DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.

DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—St. Anne.
DOUGLAS, JAMES MCCRIE—Strathcona.
DOUGLAS, JOHN C.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.
DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenburg.
DUTREMBLAY, PAMPHILE RÉAL—Laurier-Outremont.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELKIN, STANLEY EDWARD—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.
EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.

FAFARD, J. FERDAND—L'Islet.
FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's.
FINLEY, ARTHUR ERNEST—Souris.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADÉLARD—Labelle.
FOSTER, RIGHT HON. SIR GEORGE EULAS, K.C.M.G.—Toronto, N. Riding.
FOSTER, THOMAS—York, E. Riding,
FOURNIER, C. A.—Bellechasse.
FRASER, EVAN E.—Welland.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.
FULTON, FREDERICK JOHN—Cariboo.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH, St. Hyacinthe-Rouville.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERVAIS, THÉODORE—Berthier.
GLADU, JOSEPH ERNEST OSCAR—Yamaska.
GLASS, SAMUEL FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GREEN, ROBERT FRANCIS—Kootenay, W. Riding.
GRIESBACH, WILLIAM ANTROBUS—Edmonton, W. Riding.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALLIDAY, HOWARD H.—Bow River.
*HANNA, A. E.—Lanark.
HAROLD, JOHN—Brant.
HARRISON, CHARLES ROBERT—Nipissing.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAY, THOMAS—Selkirk.
HENDERS, RICHARD COE—Macdonald.
HEPBURN, WILLIAM BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, W. Riding.
HUGHES, HON. SIR SAM, K.C.B.—Victoria.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERICK—Missisquoi.
KEEFER, FRANCIS HENRY—Port Arthur and Kenora.
KEMP, HON. SIR EDWARD, K.C.M.G.—Toronto East.
KENNEDY, WILLIAM COSTELLO—Essex, N. Riding.
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.

LAFORTUNE, DAVID ARTHUR—Jacques Cartier.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
LANG, NORMAN—Humboldt.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS AUDET—St. James.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec E. Riding.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec County.
LEDUC, J. ALFRED—Westmount-St. Henry.
LEGER, AUGUSTE THÉOPHILE—Kent, N.B.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Maisonneuve, Gaspé.
LESAGE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Hochelaga.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.
LONG, CHARLES EDWIN—North Battleford.

MACKIE, HENRY ARTHUR—Edmonton, E. Riding.
MACKIE, HERBERT J.—Renfrew, N. Riding.
MACLEAN, HON. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, Ont.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Colchester.
MCGIBBON, PETER—Muskoka.
MCGIBBON, PETER ROBT.—Argenteuil.
MCGREGOR, ALEXANDER—Pictou.
MCINTOSH, JOHN CHARLES—Nanaimo.
MCISAAC, JAMES—Kings, P.E.I.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Royal.
MCLEOD, HARRY FULTON—York-Sunbury.
†MCMARTIN, JOHN—Glengarry and Stormont.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
MCHARG, JOHN A.—Maple Creek.
MANION, ROBERT JAMES—Fort William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, PETER FRANCIS—Halifax.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGHEN, HON, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MEWBURN, HON. SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MOWAT, HERBERT MACDONALD—Parkdale.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, Ont.,
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.
MYERS, EDWARD THOMAS WORDON—Kindersley.

NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens, P.E.I.
NICHOLSON, GEORGE BRECKEN—Algoma, E. Riding.
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, W. Riding.

* Deceased, 27th February; succeeded by Mr. John A. Stewart. † Deceased, 12th April

PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PECK, CYRUS WESLEY—Skeena.
PEDLOW, ISAAC ELLIS—Renfrew, S. Riding.
PELLETIER, FRANCOIS-JEAN—Matane.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, S. Riding.
PREVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

READ, JOSEPH—Prince, P.E.I.
REDMAN, DANIEL LEE—Calgary, E. Riding.
REID, HON. JOHN DOWSLEY—Grenville.
REID, JOHN FLAWS—Mackenzie.
RHODES, HON. EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDSON, ROBERT LORNE—Springfield.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Chateauguay and Huntingdon.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.
ROWELL HON. NEWTON WESLEY—Durham.
SAVARD, EDMOND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—Waterloo, S. Riding.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SEXSMITH, JOHN ALBERT—Peterborough, E. Riding.
*SHARPE, SAMUEL SIMPSON—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHAW, HUGH MURRAY—Macleod.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, S. Riding.
SIFTON, HON. ARTHUR LEWIS—Medicine Hat.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Antigonish and Guysborough.
SINCLAIR, JOHN EWEN—Queen's, P.E.I.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SPINNEY, EDGAR KEITH—Yarmouth and Clare.
STACEY, FRANK BAINARD—Westminster District.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver Centre.
STEWART, JOHN A.—Lanark.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton W. Riding.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon.
THOMPSON, RICHARD FREDERICK—Weyburn.
THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, SIMON FRASER—Victoria City.
TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.
TREMAIN, HADLEY BROWN—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TUDHOPE, JAMES BROCKETT—Simcoe, E. Riding.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN GILLANDERS—Assiniboia.
TWEEDIE, THOMAS MITCHELL MARCH—Calgary, W. Riding.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—St. Denis.
VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbinière.

WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, W. Riding.
WHIDDEN, HOWARD PRIMROSE—Brandon.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WHITE, HON. SIR THOMAS, K.C.M.G.—Leeds.
WIGMORE, RUPERT WILSON—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WILSON, JAMES ROBERT—Saskatoon.
WRIGHT, H. O.—Battleford.

* Deceased 25th May.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

Constituencies of the House of Commons

First Session, Thirteenth Parliaament..

1918

ALGOMA, EAST—George Brecken Nicholson.
ALGOMA, WEST—Thomas Edward Simpson.
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—John H. Sinclair.
ARGENTEUIL—P. Robert McGibbon.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Henry Oswald Wright.
BATTLE RIVER—William John Blair.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis Joseph Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—C. A. Fournier.
BERTHIER—Theodore Gervais.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BOW RIVER—Howard Haden Halladay.
BRANDON—Howard Primrose Whidden.
BRANT—John Harold.
BRANTFORD—William Foster Cockshutt.
BROME—Andrew Ross McMaster.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Reuben E. Truax.
BURRARD—Sanford Johnston Crowe.

CALGARY, EAST—Daniel Lee Redman.
CALGARY, WEST—Thomas Mitchell March Tweedie.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—John C. Douglas, Robert H. Butts.
CARIBOO—Frederick John Fulton.
CARLETON—George Boyce.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Joseph Archambault.
CHAMPLAIN—Arthur L. Desaulniers.
CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY—Pierre Francois Casgrain.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Edmond Savard.
COLCHESTER—Fleming Blanchard McCurdy.
COMOX-ALBERNI—Herbert Sylvester Clements.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Avard Longley Davidson.
DORCHESTER—Lucien Cannon.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John Best.
DUNDAS—Orren D. Casselman.
DURHAM—Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell.

EDMONTON, EAST—Henry Arthur Mackie.
EDMONTON, WEST—William Antrobus Griesback.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—William Costello Kennedy.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—John Wesley Brien.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Robert James Manion.
FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Samuel William Jacobs.
GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—*John McMartin.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Robert James Ball.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX — { Hon. A. K. Maclean. / Peter Francis Martin.
HALTON—Robert King Anderson.
HAMILTON EAST—Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn.
HAMILTON WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley Brown Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thomas Henry Thompson.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Joseph Edmond Lesage.
HULL—John Eloi Fontaine.
HUMBOLDT—Norman Lang.
HURON, N. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—Jonathan Joseph Merner.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

*Deceased 12th April.

JACQUES CARTIER—David Arthur Lafortune.
JOLIETTE—Jean J. Denis.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT, N.B.—Auguste T. Leger.
KENT, ONT.—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINDERSLEY—Edward Thomas Wordon Myers.
KINGS, N.S.—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G.
KINGS, P.E.I.—James McIsaac.
KINGSTON—William Folger Nickle.
KOOTENAY, E. RIDING—Saul Bonnell.
KOOTENAY, W. RIDING—Robert Francis Green.

LABELLE—Hyacinthe Adelard Fortier.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph Emmanuel Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK—*A. E. Hanna. / John A. Stewart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Paul Arthur Seguin.
LAST MOUNTAIN—John Frederick Johnston.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Pamphile Real DuTremblay.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier.
LEEDS—Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—William James Paul.
LETHBRIDGE—William Asbury Buchanan.
LÉVIS—Joseph Boutin Bourassa.
LINCOLN—James Dew Chaplin.
LISGAR—Fertis Bolton.
L'ISLET—J. Fernand Fafard.
LONDON—Hume Cronyn.
LOTBINIÈRE—Thomas Vien.
LUNENBURG—William Duff.

MACDONALD—Richard Coe Henders.
MACKENZIE—John Flaws Reid.
MACLEOD—Hugh Murray Shaw.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
MAPLE CREEK—John Archibald Maharg.
MARQUETTE—Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MATANE—Francois Jean Pelletier.
MEDICINE HAT—Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
MEGANTIC—Lucien Turcotte Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Samuel Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—William Frederic Kay.
MONTMAGNY—Aimé Miville Dechene.
MOOSEJAW—Hon. James Alexander Calder.
MUSKOKA—Peter McGibbon.

NANAIMO—John Charles McIntosh.
NEEPAWA—Fred Langdon Davis.
NELSON—J. A. Campbell.
NEW WESTMINSTER—William Garland McQuarrie.
NICOLET—Arthur Trahan.
NIPISSING—Charles Robert Harrison.
NORFOLK—William Andrew Charlton.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Charles Edwin Long.
NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.—William S. Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT.—Charles Arthur Munson.
ONTARIO, N. RIDING—†Samuel Simpson Sharpe.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA—Alfred Ernest Fripp. / John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARKDALE—Herbert Macdonald Mowat.
PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Samuel Charters.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Hugh Boulton Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Albert Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John Hampden Burnham.
PICTOU—Alexander McGregor.
PONTIAC—Frank S. Cahill.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Francis Henry Keefer.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Andrew Knox.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Bernard Rickart Hepburn.
PRINCE, P.E.I.—Joseph Read.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC COUNTY—Henry E. Lavigueur,
QUEBEC EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC SOUTH—Charles Gavan Power.
QUEBEC WEST—George Parent.
QUEENS, P.E.I.—Donald Nicholson. / John Ewen Sinclair.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—Walter Davy Cowan.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Herbert John Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Isaac Ellis Pedlow.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Pius Michaud.
RICHELIEU—Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE, Q.—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel d'Anjou.
ROYAL—Hugh Havelock McLean.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. ANN—Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty.
ST. ANTOINE—Sir Herbert Brown Ames, Kt.
ST. DENIS—Alphonse Verville.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Louis Joseph Gauthier.
ST. JAMES—Louis Audet Lapointe.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Stanley Edward Elkin, Rupert Wilson Wigmore.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—Marie Joseph Demers.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ST. GEORGE—Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
ST. MARY—Hermas Deslauriers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—James Robert Wilson.
SELKIRK—Thomas Hay.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.

*Deceased 27th February, succeeded by Mr. Stewart. †Deceased 25th May.

SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Francis N. McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—James Brockett Tudhope.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—William Alves Boys.
SKEENA—Cyrus Wesley Peck.
SOURIS—Albert Ernest Finley.
SPRINGFIELD—Robert Lorne Richardson.
STANSTEAD—Willis Keith Baldwin.
STRATHCONA—James McCrie Douglas.
SWIFT CURRENT—Ira Eugene Argue.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Jules-Edouard Prevost.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TIMISKAMING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
TORONTO CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO EAST—Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO NORTH—Right Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO SOUTH—Charles Sheard.
TORONTO WEST—Horatio Clarence Hocken.

VANCOUVER CENTRE—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VANCOUVER SOUTH—Richard Clive Cooper.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA, ALTA.—William Henry White.
VICTORIA, ONT.—Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON, N.B—Hon. Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
VICTORIA, CITY (B.C.)—Simon Fraser Tolmie.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William D. Euler.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—Evan E. Fraser.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—William Aurelius Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hon. Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon Crooks Wilson.
WESTMINSTER DISTRICT—Frank B. Stacey.
WESTMORLAND—Arthur Bliss Copp.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRY—Joseph Alfred Leduc.
WEYBURN—Richard Frederick Thompson.
WINNIPEG CENTRE—George William Andrews.
WINNIPEG NORTH—Matthew Robert Blake.
WINNIPEG SOUTH—George William Allan.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—Joseph Ernest Oscar Gladu.
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Edgar Keith Spinney.
YORK, E. RIDING—Thomas Foster.
YORK N. RIDING—John Alexander Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YORK, W. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK-SUNBURY—Harry Fulton McLeod.
YUKON—Alfred Thompson.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Monday, March 18, 1918.

MEMBERS SWORN IN.

To-day being the first day of the meeting of the first session of the Thirteenth Parliament for the despatch of business, William Barton Northrup, Esq., M.A., K.C., Clerk of the House of Commons, Francis H. Gisborne, Esq., I.S.O., K.C., Parliamentary Counsel, Arthur Beauchesne, Esq., B.A., K.C., Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, Commissioners appointed by Dedimus Potestatem for administering the Oath to members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty, James G. Foley, Esq., Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said William Barton Northrup a roll containing a list of the names of such members as had been returned to serve in this Parliament.

The aforesaid commissioners did administer the oath to the members who were present, which being done, and the members having subscribed to the roll containing the oath, they repaired to their seats. The Clerk of the House said: I have the honour to communicate the following letter which I have received from His Excellency the Governor General:

Ottawa, 14th. March, 1918.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the Session of the Dominion Parliament, on Monday the 18th day of March at 11 o'clock.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. B. HENDERSON, Lieut.-Col.
Governor General's Secretary.

The Clerk of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, who was received at the door of the Commons Chamber by Louis Charles Panet, Esq., Acting Serjeant-at-Arms:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

And the House being returned.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

HON. EDGAR N. RHODES, ELECTED SPEAKER.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Northrup, we have just been reminded that it is the first duty of a newly assembled House of Commons to elect a Speaker. The presidency of this House is a position of great honour and dignity, and the proper fulfilment of its duties demands the highest qualities of intellect and temperament. It is necessary that the Speaker should preside with dignity, with fairness and with courtesy. Moreover, he must be perfectly impartial, and more than reasonably patient. The gentleman whom I am about to propose is still a young man, although he has had a long experience in public life. More than that, he has already fulfilled the duties of Speaker of the House of Commons; and I do not think it is too much to say that in the discharge of those duties he has brought to bear qualities of intellect and temperament which eminently fit him for the position, and which render him conspicuous among those who, during the past, have occupied that very important office. It is therefore, with great pleasure that I move, seconded by Mr. Carvell:

REVISED EDITION

That the hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, Member for the electoral district of Cumberland, take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Northrup, we meet under conditions of some peculiar novelty. We do not meet under the rules of the House because those rules say that this House shall meet at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. We do not meet under the proclamation of His Excellency the Governor-General, because the Governor-General, while fixing the date of the meeting of Parliament, did not fix the hour. Of course, Parliament, though elected by the people, has to be called by the Governor-General. It is within His Excellency's privilege to summon it at any time and for any time he pleases, and to fix the hour also. It has pleased him to call Parliament for the 18th March, but he has not fixed the hour. He might have said that we should meet at 11 o'clock of the morning or at the same hour in the evening, and we would have to obey his command. I think, therefore, that under such circumstances the House is irregularly called. But on this side of the Chamber we do not want for that reason to raise any objection; all we are anxious to do is to expedite business as far as we can. I merely say, as a word of friendly criticism to my Rt. Hon. friend on the other side of the House, that it would have been more regular if when summoning Parliament, the hour had been stated.

Having said this much, not by way of offensive criticism but merely to emphasize the desirability of at all times following the law, I now come to the motion which has just been moved by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. The motion is that the member for Cumberland be elected Speaker of this House. I may frankly say at once that I would rather see the member for Cumberland in the Chair than on the floor of this Chamber. On the floor, from past experience, he was not above party spirit. I do not blame him too much for that, although I think some of the views he held were blameable. As to his action in the Chair in the past, however, I have nothing but what is complimentary to say of his administration and his conduct. Mr. Rhodes occupied the Chair of this House last session, and previous to that discharged the duties of Deputy Speaker. Both as Deputy Speaker and as Speaker of this House he certainly was entitled to the encomium which has just been passed upon him by the Prime Minister. For he performed his duties with impartiality, which

is the first qualification for the Speakership of this House, with dignity, and with full knowledge of Parliamentary law. Having given that evidence of his fitness for the office, it is with great pleasure that we on this side of the House agree to the motion.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just one word in reply to what the right hon. leader of the Opposition has said. I am confident, speaking from recollection, that the Order in Council which provided for the issuance of the Proclamation summoning Parliament did name 11 o'clock of the forenoon, but I am not at all sure about the Proclamation itself. If the latter did not name the hour, according to my recollection it departed from the terms of the Order in Council, and the omission was unfortunate.

The Clerk: It has been moved by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister that the Hon. Edgar Rhodes take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

There being no other nomination I declare the Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, member for the electoral district of Cumberland, duly elected to the Chair as Speaker of this House.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Sir Robert Borden and Hon. F. B. Carvell.

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT said: I beg to tender to this House my sincere and hearty thanks for the high honour it has conferred upon me by again electing me as its Speaker. It shall be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to endeavour to deserve that high honour by dealing with all questions which come before me in my official character with firmness and with impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position, but I rely confidently upon the co-operation of honourable members on both sides of this House to assist me in maintaining and in preserving our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate according to ancient usage.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM BARTON NORTHRUP, M.A., K.C., ANNOUNCED.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that William Barton Northrup, Esquire, M.A., K.C., has been appointed Clerk of the House in the place of Thomas Barnard Flint, Esquire, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L., retired.

APPOINTMENT OF SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that Major Henry William Bowie has been appointed Serjeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons in place of Colonel Henry R. Smith, C.M.G., I.S.O., A.D.C., deceased.

I have also the honour to inform the House that, pending the return of the Serjeant-at-Arms from overseas, I have appointed Louis Charles Panet, Esquire, as Acting Assistant Serjeant-at-Arms.

THE LATE DR. A. E. HANNA.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, before the session is suspended I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that although this Parliament has been so newly elected, one of the members who should have taken his place among us has already passed away, even before he could formally be returned to the House and before he had the opportunity of taking his seat. I refer to Dr. A. E. Hanna, who sat in this House as member for South Lanark for some four or five years. He had not a long parliamentary career, and his voice was not heard very often within the walls of Parliament, but all those of us who were associated with him in the last Parliament can bear witness to his strong devotion to duty, his intelligent grasp of public questions, and his desire to fulfil worthily the responsibilities resting upon him as a member of this House. I am confident that all of us will join in extending to his family our very deep sympathy in the bereavement and loss which they have sustained.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate event to which my right hon. friend has alluded may be accepted as an indication of the uncertainty of life. Dr. Hanna passed away just as he had been elected member of this House, and we are reminded of the famous Bristol election, where the opponent of Edmund Burke died during the election. Dr. Hanna has certainly left among us an appreciation of him as an honourable citizen. He was a useful member and one who was entitled to the respect of everybody. I am sure that the House will join heartily in extending its condolence to his family.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare this sitting suspended until three o'clock this afternoon.

The House resumed at Three o'clock, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, Speaker, in the Chair.

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

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please your Excellency,

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

The Hon. the Speaker of the Senate addressing the Hon. the Speaker of the Commons, then said:

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

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

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

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

OATHS OF OFFICE.

Bill No. 1, representing the Administration of Oaths of Office.—Sir Robert Borden.

REPORT PRESENTED.

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

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will give me the names of members on that side of the House for a special committee to select, under Rule 10, the committees of the House, I will make the motion in that regard to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons.

You have been summoned to the first session of a new Parliament in the midst of a world-wide struggle which vitally concerns the liberties, the institutions, and the destiny of our country, and of the whole world. Thus the responsibilities and duties imposed upon you are even graver and more far reaching than in the ordinary course of public affairs. Bearing with you a new mandate from the people, and animated by the unfaltering spirit which has inspired them during the long and anxious years of effort and sacrifice, I am confident that you will bring to the discharge of your public duties an unflinching resolve to sustain the high cause in which our country has already borne so splendid a part.

After nearly four years of war the issue still remains undecided. The effort which yet lies before us demands our sternest resolve, but we shall not shrink from it if our hearts are as firm and our courage as undaunted as those of our countrymen who hold our battle line beyond the seas. The Canadian Expeditionary Force still sustains its unbroken record of distinguished achievement to which it has notably contributed since the close of the last session.

Notwithstanding a greater delay than was anticipated in the operation of the Military Service Act, the necessary reinforcements to keep our forces at full strength have been provided and this purpose will be maintained in the future.

In order to extend the principle of the present Civil Service Act to the Outside Service, and thus to provide that all appointments to the Public Service shall be made upon the sole standard of merit, further enabling legislation will be necessary. In the meantime, the principle thus adopted has been carried into effect, as far as possible, by an Order in Council which will be placed before you.

My advisers are impressed with the necessity of a strong and progressive policy of immigration and colonization, accompanied by suitable provisions to induce settlement upon the land, to encourage increased agricultural production and to aid in the development of agricultural resources. In pursuance of this purpose, the Ministry of Immigration and Colonization has been established by Order in Council, and necessary legislation to confirm this action will be laid before you.

In connection with the demobilization of our Forces, my advisers recognize the urgent necessity of provision for the care and vocational training of returned soldiers. Organized effort to provide such training, to assist them in obtaining employment and to aid in establishing them in the activities of civil life is not only important but essential.

A department of the Government for this purpose has been constituted and has been invested with necessary powers and duties. Legislation to confirm this action will be submitted to you.

Measures which have been taken by Order in Council to prevent excessive profits in certain industries, to stimulate and increase the production of food and to encourage and develop the shipbuilding industry will be communicated to you, and any relevant legislation which may be found necessary will be submitted to you.

A Bill for extending the franchise to women, with suitable provisions respecting naturalization, will be submitted and commended to your consideration.

Your attention will also be invited to a Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to railways, a Bill relating to Daylight Saving; Bills relating to taxation of war profits and of incomes, and other measures.

In order to insure the fullest co-operation with the Government of the United States and to assist in securing the most effective utilization of the resources of both countries for war purposes, a Canadian War Mission has been established at Washington, and a War Trade Board has been constituted at Ottawa.

In view of the need for conserving to the fullest extent all national resources during the war and in furtherance of provincial enactments, action has been taken under the War Measures Act, 1914, to prohibit the importation and manufacture of intoxicating beverages and to forbid the transportation thereof into any community where their sale is contrary to law.

My advisers having reached the conclusion that a complete registration of the manhood and womanhood of Canada above the age of sixteen years is not only important but essential under present conditions, the necessary authority has been provided under the War Measures Act, 1914.

The Orders in Council embodying the foregoing provisions will be laid before you.

The appalling disaster at Halifax resulting in the loss of many hundred lives, and the destruction of a considerable portion of the city, and of the adjacent town of Dartmouth, has evoked universal sympathy for those who have suffered. My advisers will submit to you proposals for relieving the distress and loss thus occasioned.

Notwithstanding the critical and trying conditions through which the country has passed during the last three years, the commercial, industrial and financial stability of Canada has been well maintained. The volume of foreign trade greatly exceeds that attained during any corresponding period in previous years and the favourable balance of trade has also vastly increased.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last and the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted to you without delay and you will be asked to make the necessary financial provision for the effective conduct of the war.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons.

Notwithstanding disappointments in the Eastern theatre of war, there is no reason to doubt the ultimate triumph of our cause. The

effort of the nations included within the British Commonwealth is still unabated and will so continue to the end. Equally earnest and resolute is the spirit of all the allied nations and especially of the great neighbouring and kindred Commonwealth, whose enormous power and vast resources are now beginning to make themselves felt in the determination of the issue.

I commend your deliberations to the Divine guidance in the confident expectation that they will be worthy of the supreme purpose to which our national endeavour is dedicated.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration to-day. I would suggest to my right hon. friend that it would probably suit the convenience of hon. members if the mover and seconder were to proceed with their addresses to-day, at the conclusion of which it might be more convenient to adjourn the debate, to be proceeded with to-morrow. As the speech of His Excellency has only just been delivered, I would not desire to go on with the debate to-day unless my hon. friends on both sides of the House prefer that course. For my part, I think it would be better to adjourn the debate until to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, it was ordered that the Order for the consideration of the motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills, until disposed of.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

Mr. HERBERT M. MOWAT (Parkdale) rose to move that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament. He said:

Mr. Speaker, any speech by His Excellency the Duke of Devonshire, even though he may have had the assistance of others in its details, must now have a personal character because of the regard in which he is held in ever-increasing measure in the hearts of Canadians. He has now been with us nearly two years, and his public utterances, and patronage of that which is good, as well as his domestic example and devotion to duty, are such as commend themselves to all. For many years there have been Cavendishes who have been eminent public servants, and our Governor General maintains the family tradition.

I would like to pause here for a moment to extend—at any rate on behalf of the new members of the House—felicitations upon your re-election as Chief Commoner, and to say that we concur in the true and proper things which were said of you by the right honourable leaders this morning.

This first session of the thirteenth Parliament of Canada is held under unusual circumstances; circumstances agreeable in that a new and fresh mandate of the people has been given which clears many difficulties in war-time government, and not so agreeable in that in the obtaining of the judgment of the people some political adherences have suffered a severance for the time, owing to divergence of opinion as to the sternness of the demands of war. Strong men have strong opinions, and cross currents of political thought arose which made excisions in party alignments. The last Government and the present Government said that a case had arisen to compel young men to serve as soldiers. Their opponents said, "No. You go too fast. You break traditions. We are voluntaries. You will do better by making another appeal for service first. We want a vote on the specific question. We have principles which are immutable in time of peace and must not be forsaken in time of war. One of these principles is our dislike of compulsion." There were some who presented pleas on perhaps a lower plain and which were less attractive. They said: "We have done enough. No one had the right to offer 500,000 men. The war is three thousand miles away. Let our American neighbours do it now." These arguments, on the other hand, were resisted as being inadequate. "We entered the war," said the other party, "for the sake of liberty and civilization which are in peril, as well as because we were of the British Empire. Volunteering has ceased. Honour requires us to support the men who have gone out for us and whose ranks have sadly diminished." War changes minds and relieves from adherence to principles held in time of peace and of philosophic reasoning. War is ruthless. We must hurry or we shall be too late. Besides, there are the dead of all the provinces.

We are the dead."

"Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you with failing hands we throw
The torch. Be yours to hold it high;
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep tho' poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

With contrary thoughts such as these, tenaciously held and raging, it was inevitable that the banks of the party streams should break, and that new streams of like thought and impulse should meet and mingle and unite. The strongest and deepest united stream as the result of the general election proved to be that called Union Government, which is now to be given a fair trial. But, thank God, there are signs that no factious efforts are to be made to keep alive the disputes which separated us in the contest. As the turmoil subsides and the accusations cease and the charges of desertion grow less robust, we can unite at least for war purposes in this hour of our greatest national danger. We have a common love for a common country. We may see its beauties and its possibilities from different viewpoints, but all will be resolved not to let any domestic brawling militate against our dignity, and our right eventually to take a proud position in the world. It may be that we are not old enough or not yet national enough to have the devotion to country of some other peoples. Recently a soldier of France about to die on the field wrote some lines in the last hour of his expiring life, which were found:

France my country I love you.
I have given my life for you.
Would that I could kiss away the blood from your wound.
I love you France,
Take me forever to your bosom.

It is scarcely likely that a Canadian would show such intensity of feeling, but in a less fervent way we are all of the mind to do for our country in one way or other all we can each in his own time to make her honest and righteous and strong.

Maybe the House will bear with me if I relate an instance of the dissolution of party lines in the case of the constituency of Parkdale which sent me here. This riding is probably the most populous in the Dominion, and, judging from past contests, the dominant party had absolutely no cause for anxiety as to the result. But in view of the importance of the main principle at stake in the election, they spontaneously decided to make their candidate me, known always to have been a political opponent, because they believed in the sincerity of my support of the idea of

Union. Chivalry and self-denial could go no further than this, and it is in recognition of these qualities, no doubt, that their member was asked to occupy this post of honour of addressing the House at this moment.

The Speech naturally alludes to measures calculated to improve the capacity of the country to prosecute the Great War. Under this head comes the obtaining of reinforcements under the Military Service Act, 1917. We will, no doubt, soon receive detailed information as to what extent the measures now in force have so far produced the men. It has been rumoured that the opposition of certain classes of employers and producers before the tribunals, and severe medical fitness tests, have cut down the selection below what was expected. If that is so, I am sure there will be no shrinking in this House from extending the call or speeding it up after all combing efforts have been taken. Yet young men and unmarried are the ideal class because of their physical fitness and greater freedom from domestic responsibilities.

The proposed legislation to endorse the new department for the care of returned disabled men and their training for vocations is of great interest and will, no doubt, be willingly passed. We must be patient with the men and persist in kind treatment of them.

The announcement of regulations for the registration of the man and woman power of the Dominion was received with marked approval by those who know, or who think they know, the vast importance of this delayed measure. It is gratifying to learn also that the superintendence and carrying out of the measure has been largely undertaken by the representatives of the Labour interests. The attempted registration of every grown person, male and female, if loyally agreed to and efficiently carried out, will solve or lessen many difficulties; those of the recruiter, the food controller, the fuel controller and those of manufacturers and munition makers. There has been guess-work and rule-of-thumb when efforts to correlate work and production so as to prevent overlapping and waste, have been undertaken. It is no disgrace for the rich and powerful to be under obligation to show papers on demand proving position, status and nationality any more than it is for the humble and lowly. The day of the slacker and no-account man and drone should be numbered if the work is well carried out. In addition to those advantages, it will add to the sense of citizenship of both men and women when it

is made clear that all are looked to, and all are expected, to fill a place in the struggle, instead of being treated in the loose and haphazard ways of backward countries. We do not wish to be too much governed, but too little government may bring on national decrepitude.

Turning to measures not essentially war measures, a good legislative bill of fare is furnished, including the improvement of the Outside Civil Service and the systematic encouragement of immigration. As regards immigration, the country will be quite prepared for discrimination in favour of our present gallant European allies as against those who we are not confident will coincide with us and make citizens of like ideas with our own. If legislation is needed to strengthen Orders in Council for preventing excess profits in certain industries, and to encourage the production of foods and the building of ships, such legislation will, no doubt, be readily granted.

4 p.m.

No one knows the exact features which the future has in store for our country. If difficulties in trade and tariffs, or race sentiment, or finance, arise, we are prepared to meet them courageously when they do come, and will not worry about them too soon. Our foreign trade has increased; the balance continues to be in our favour. We can be content largely to consume and to use our own products and manufactures. We will not lose sight of the importance of being frugal. We have confidence in the spirit and resourcefulness and capacity of our men serving in the field and in the air, and we are resolved that war-weariness shall not overtake or unnerve us. In this spirit and with these advantages, we look forward joyously to the great future which we hope, which we know, will be ours.

Mr. JOHN LEO CHABOT (Ottawa) (translation): Mr. Speaker, the conciseness and spartan simplicity that characterize the speech from the Throne might well convey both precept and example to those desirous of discussing the momentous problems of the present day. It is, therefore, my intention to avail myself of such discreet and appropriate counsel in seconding my Honourable colleague, the member for Parkdale, Toronto, (M. Mowat) who has moved the address in reply to the speech delivered before both houses by His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of the opening of the first session of this Thirteenth Parliament.

The speech which you have just heard is an honour both to him who delivered it with so much eloquence and to those who applauded his moving and illuminous language. I find it, therefore, a delightful duty to congratulate the Honourable member for Parkdale on his happy inspiration.

Before entering upon the few brief remarks which I intend to make, I wish to pay a tribute of remembrance, a tribute of regret, to the memory of Dr. Hanna, swept away, in such premature fashion, from the solid friendship of all those who enjoyed the privilege of knowing him and of appreciating his sterling quality. May the expression of our sincere sympathy reach out to those whom this loss has affected in the most intimate fibres of their being.

If, on the other hand, I turn my gaze toward the very first ranks of the Loyal Opposition, I am chagrined to find there still a seat which is painfully vacant. I am speaking of the absence of my excellent friend and colleague the Honorable member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), brutally torn from all the objects of his affection and all the promises of happiness by an enemy who rejoices in torturing heroes. As a French-Canadian, I am proud of such a prisoner, of such a martyr in the great cause, of a compatriot who is the pride of my race and the eternal shame of his tormentors. I wish to express my most ardent desire that the captive will obtain his freedom.

In another sphere of sorrow, I wish to offer a few words of comfort to the thousands of families thrown into mourning and reduced to the hard existence of deepest misery by the terrible disaster of Halifax. Let us hope that, thanks to the united efforts of kindness and courage, this unhappy city will be resurrected from its seeming death.

Having given thought to those events which the painful vicissitudes of life and the unforeseen blows of destiny have visited upon us, let us consider what is happening today. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, allow me to assure you of my great pleasure at seeing you continue to preside over the deliberations of this House. As in the past, your eminent qualities, as gentleman and jurist, will make you one of the champions of parliamentary dignity and impartiality. May you long be spared for the exercise of these functions so manifestly useful.

We have just heard, Mr. Speaker, in the speech pronounced by His Excellency, a clear and succinct statement of the policy which the Government intends to follow. From the tenor of the document, it is easy to grasp the great thought which dominates

all the others: that of an unflinching resolve in the prosecution of the struggle against the common enemy. That is the supreme consideration of the present Government. All other cares—no matter how important they may appear—fall below it. And, in the course of this speech, the Union Government, under the respected leadership of the Right Honourable Sir Robert L. Borden, reminds each and every one of us that the freedom, the institutions and future of our country must be safeguarded. This is why we are asked through the voice of His Excellency, to remain steadfast in our resolve to win. On behalf of our agonizing country, those who are weighed down with the precious burden of her destiny beseech us to hold fast until the day of ultimate triumph and to consecrate ourselves to a cause which has already brought to Canada untold sacrifices and a resplendent harvest of glory.

Moreover, the main lines of appropriate legislation which conforms to our present aims have been submitted to the consideration of those whom the people have chosen as their representatives. Let us cast a rapid glance at a few aspects of this world conflict, and then briefly review the various measures set forth in the speech which we are discussing.

May I first be permitted, however, Mr. Speaker, before touching on what pertains to Canada's effort, to thank the hon Prime Minister for the signal honour he has done the city of Ottawa in choosing the representative of this electoral college to second the motion of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. But, great as that honour may be, I do not hesitate to affirm that those who made it possible had acquired a certain right to it.

Nigh onto four years ago, the British Empire—having exhausted all the resources of diplomatic conciliation—cast into the fray, where nations were already at each other's throats, a sword which from that instant has never been sheathed. In vain the formidable Albion had striven to spare the world this most bloody holocaust of history. Germany, a nation of prey, had torn to pieces all her treaties, had betrayed her given word. The invasion of Belgium was to point out to England her noble line of conduct. Then came the message from the Canadian Government, sent to the British authorities in the first days of August, 1914. The hon. Prime Minister imparted the hope that these international misunderstandings would be solved without bloodshed. On the other hand, the Mother Country was assured of our most loyal assistance, in every shape and form, should war break out. The Empire was threatened; the greatest of Dominions declared herself ready, irrespective of political ties, to accept the most bitter sacrifices in the task of upholding the integrity and the honour of the British flag. What followed has shown that the promises made, in the first days of war, by certain elements, have been implemented by the Canadian people. And it is in my twofold capacity as a British subject and as a descendant of one of the pioneer races of the Canadian nation, that I wish to dwell a few moments upon this drama, so terrible and withal so glorious.

Is it necessary for me to recall to those who hear me the justice of the cause which our people are defending with their blood? Our case in this regard has been unassailably established. This cause for which you have seen your brothers, your friends, and those still nearer and dearer, leave our shores, this cause, I say, is just not only with regard to Great Britain and her colonies, but it is the very Cause itself of Light against Darkness. A victorious Germany would mean that everything which humanity holds sacred would be ground down into the dust. It would be the apotheosis of might against right, of error against truth. All the efforts of mankind, since the dawn of time, towards better things, would go for naught. But reassure yourselves; so much blood has not been shed in vain. So many tears, such universal mourning, will never end in a mere shadow of victory. England, France, the United States—that great republic, our neighbour, who has now entered the fray side by side with us, and whose soldiers are today almost our brothers—Belgium, Italy and the allied countries, will take good care that peace will mean the shattering of Prussia. And it is to render the annihilation of autocracy more decisive that, from the very inception of the war, and since, England and her sister nations have had but one single voice to loudly proclaim that we must either be the victors or wear the chains of slavery.

This solidarity betwixt England and Canada has been proven, and continues to be so every day, if we but stop to consider the effort put forth by our country. hWat need is there of insisting on the part played by the Canadians during more than forty months of war? We should have to retell the thousands of heroic feats performed by officers and by the humble rank and rifle alike. We should have to parade before

your gaze the magnificent spectacle of an epopee hitherto unheard of.

What could I say, here, worthy of you, soldiers of Canada, who were at Ypres, at Festubert, at Givenchy, at St. Julien, at Courcelette, at Vimy, at Passchendaele and a hundred other spots? You have shown to the world without distinction of race or creed, what valour, courage and heroism can do. Your achievements are inscribed on the most glorious pages of the history of all time, and your sacrifices will never be forgotten. Let those who come back from this awful fray be welcomed as the saviours of tottering civilization. As to those who have fallen, let us salute them, as so many martyrs who did not hesitate to defend their country and to die for her.

But, as you know, if the readiness of Canada to hurry to the aid of the Empire in danger has compelled the admiration of Europe; if the valour of our legions has been for all of us a constant source of most legitimate pride, our national spirit has manifested itself in other ways. With most admirable unity, our population has given itself to war-work, and those whom the great voice of the people have placed in control of the Ship of State have striven to promulgate laws which will promote and guide within the bounds of safety the economic and commercial development of the country.

We have, first of all, Mr. Speaker, the noble initiative of the Canadian people in forming committees to care for the families of our soldiers. That is the origin of the Patriotic Fund, to which so many millions has been subscribed to help those who are suffering through the war. And then, who has not admired the sublime mission of the Red Cross in alleviating the bitterness of unspeakable pain. These are but a few isolated examples of the devotedness of all, and they give scant justice to the extent of what has been accomplished. We should have to cite long rows of figures, if we wished to enter into the details of other works of the kind performed by other associations and patriotic leagues. The Daughters of the Empire, the Comité de Secours National of France, the Belgian Relief Commission, the Women's Club, with their numerous branches and chapters, are all enrolled in this huge army of benefactors.

Let us bow as well to the abnegation of all those valiant women who on the fields of carnage or at their own hearth, have given the most noble examples of strength of soul and who have never weakened. Were I permitted to mention names and to recite to you the roll of honour of the miracles of kindness, I should be compelled to read a list which is seemingly without end. But the praises of the present day, no matter how sincere, are merely fast-withering blooms beside the crowns with which posterity will adorn the brow of all these men and women who have given themselves to these works of kindness and mercy.

Let us remember, also, the astounding rapidity with which our war loans were subscribed. More than ten times the amounts required were garnered within a few days. The Governments themselves, provincial legislatures as well as Federal authorities, gave freely to maintain all these laudable enterprises and to feed the hungry mouths of Europe. What can we add to this enumeration except to record that so many wonderful efforts crowned with success were gloriously completed by the sending over-seas of those valorous contingents, the choicest of troops, who are still fighting against the hordes of Attila. After the offering of gold and of energy, we have seen the offering of blood. This blood of our bravest will wash away hate and rancour; this blood will cement the two great nationalities destined to live in common in this Canadian land of our forefathers; this blood will be the seed of " sound ideas and noble actions." There you have what we wished to say of all this warwork. Even in the brief synopsis which I have just given, each of you can see that the Canadian nation has risen to the test of the tragic circumstances which have encompassed her.

As regards the economic, industrial and financial well-being of Canada, I do not feel called upon to treat of it after the categorical affirmations in this regard that we have had in the speech from the Throne. I intend, however, to congratulate the Government upon the wisdom of their decision in the matter of Civil Service reform, whereby all appointments to the Outside Service are to be made on the basis of the merit system. If there be in this House a member who has more cause than the one now speaking to appreciate the wisdom of such a law, let him take the floor. To the member for Ottawa, the end of patronage dickerings is like the calm after the storm.

As regards the problems of the post-bellum period, and with respect to demobilization, we must hope that the far-seeing legislation which the Government has in view will receive the support of all those who have at heart the proper care of our intrepid soldiers and the assistance due them in the

matter of re-education, in refitting them to earn a livelihood and in other things.

As to the Bill which aims to give to our Canadian women the right to vote, I hold that a more just measure could not be brought to the attention of this House. Without wishing to pose as a champion of the feminist movement, I shall not hesitate to say that these women who are carrying on the work of the country, that these women who are—very often—more devoted than we are ourselves to the great interests of our homeland, deserve respect for the intelligence of their endeavour and a reward for the magnanimity of their sacrifice.

A few words more, Mr. Speaker, and I have done. My last words will be an appeal for the union of all minds and all hearts; a call for the unity of will and energy so that Canada may accomplish to the very end the heroic task which she has taken upon herself. Thanks to his unwavering devotion to the public welfare a man who sits in this House has made it possible to confer upon the country the inestimable boon of union. But this spirit of union must penetrate to every quarter, and it must be founded on generosity and on patriotism. Majorities must be magnanimous enough not to judge too hastily, or perhaps with some bitterness, minorities who have equally at heart the greater welfare of the nation but whom various causes appear to incline towards other methods of action.

After all, why is it that in the face of the enemy, whose prying eyes are forever upon us, should we cast about for causes of dissension? Why, for instance, try to measure or weigh, so to speak, the quantities of such and such blood that has been shed, in comparison to the rivers of such and such other blood that have flowed. Why raise the cry: here less French-Canadian blood was spilt, and there more Anglo-Saxon blood, or Scotch, or Irish? Why take the futile care to indite long pages of statistics proving that such and such a province has to its credit more blood or more sacrifices than such and such another? One thousand times No! This is not the time for such figuring. Glory to those—be they where they may—who have done more! They constitute a noble example for those ethnic groups whom certain conditions, peculiar to their temperament or to their social function,—or perhaps whom pernicious influences—have rendered less sprightly to answer the first blasts of the bugle. Let us call a halt today to these matters of the census: posterity will see to them. Rather let us remember that those who have died have mingled their blood—their Canadian blood—on the soil of France or of Belgium, and that this heroic soil has drained it without distinction.

Let us mass ourselves in serried ranks behind these heroes, our models, and tomorrow our eye will behold the blessed dawn of victory.

Mr. Chabot continuing in English:

Before resuming my seat, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in English in deference to my English-speaking constituents in Ottawa. In the first place I desire to express my feeling of sincere gratitude to the right hon. leader of the Government for the honour he has conferred upon me and the constituency which I represent in this House, in asking me to second the address of thanks to His Excellency the Governor General for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both houses of Parliament, so eloquently proposed by the hon. member from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat).

I appreciate the distinction all the more because of the fact that this is the first session of the Thirteenth Parliament, called at a time when the political situation in this country has undergone a marked and decided change; when our fair Canada is confronting the most momentous issue, and passing through the most critical period in her national history; at a time when some of the most able men on both sides of politics—men who have fought one another politically, through the press, and even in Parliament, in answer to the call of duty have sunk their deep-rooted political feelings and convictions, prepared to combine their very best efforts and put forth their strongest endeavours, with a view of carrying on legislation and following out a policy intended to prosecute the war more vigorously and more effectively; and at the moment when Unionism and what it stands for are paramount in the eyes, and are strongly entrenched in the hearts of a large portion of the Canadian people.

Since the beginning of this terrible world's war, our Canadian soldiers on the battlefields of France and Flanders have by their valour and their courage, and particularly by their resourcefulness, covered themselves with glory, and have been a source of pride to their country. They have proven themselves to be as good soldiers as the very best, and have struck terror into the hearts of the enemy, who, I am told, would just

as soon meet the devil, as face the Canadians on the field of battle.

Four hundred thousand men from Canad have gone overseas since this war began. There have been close on to 100,000 casualties since the Canadians have begun to fight at the front, and 30,000 Canadian boys in the strength of their manhood, the very flower of our country, lie buried in so many graves in France and Flanders; graves haloed by their death and glorified by their sufferings. We deeply grieve their loss, but our sorrow is lightened by the knowledge that they fell on the field of honour, fighting for the sacred cause of democracy and freedom. We reverently honour their memory.

The women of this country, since the outbreak of hostilities, have displayed such admirable patriotism, energy and unselfishness in the fields of philanthrophy and patriotic work, and in the various spheres of activity formerly occupied by men; on the land, in the factories, in the hospitals, and on the very field of battle, that their invaluable and patriotic endeavours have enlisted the admiration and won the approval of the people of Canada and of the Empire; and, besides, have earned the undying gratitude of thousands of sick and wounded soldiers.

The Canadian surgeons and physicians at the front, and in the hospitals, have done themselves proud in the eyes of the whole world because of their devotion to duty, their spirit of self-sacrifice and all round good work. They have performed their manifold duties and arduous labours in a manner which has called forth the approbation of the British and Allies alike.

Canada has made many sacrifices since this war has begun. The people of this country have endeavoured to honourably discharge their duty for the cause of humanity and civilization, and we must be prepared to go on to the last gun, to the last man, to the last dollar, until militarism and autocracy have been crushed, and this terrific conflict brought to a successful and glorious termination. Let us, the representatives of the Canadian people in this House, consider it our sacred duty under the circumstances, to do all in our power to keep faith with our boys at the front, to labour for the maintenance of a united Canada in order to win the war and to save our beloved country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, as was intimated a few moments ago by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden)—and in this I think he was perfectly correct—it would suit the convenience of both sides of the House if this debate were not prolonged this day. Therefore, I shall not at this moment offer to the House the observations which seem to be called for from His Majesty's loyal Opposition by the speech of His Excellency. But I think I should not wait until to-morrow, that I should not wait a single moment longer, before I tender to both my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) and my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) the congratulations of both sides of the House upon the admirable addresses with which they have favoured us. I commend especially the spirit of harmony and union between all the elements in this country which was particularly noticeable in the speech of my hon. friend from Parkdale and also in the observations of my hon. friend from Ottawa. In what these two hon. gentlemen have said there is a great deal with which I can altogether agree and there is very little to which I must take exception. But, unfortunately, there are some things to which I shall have to take exception, and it would suit my own pleasure and convenience better if I deferred until to-morrow the observations which I shall have to offer in criticism of their observations. I therefore now beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

The right hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General approving minute of Council appointing:

The Hon. Martin Burrell, Secretary of State; the Hon. John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Railways and Canals; the Hon. Arthur L. Sifton, Minister of Customs, and the Hon. James A. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonization, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

SUMMONING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With the consent of the House, I should like to mention to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with respect to the matter to which he called attention this morning, that my recollection was right as to the terms of the Order in Council which was passed and approved for the purpose

of summoning Parliament. It reads in this way:

The Committee of the Privy Council on the recommendation of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, Prime Minister, advises that a proclamation be issued summoning the Parliament of Canada to meet on Monday the 18th day of March at 11 a. m. at the City of Ottawa for the despatch of business.

Through some inadvertence on the part of the officer who prepared the proclamation the hour seems to have been omitted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There was no reference to it in the proclamation but there have been so many Orders in Council that I am not surprised at the omission.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall proceed, notwithstanding the reluctance of my right hon. friend to have these thrust upon him, to lay several of them upon the table of the House. I beg to lay on the table of the House, by command of His Excellency the Governor General, the Defence of Canada Order, 1917, and certain Orders in Council in amendment thereof. I also desire to lay upon the table an Order in Council respecting freight rates and special taxation in respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway; an Order in Council with regard to the importation, manufacture and transportation of intoxicating liquors; an Order in Council respecting the Department of Immigration and Colonization, and the Department of External Affairs; Orders in Council respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Military Hospitals Commission; an Order in Council respecting the War Purchasing Commission; two Orders in Council respecting the Canadian War Mission, Washington; Orders in Council respecting the disaster at Halifax, establishing the Halifax Relief Commission and making certain recommendations with regard to relief; Orders in Council with respect to the War Committee of the Cabinet, and the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet; Orders in Council respecting the Civil Service Act, conferring certain powers upon the Civil Service Commission; an Order in Council respecting the Canada Registration Board; Orders in Council, passed under the Military Service Act, embodying regulations made thereunder; an Order in Council respecting applications to dismiss on the ground of offensive partisanship.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is all.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I notice there is no Order in Council to dispense with Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my right hon. friend deems such a measure to be advisable we shall be glad to take the suggestion into consideration.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: I lay upon the table copy of an Order in Council creating the office of Director of Public Information.

Hon. J. A. CALDER: I produce copy of the minutes of a conference held between the Dominion and Provincial Governments on February 15 and 16 last.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR: I submit copy of Orders in Council and Regulations with respect to the Food Controller and the control of food supplies.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 4.37 p.m.

Tuesday, March 19, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL LAID ON THE TABLE.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: I produce copies of certain Orders in Council pertaining to the Naval Service of Canada; also copies of the Annual Report of the Naval Service in English and French; also the English edition of the Annual Report of the Fisheries Branch.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I submit copies of Orders in Council establishing the office of Fuel Controller and regulations made in connection therewith; also, similar Orders in Council with reference to the establishment of an Editorial Board; also copies of Orders in Council establishing the War Trade Board.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved, seconded by Sir George Foster:

That a Special Committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10; said Committee to be composed of Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Messrs. Reid, Grenville, Carvell, Robb and McCoig, and that that portion of Rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the speech which was placed in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General by his advisers is one of unusual length. It deals with many subjects old and new, chiefly old. With both we are already familiar, and if some are new to the House they are not new to the public; they have been discussed again and again, and upon them the public is now awaiting the decision of the Government. Therefore we may well pass these subjects over awaiting the opportunity when the Government will place them before the House in concrete form for adjudication.

In the address to which we listened yesterday there is no mention of a subject which does not require any legislation and in which the public is much interested—that is to say, that since Parliament prorogued in the month of September last there has been quite a change in the Government. If you will permit me, I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to my expression. I did not say "change of Government," I said "change in the Government." My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Mowat) yesterday, in referring casually to this in his speech, made a distinction between the old and the new Government. There is no new Government; we have the same Government that has existed for the last six years—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And so long as there is no change in the Premiership it is a continuation of the same administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is the same control, the same principles and the same everything in connection therewith. I emphasize that there is the same control and the same principles. There is a change, I must admit, in the complexion of the Government, and if I may say so it is not only a change but an improvement.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As we look at the Government from this side of the House we cannot fail to notice that it is characterized by a healthier complexion than it wore last session. There is not about it the same pallor that existed then. Although not a follower of the Government, I am glad to say that the present Administration displays a rosy red colour which is at all events pleasing to the eye. Last summer the friends of the Government were much concerned as to its condition. Many of them, perhaps I should say all of them, believed that unless there was a copious draft of rich red blood injected into its system, things might go hard with them. This condition necessitated a surgical operation. Such operations have been very much resorted to of late, especially since the war began. Many have been the instances where healthy, strong men came forward and presented their bare arms to the surgeon in order to have a vein opened in the last desperate attempt to save a moribund life.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The records do not always show that the operation was successful. Indeed it so happens that in many instances the patient was so far gone that he could not be saved except by the sacrifice of another's blood, and sometimes the sacrifice was fatal even to the saviour who offered his blood for transfusion.

Let me say at once that to these Liberal members who joined the Administration, I do not wish such a fate. With most of them it was my privilege for many years to be closely associated in intimate friendship. I know them too well not to realize that in what they did they were guided by wholly conscientious motives. Indeed we have the declaration of some of them that it was a sacrifice; indeed there is the written statement of others that they for a long time hesitated and resisted all advances. Conscience is the supreme arbiter, and into the sanctity of conscience I will not enter. I respect the convictions of everybody, even of those with whom for the time being I may differ; but I may be pardoned if I say that so far as I am concerned I never could appreciate those many subtle disquisitions made in the effort to convince us that war necessitates and creates new standards of duty. There is no such thing as new standards of duty in war. Duty is only the concrete expression of eternal truth which never can vary; which remain the same in war as in peace. But war undoubtedly intensifies all duties and lifts them up to an

altitude which of course is unknown in peace times.

As I look at the history of this war it seems to me that nothing has occurred to show that the principles of the British system of constitutional Government should be discarded in war time, and put in cold storage, to be taken back after the restoration of peace. None of the many attempts which have been made in England to join discordant elements under the name of Union on the ground that the winning of the war would thus be facilitated, have succeeded in creating a Government which could do better or more than its predecessor. If the principles of the British system of Government are sound and efficient in peace, they are equally sound and efficient in war. If there is a feature of the British system of Government which makes for superiority, it is that the system is not complete unless there is in the face of the Government a strongly organized Opposition—an Opposition organized not for the purpose, as is too often supposed, of always opposing, but to supervise, to criticise, to support, as the public welfare may require criticism or support. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and the universal testimony of history is that unless there is eternal vigilance on the part of a strong and resolute Opposition, encroachments upon freedom and abuses in office will creep in, just as surely and just as certainly as weeds and tares will invade and choke the crops of the husbandman if he is not constantly on the watch. Nay, more; I think I can invoke also the testimony of the history of British institutions to show that if at any time there is on the part of some section of the Opposition a relaxation in vigilance, weeds and tares at once appear in luxurious growth. Already we have evidence of this, and the evidence is that today this Parliament of Canada meets in violation of what is left of the electoral law of Canada.

Sir, last session those who sat in the House were divided on the question of conscription. There were members of the Liberal party who favoured conscription; others opposed it. Upon this point I as the recognized leader of the Opposition, did not interfere with the conscience of any man. Strong reasons were brought forward in support of each view, but there was no divergence of opinion on this side with regard to the outrageous measure; known as the War-time Elections Act, or, to call it by its popular name—or unpopular name, rather—the Franchise Act. Among members of the Opposition there was no divergence of opinion; they were unanimously opposed to it. Every feature of that law was an outrage, an odious violation of the very foundation of our system of democratic government. The creating of a special electorate in view of an impending election; the granting of the franchise to some and the withholding of it from others; the opening wide of the door to fraud which enabled the Government or its officers to ostracize some classes of His Majesty's subjects and to include others whom they did not dare ignore —all these were features of the Act which could not be accepted by any man who desired to uphold the principles of Liberalism. The measure was accepted by Liberal members who entered the Government under the argument of war necessity. Nothing, Sir, is more certain than that one illegality will lead to another; that, as a logical consequence, wrong will be followed by wrong. I repeat that this Parliament is assembled in direct violation of what is left of the electoral law after the passing of the War-time Elections Act.

Last year we passed legislation to take the votes of the soldiers who were in the trenches. We had a civilian vote as well as a military vote to record. So far as the civilian vote was concerned, there was not much alteration in the Act. The only alteration of which I was aware was that section 211, which prescribed the duties of the returning officer under the old Act, was somewhat interfered with. I need not refer hon. gentlemen to the fact that under our system all elections are carried out under the writ of the King, which is issued to officers specially selected in every riding to take the vote of the people and to report it to an officer known as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Section 211 provides that after the votes have been counted the returning officer will transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery his return that the candidate having the largest number of votes has been duly elected. It is the duty, therefore, of the returning officer to count the votes and then to make his return that the man having the majority of votes is the elected representative. That portion of the Act was amended to this extent: The return to be made is not a direct return; a certificate is to be issued by the special returning officer to an officer known as the general returning officer, stating the number of votes received on each side. The Act

which was passed last session for the taking of the soldiers' vote provided that the vote should be taken in a certain manner—I need not direct attention to the method at the present time—and, the special officers appointed to count them were required to report their proceedings to the Secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London and to the Commissaire Général in France, who were required to send at once a telegraphic report to the general returning officer, and to forward the poll books and all records connected with the taking of the vote. Two duties, therefore, were imposed upon the Commissaire in France and the Secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London: to send a communication by telegraph to the general returning officer, and to forward at the same time the poll books and the records.

The duties of the general returning officer in this connection are defined in section 14 of the War-Time Elections Act:

> Upon receipt of my telegram from the Secretary of the High Commisioner's Office, or the Commissaire Général du Canada in France stating the number of votes given for the several candidates in any electoral district, the General Returning Officer shall cause the information therein contained to be made available to any person applying therefor.

That is all the effect which is given to this communication by telegraph. The information may be given to any person who asks for it. It has no more effect than that. It is not official. It is simply to satisfy the curiosity of anybody who may inquire.

Then when he has received the poll books and records and all the documents relating to the counting of the votes taken in Europe these are his duties.

> Upon receipt from the Secretary of the High Commissioner's Office the Commissaire Général du Canada in France and the special Returning Officers in Canada of the statements referred to in Section 12 subsection four of this part.

That is to say, the poll books and other records.

> The General Returning Officer shall add the number of votes given for or applicable to the respective candidates in each electoral district, as disclosed by such statements, to the votes given for the candidates as shown by the certificate of the Returning Officer made pursuant to section 13 of this Part, and shall openly proclaim and shall return pursuant to the provisions of section 211 of Part III, as being duly elected a member or members to represent such electoral district

That is what completes the report upon the King's writ. The General Returning Officer was bound to count the votes in public, and to make his report accordingly, and then the election was complete. Have these formalities been complied with by the General Returning Officer? They have not been complied with, and the reason why they have not been complied with is simply this—and my assertion cannot be successfully controverted—that at this moment the General Returning Officer has not received from Europe the records of the votes given by the soldiers in Europe. I will come presently to the reason why these formalities have not been complied with. But I may be told before I go further: This is a simple formality; it does not matter much whether the candidates for membership in this House are reported upon by telegraphic communication or whether they are solemnly reported upon when the records are received; the certification is simply a formality. If it is simply a formality, why do we have it in the Statute? Personally, I am not very particular as to non-compliance with the strict letter of the law when such non-compliance does not defeat the purpose of the men who are responsible for the law; but it is a good principle of law, common sense, fairness, that no man shall be permitted to disregard the law in order to shield or to conceal or to get rid of his own laches. This, however, is exactly what has been done to-day by the Government. Why is it that there are laches on the part of the Government? If the writs had been issued immediately after dissolution, the records would have been received before now; but Parliament prorogued on the 20th of September last and Parliament was not dissolved and the writs of election were not issued until the first days of November. Some five weeks passed before the writs were issued and before the people were summoned to the election. Why was not Parliament immediately dissolved? Could any reason of public welfare be invoked? Could any reason be given for it? I speak with knowledge, and no one will contradict me—the reason why Parliament was not dissolved immediately after prorogation was because the Government were not ready and they had not time to organize the working of the War-time Elections Act. On account of the Government having waited until the month of November to issue the writs, to-day, the 19th of March, the records of the voting that took place in Europe have not been received. How is it, then, that we have in the Votes and Proceedings a list of the members elected? If we have this list of members elected, it is not in accordance with the law. How then is it we have it? How is it that the returning

officer, Mr. O'Connor, has published such a list as we have before us to-day? I do not know much of Mr. O'Connor; I have had little to do with him; but I believe, so far as I have seen anything of him, that he is an able, fair and high-minded servant of the public. I do not believe that he would be capable of doing anything wrong in making a report of this kind. Yet he has made such a report as this, and what is the result? Since yesterday batches of Orders in Council have been brought down. I do not know how many there are of them, but I think upon investigation one will find that some seven pages of Orders in Council have been brought down. To-day some more have been brought down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne); but I do not know whether there was an Order in Council brought down, although I am told that last Friday or thereabouts an Order in Council was passed giving authority to the returning officer to disregard the letter of the law, and, simply upon receipt of telegraphic communication, to make a report as to the voting in Europe. If I am wrong in this, I can be corrected; but I believe the statement is true that such an Order in Council has been passed. What was the authority of the Government for passing such an Order in Council? Was it to be found within the four corners of the electoral law passed last session? No. I am at a loss to know upon what authority the Government took it upon themselves to pass such an Order in Council unless it be that once more they have resorted to the War Measures Act passed in 1914. The War Measures Act has already covered a multitude of sins, but there is a limit to the War Measures Act. Shall we be told seriously that it is in the power of the Governor in Council to pass an order to override the positive letter of a statute passed only last session? If it be so, it is only a further proof of what I said a moment ago, namely, that we sit here to-day by direct violation of the law of the land. But I may be told that the majority which sits behind the Government is so strong, notwithstanding all the actions of the Government, that the people have ratified everything—that is, the people of all the provinces, with the single exception of Quebec. The argument would be admitted if the appeal which was made to the electorate had been made to the solid electorate of the land under the statutory law of the country. If the appeal had been so made, the Government would have had behind them the public opinion of the country; but the appeal was not made to the solid electorate of the country; it was made to a special electorate specially manufactured for the purpose.

And under such circumstances it is idle to tell me that the same respect must attach to the verdict of the people as otherwise would have been accorded to it. And, Sir, if the appeal was not made to the general electorate of the country, there were reasons for it, reasons which were stated on the floor of the House last session by men who are now on the Treasury benches and by men who are not far from the Treasury benches, and those reasons tell the story why this special electorate was manufactured.

The question before the House last year was conscription. We heard it said on the floor of this House that conscription could not be submitted to the people by means of a referendum. Why? Because if the policy of conscription were submitted to the people by means of a referendum it would be rejected. You have heard that, Mr. Speaker, and the old members of this House remember it very well. The statement was made in so many words that members would not vote in this House for a referendum because the referendum would be defeated by the people. But, Sir, if a referendum was to be voted down by the people, the same policy might also be voted down in a general election. This thing has happened elsewhere. In Australia, the Government was supported at the general election although in favour of a policy of conscription, which policy had been voted down in a referendum. In this country, the Government would not submit to the possibility of being defeated on such a question. Hence, ways and means had to be found in order to make sure, and amply sure, that the Government would be supported and the policy enforced, no matter what the majority might think of the policy of conscription. Again, I say, that under those circumstances there cannot be the same respect for the Act as there otherwise would have been. The Act was conceived in iniquity and was carried out in worse iniquity still. I say it, and I say it soberly in the presence of the new members of the House and of the old, that the Act by which the elections were carried was such that there was no fair play for the Opposition. With partisan enumerators, partisan returning officers, and partisan deputy returning officers, the true electorate of the country was diminished almost to the vanishing point.

Lest some may think I am too strong in my contention that there was no fair play for the Opposition, let me give a few instances to the House. There is a constituency called Edmonton West, which was represented in the last Parliament by as brave a man as ever stood on the floor of this House, a man of intense courage and of absolutely independent mind, who would not bow the knee to anybody or vary his opinions for any man living. I say there was nothing short of a conspiracy to defeat Mr. Oliver. Am I too strong in that statement? This is what took place in the constituency of West Edmonton: In no less than seven polls there were not enough ballots for the electors who came to register their votes. If that had taken place in only one poll, I would not have very much to say, but when it is a fact that the same thing occurred at seven different polls, I say that it was a conspiracy. In three of these polls the electors were so insistent on their right to have their votes recorded that ballots were substituted. At the fourth poll also, eighty-two ballots were substituted, but the returning officer refused to count them at any of the polls. Was that all? No, there is something more. In three sub-divisions the polls which the returning officer had proclaimed would be opened, were never opened at all on election day, and men who had travelled hundreds of miles and more to the poll found it locked on their arrival, and they were unable to record their votes. Is not that something to confirm the words I used a moment ago, that there was no fair play for the Opposition?

But there is something more. In the riding of Bow River the returning officer issued over his signature the following notice to the deputy returning officer:

> By order from the General Returning Officer I am to advise you that naturalization can only be proved by production of naturalization certificates in the manner before advised, and that neither oath of person affected, nor presence of his name or any voters' list will be proof of his right or his naturalization for purposes of section sixty-two or otherwise.
>
> Arthur G. Bond,
>
> Returning Officer for Bow River Electoral District.

That is the statement made by the returning officer of Bow River, who shields himself behind the General Returning Officer, Mr. O'Connor. I believe, for my part, that Mr. O'Connor never gave such an order, but we shall know by-and-by. But whether the authority, so called, was, from headquarters at Ottawa or from the returning officer himself, the fact remains that no naturalized British subject whose name was already on the list would be admitted to vote unless he had his naturalization certificate in his pocket. Could anything be more arbitrary or more tyrannical even in Germany itself or in Russia? A man who has been living the life of a peaceful citizen, who has been acknowledged and recognized by his neighbours as a British subject, and whose name is on the voters' list—this man has to bring his naturalization certificate in his pocket before he can be permitted to vote. I am sure that such a thing shocks the sense of justice and fair play of every man in this House. I am told, Sir, that in the constituency of Bow River, Belgians who had come from heroic Belgium, Frenchmen who had come from glorious France, and Americans who had come from the land of freedom, and who had all been naturalized, were not allowed to vote because they had not their naturalization certificates in their pockets. I am told more, and I believe it is true, that the same principle, the same doctrine, the same order, was followed in constituencies other than those of the four provinces west of Lake Superior. That is the situation.

Here are two constituencies in which the most sacred laws of British freedom were violated. I will be told perhaps: "But what of the soldier's vote? Was it not overwhelmingly on the side of the Government?" I admit it was, but what of it? I will not be prepared to-day to give all the evidence which I shall have to submit, but I can call attention to some facts. The Minister of Militia, in the early part of November, addressed a meeting in the Russell Theatre, Ottawa, which it was my pleasure to attend, in connection with the Victory Loan, and he made the statement that the number of enlisted soldiers at that time was 35,000. It turned out that the number of soldiers who voted in Canada was not 35,000, but 54,200. In less than one month, or thereabouts, the number of enlisted soldiers in Canada had increased from 35,000 to 54,000 odd. We have no explanation of this fact yet, and we might ask, whence came these additional 20,000 soldiers who voted on the 17th December? They could not have been conscripted under the Act. The Act had just been put in force, and nobody had been conscripted at that time. Was the explanation that they had enlisted voluntarily? We had been told by the Prime Minister again and again that voluntary enlistment had completely broken down in Canada. Or was the explanation that a certain number of men were put in khaki, not to win the war, but

to win the election? Here is a fact which has not yet been explained, but which will require some explanation. It seems to me it will be exceedingly difficult to explain how it is possible that the number of soldiers should have increased in less than one month from 35,000 to 54,000. Now, what of the soldiers in Europe. I will refer to these soldiers in Europe, dealing with what has come to our notice in the press. I have in my hand a picture which was published in all the ministerial papers in the month of December, 1917. It is a photograph of a polling booth for soldiers in London. The copy which I have was taken from the Toronto Star of the 19th December, and under this cartoon I find the following:

> The picture shows Canadians at a London polling station on December 2nd, and is from the first pictures to reach Toronto since the voting began on December 1st.

There is the recording officer. There is the voting soldier. There are the clerks; there are soldiers coming also to offer their votes, and on the wall is this placard "A vote against the Government is a vote for the Hun."

We have seen that in Canada, Sir but not in the polls. We have seen it placarded in the streets of the city of Ottawa, that a vote against the Government is a vote for the Hun. We have seen more in the city of Ottawa. We have seen the statement made that a vote for Union is a vote for Christ. If the law can be thus openly, and even boastfully, violated in the polls in England, then we can have an idea of the opportunity which was left to the soldier to cast his vote untrammelled. In the face of all these circumstances, is it not evident to all classes of the community, to all impartial men—whether they are on the side of the Government or on the side of the Opposition, or whether they form part of that larger body, which associates with no party, and which is, perhaps, in the last resort, the grandeur of the nation—that the verdict recorded on the 17th December for the Government is not a victory for democracy, but rather that it is a blow to the very foundation of the system of free institutions under which we live. If democracy is to produce all that we hope and expect for it and from it, it must be apparent to everybody, it must be in the breast of every man that every consultation with the people ought to be carried out in such an open manner that every man must be satisfied that the vote recorded is an expression of the majority of the people. Not, Sir, that the majority of the people is always right. Majorities are wrong sometimes, and so are minorities. But, after all, under our constitutional system, whether we sit on one side of the House or on the other, what we want is that the Government of the country should be carried on by representatives of the majority of the people, according to the opinion of the people as it exists in this country.

Here are some of my friends on the side of the minority. It matters not whether we are on the right side or on the left side of your chair, Sir, what we want is that the voice of the people should be heard, and, even though we are in a minority, at all events that the people should rule. But, Sir, in regard to the verdict which was recorded on the 17th December, and which I see represented before me to-day, however respectable the representation may be, no amount of sophistry, no loud clanking of sonorous numbers can give it the character of certainty and respectability, which ought to be the concomitant and the result of right done. It is the misfortune of the Government and the misfortune of the country, but it is still more the misfortune of the Government that, by their own conduct, they have failed to obtain moral support with their majority; they have failed to win an honest victory, and failed to obtain that support which is the one support a government should have, if the battle had been fought by fair and honest methods.

As to the members on this side of the House, we Liberals sitting here—what is left of us after these vicious practices—what is to be our attitude? Sir, so far as I am concerned, and so far as my friends about me are concerned, the answer is easy. Liberals, democrats, law-abiding citizens, we went into this fight. Liberals, democrats and law-abiding citizens we come back from the fight. We come back depleted in number. In number we are not as strong as we were, but we are stronger before the people, because we fought an honest fight according to our own views.

What shall be our attitude? Sir, I have only this to say, that the laches of the Government will in no way affect our conception of the duty which we owe to our country. We have our views upon the questions which are now before the Canadian people. We stood behind the Government in all of their war measures except one, and we will carry on the same policy; we will be behind them in all their war measures, with the same reservation.

Sir, when the policy of conscription was introduced last session, it seemed to me that, if the object of the Government was really to assist in winning the war, they were singularly blind as to the condition of the country whose affairs it was their duty to administer. We divided, as I have said, upon this question. I challenge no man's conscience; I respect everybody's views upon this question. But now, Sir, that the fight has been fought, now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, now that the Government are in the saddle —no matter by what methods—in the face of what has taken place, in the face of what is taking place every day, I ask the Government if they will not question their own methods, and if they still believe that the policy that was adopted by them is the surest way of helping to win the war. I think the views of the Government changed on that question when they passed in December last an Order in Council to which it is now the duty to call the attention of the House. On the third of December last the following Order in Council was passed:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, the Prime Minister, and under and in virtue of the provisions of The Military Service Act, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that in any case where a person engaged in agriculture has applied for exemption and such exemption has been refused—

Mark those words "and such exemption has been refused"

—the Minister of Militia and Defence, if he is of the opinion that the services of such person are essential for promoting agricultural production may, by order under his hand, discharge such person from military service.

In the Act passed last session it was provided that conscription was to be universal, that the Government should not interfere, that judges should be appointed for the purpose of determining who, and who alone, should be exempted. Yet here is an Order in Council, whereby a minister of the Crown is empowered to discharge any farmer or any one engaged in agriculture if, in the minister's opinion, it is believed that his services would be better upon the farm than in the ranks. Well, Sir, if such be the case, why was this Order made, I want to know? Why was it made during the election?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why was it made during the election? It was because there were so many complaints coming from all parts of the country that if the Act was to be applied it would disorganize the country for agricultural production, and this demand was so insistent that this order was passed, an order which the Government have no power to pass.

4 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where, in the Military Service Act, is power given to the Government to exempt anybody? Judges can grant exemptions; but I am not aware that, under the Act, there is any member of the Government authorized to take such liberties with the enactments of Parliament. In this connection, a very important correspondence has taken place (which I hold in my hands), giving the opinion of the law experts of the Government upon their own action. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister received in last month the following letter:

Uxbridge, Ont., Feb. 18, 1918.

The Honourable Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

On the 28th of November last, while delivering your speech to a full house at Uxbridge, you said that if any farmer's sons that always worked on the farm and always intended to do so, if they thought that they did not receive justice at the appeal courts, if they wrote to you, you would give them their exemption.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: (Reading):

Now I feel that I have not received justice at these appeal tribunals, and I am appealing to you for justice. I am sending you a copy of my appeal. I have always worked on the farm since childhood and always intend to. Thirty-eight of my nearest neighbors signed a petition stating that I would be of more service to my country in working my farm and producing food.

This letter was evidently passed on by the Prime Minister to the Department of Justice, and the following is the answer which my correspondent received from that department:

Military Service Branch.
Royal Bank Building,
Ottawa, March 1st, 1918.

Dear Sir,

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 18th addressed to the Honourable Sir Robert Borden.

In reply I have to inform you that no minister of the Crown has the power to interfere in any way with the working of an Act passed by parliament. All matters of exemption must be left to the sole discretion of the local tribunals and appeal courts,——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: (Reading):

—established under the Act for this purpose.

Should your son already have received an order to report for duty with a Depot Battalion, he may through his Commanding Officer make application to have his case submitted to the Leave of Absence Board for consideration.

Yours truly,

Sgd. Deputy Minister of Justice.

Sir, this is a very significant commentary upon the legislation which was passed last session. I leave it to the comments of the Government and their followers. I do not want to make the matter worse than it is; but in the face of all this I ask if the Government and their followers are satisfied that in introducing that legislation they chose the best means of helping to win the war?

We are now, Sir, in the fourth year of the war. The military situation is serious, more serious, perhaps, than at any time since the early days of September, 1914, when the cable every day brought us news that the German armies were advancing towards Paris and had almost reached the gates of that city. Luckily, we were all relieved when a few days afterwards the news came that the German advance had been stopped and their armies thrown back from the gates of Paris, from the river Marne to the river Aisne. Four years have elapsed since then. No great advances have been made either way. The Germans have not made any headway towards Paris, and the Allied armies have in no sense made a great advance towards the Rhine, and it would be a bold man who would say that the campaign of 1918 will result in an advance towards the Rhine such as we contemplated in 1915, in 1916 and again in 1917.

What is not beyond doubt, what is only too certain, is that day in and day out it is becoming more evident that the food problem may become perhaps the most important factor in the final decision towards victory. Upon this I offer no comment; the Government know the situation better than we do. I ask them for no more information than they can give us; I do not know what their attitude will be upon this question.

But, Sir, I have only to repeat once more that we, on this side of the House, stand exactly as we have at all times stood since the war began by this declaration: It is our fervent and solemn conviction that the issue which is now trembling in the balance of destiny is that of Freedom and Liberty itself. It is a sad thing that upon such an issue as this, when we are battling for the sacred cause of Liberty and Freedom, that I should have to arraign the Government for having itself sapped the foundations of the free institutions under which we live, a deed which has already produced its evil effects. Men there are to-day who declare by voice and pen that all the militant powers are governed by the same selfish spirit. Against such an unfounded assertion I protest with all the force at my command and with all the energy I can put into my words. To say that there is no difference between the belligerent—to put Germany on the same plane as France, as the United States, as Belgium and as England, is simply to flout history. The rulers of Germany have shown that they will respect no law, neither of God, nor of nations, nor of men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Germany has shown she holds the view that there is one law for herself and another for the nations against whom she is warring, and she is seeking to realize her schemes of aggrandisement and ambition regardless of the consequences to others. Sir, if there is one reason more than another which makes me proud of the cause for which we are fighting, it is that in this contest the best nations of the earth—Great Britain, France, Belgium and the United States, are united in the cause of battling to the end for Freedom. Unfortunately the people of Germany do not seem to be yet sufficiently advanced in the doctrine of self-government, or in the principles of freedom, to assert the sovereign right of the people to check their rulers where those rulers go wrong. On the other hand the Allied Nations are all united in proclaiming their devotion to the cause of freedom; and if any government among them should depart from that ideal, an ideal that still lives in the minds, in the hearts, and in the souls of the people, sooner or later when the greater danger which overshadows us has been conquered and overcome, the recusants will be called to severe account. But our first duty is to overcome the greater danger which threatens, and to that imperative duty we on this side of the House will give, with all our might, whatever it may be, and with our whole heart, we shall give it our undivided support.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in the appreciation which has been expressed by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laur-

ier) of the speeches delivered by the mover and seconder of the address. The mover (Mr. Mowat) bears a distinguished name. Before his entrance into this House he had taken no inconsiderable part in public affairs, and his speech yesterday was delivered with earnestness and was characterized by qualities which I am sure will give him a high place in the deliberations of the House. The seconder of the address has been in Parliament for many years. His devotion to public affairs, his intelligent grasp of all public questions, more than that his courage, are well known to all those who have been associated with him in the past. He happily sustained the excellent record which he has borne among us at all times since he first entered the House.

Now I come to some observations of my right hon. friend. With the exception of the latter part of his speech, his remarks were of an exceedingly critical nature. I cannot say that all his observations were characterized by a keen sense of logic, because he contended in the first place that this is precisely the same Government as in the past, while at the same time he stated there was a marked improvement in its personnel. I cannot quite reconcile these two ideas, and the right hon. gentleman would find it hard to explain how the Government shows that marked improvement in personnel if it is precisely the same Administration as in the past. The right hon. gentleman found a good deal of fault with the Government which preceded the present one, and if one may judge from his observations to-day he is likely to be as intensely critical of the Government which was formed on 12th October last. I quite agree with him that there is a political colour of a pronounced red type, if you like, in some of the gentlemen who are members of the Government. That was precisely the intention when this Administration was formed. We desired to form, and we did form, a Government based upon equal representation of both the great political parties of this country. Practically that has been accomplished, and insofar as it has not been carried out to the letter it will be fulfilled to the letter at the earliest opportunity. I agree with my right hon. friend that the gentlemen who were formerly associated with him on the other side of the House were inspired by a keen and unfaltering sense of duty when they agreed to join this Government. That has been publicly emphasized by me on several occasions. In that observation of my right hon. friend, all sides in this House will heartily concur. The present Government was formed for the purpose of giving a just representation to all those elements of the population who are animated by a sincere desire to throw the full efforts of Canada into this war. It was formed, further, with the idea of giving a just representation to the great industry of agriculture and to the labour organizations of the country. That purpose, I think, has been immeasurably well carried out; and with all respect to hon. gentlemen opposite, I venture to believe that the great Liberal party of Canada is well represented on the Treasury benches of Canada to-day.

My right hon. friend denounced what he was pleased to consider a violation of the electoral laws of Canada, when he alluded to the Order in Council passed on the 12th of March last, under which a preliminary return of the members of this House has been made. I was under the impression that this Order had been laid upon the Table yesterday, but I find that such is not the case. In order that there may be no doubt as to its purport, I shall read the Order in Council as it was passed, after which I shall make a few observations with regard to it.

At the Government House at Ottawa.

Tuesday the 12th day of March, 1918.

Present:

His Excellency

The Governor General in Council.

Whereas owing to conditions arising out of the war there has been unforeseen and unavoidable delay in the receipt by the General Returning Officer of the official statements required by Subsections 4 and 9 of Section 12 of the Military Voters Act, 1917, to be recorded, signed and sent by registered post to the General Returning Officer, and it is by reason of such delay impossible that the proclaiming and return of the members of the House of Commons, as contemplated by Section 14 of the said Act can be made before 18th March, 1918, for which date Parliament is summoned to meet for the despatch of business;

And whereas confusion and great inconvenience in connection with the business of the session, and especially with regard to war measures, will ensue if the assembling of Parliament be postponed until after the fiscal year which will expire with the present month, and it is therefore deemed expedient to authorize the proclamation and return of the members in anticipation of the said official statements upon the telegraphic information received of the facts which the official statements contain:

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice and under the powers conferred by the War Measures Act, 1914, and by Section 19 of the Military Voters Act, is

pleased to sanction and doth hereby sanction the following provisions:—

1. Upon receipt of information by telegraph from the Secretary of the High Commissioner's Office, or the Commissaire Général du Canada in France, of the contents of the official statements mentioned in Subsections 4 and 9 of Section 12 of the Military Voters' Act 1917, the General Returning Officer shall add the number of votes given for or applicable to the respective candidates in each electoral district, as disclosed by the information so communicated by telegraph, to the votes given for the candidates as shown by the certificate of the returning officer made pursuant to Section 13 of Part IV. of the Dominion Elections Act, and shall openly proclaim and shall return pursuant to the provisions of Section 211 of Part III. as being duly elected a member or members to represent such electoral district in the Commons of Canada, the candidate or candidates found to have the greatest number of votes, and shall, if requested to do so, give to each such candidate a certificate stating the fact of his election; and until superseded in the manner hereinafter provided the proclamations, returns and certificates so made or issued by the General Returning Officer shall have the same force and effect, to all intents and purposes as if made upon the said official statements pursuant to Section 14 of the Military Voters' Act, 1917.

2. The General Returning Officer shall, nevertheless, upon receipt of the said official statements through the post make his proclamations and returns and issue his certificates as required by Section 14 of the Military Voters' Act, 1917, and the latter proclamations, returns and certificates so made or issued upon receipt of the statements themselves shall supersede the proclamations, returns and certificates made or issued upon telegraphic information as hereinbefore authorized, and shall thenceforth be and be deemed to be the effective proclamations, returns and certificates.

What was the situation that confronted us? We had summoned Parliament for the eighteenth day of March, the latest date on which we could do so if we are to make necessary provision for the ensuing fiscal year; necessary provision for the pay and maintenance of those men who are fighting our battles overseas and of the troops we are assembling in Canada and have assembled in Great Britain for supplying necessary reinforcements. Upon the high seas there is a submarine menace. We found that, even in the ordinary course, the statements which had been prepared by the Commissaire Général in Paris and by the Secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London could not reach us at this date. They might not reach us until the middle of April or the first of May; the ship in which they were coming over might be sunk. Well, what were we to do? My right hon. friend himself has called attention to the fact that there is a provision in the Military Voters' Act for the sending of telegraphic information. It is perfectly true that the Act itself did not provide that the return could be made on that information. We decided to take cognizance by telegram of the statements which had already been signed by the Commissaire Général in Paris and by the Secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, and upon those statements so signed and communicated to the General Returning Officer by telegraph we provided not for a final return, but for a preliminary return, in order that the representatives of the people of Canada might meet here in Parliament in time to provide for the next fiscal year. But we declared further that as soon as those statements so signed by the two officers mentioned shall reach the General Returning Officer, he shall make another return, which will supersede the preliminary return to which I have referred. That simple and justifiable method of summoning Parliament is characterized by my right hon. friend as an outrage. I say to him, in reply, that if by not taking this step we had neglected to make provision for the men who are fighting our battles overseas that would have been an outrage not only upon them, but upon the people of Canada and upon this Parliament. My right hon. friend was rather free with his use of the word "outrage." He found an outrage in the War-time Elections Act of last session.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That Act was debated last session and passed by the late Parliament. I do not know whether he regards it as an outrage—apparently he does—that we gave to the female relatives of the gallant men who are holding our battle line the right to vote at the last election. According to my right hon. friend's statement, it was an outrage—he nods his acquiescence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Oh, no.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He does not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The outrage was in giving the franchise to some and taking it away from others.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We did not take it from any of the women of Canada; on the contrary, we gave it to many thousands of them. Moreover, we shall proceed at this session to give the franchise to all the women of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: The election is over now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The election is over, and perhaps if we had given all

women the right to vote, my hon. friend would not be here.

Mr. BUREAU: The women prevented the opposition of the friends of my right hon. friend.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend, I believe, is distressed by other features of that enactment—more concerned by them than he ever was by any desire that the men overseas should vote. But I do not intend to enter into any discussion of what took place at the last session; we shall have enough to occupy ourselves with at the present session. So, let that past attend to itself. Let us go ahead and do our duty in this Parliament as it lies before us.

My right hon. friend ventures to say to me that partisan returning officers and enumerators were appointed. I have been in this House for nearly twenty-two years, I have passed through six general elections, and I never passed through an election the methods of which were not discussed and criticised, at the first session of the following Parliament, by the party which lost. But I have never heard any hon. gentleman go so far as my right hon. friend has gone to-day. I want to tell him that I issued a statement, which was circulated through the press of Canada near and far, asking that the returning officers should select enumerators of both political parties, and that equal representation should be given to all interests in the country; in that selection, and in the selection of returning officers themselves, I endeavoured so far as I was able, to have that principle carried out. That is the first time such a course was ever pursued in Canada. The leader of the Opposition would never have dreamed of doing it. Men within the sound of my voice have come to me more than once and complained that by reason of the appointment of returning officers and enumerators opposed to the Government they had lost hundreds of votes and their election to this House had been endangered. I venture to say that since the history of this Confederation there never was an election in Canada conducted more fairly and decently than the recent one.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Possibly the subject which excites the mirth of my hon. friends is the denial of free speech in some parts of the country. My right hon. friend has referred to a supposed conspiracy to defeat Mr. Oliver. By whom does he allege that that conspiracy was made or carried on? He has said either too little or too much. If he has any charge to bring against the Government, or against any member of the Government, or against any official of the Government, let him go further and make his charge and we shall have it investigated. That is the way to deal with such matters, if my right hon. friend has anything to complain of. He regards the defeat of Mr. Oliver as due to a conspiracy, because in three polling divisions, I think, out of about 150, some alleged irregularities may have taken place. I have just been informed that ballots enough for all the voters upon the list were placed at the polls to which my right hon. friend has alluded, and that those who came and demanded ballots were, in many instances at least, persons who were not upon the list. I knew nothing of this matter and heard nothing about it until my right hon. friend alluded to it. As I have said, if my right hon. friend wants any investigation into the matter, the courts are open to him, or the procedure of this House is open to him.

My right hon. friend sees fit to suggest that there has been some plot or conspiracy in connection with the voting of soldiers in Canada, and he even insinuates—and I hope he will permit me to say that I think the insinuation was unworthy of him—that men were put in khaki in order that elections might be won. As I understand the matter, the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence to which my right hon. friend alluded, did not include the men in hospitals, the returned soldiers, the soldiers home on leave; it included only those who had been raised and recruited in Canada in order that they might proceed overseas, and therefore the supposed anomaly to which my right hon. friend alluded might easily have been cleared up if he had seen fit to make a little further inquiry.

I do not know as to the cries which he says were used in some parts of the country. There may have been cries here and there that were unworthy. There was no such cry put forward on behalf of the Government, so far as I know, either here or overseas. I do not think my right hon. friend will find it in his heart to say that the overseas men voted in favour of the Government and against him by reason of any compulsion or pressure put upon them. They are men who would keenly resent any attempt to place compulsion upon them. I believe that they voted against my right hon. friend because they attributed to him some such spirit as that which I found running through his speech, a spirit which at-

taches more importance to the result of elections to this House than to the actual task of winning the war. Our men at the front are in deadly earnest in that task, and I believe they voted as they did because they realized that in the Government they had an Administration which was disposed and determined to support them by every means within its power. In that estimate of the intention and attitude of the Government they will find they were not mistaken.

My right hon. friend was good enough to tell us that although there is a very considerable majority supporting the Administration in this House, the Government has not the moral support of the country. I do not know by what warrant my hon. friend undertakes to speak for the country in that regard. With all deference and respect to him, I venture to say that there never has been any Government of this Dominion since 1867 which has had the moral force of the country more strongly behind it than the Administration which is in office to-day.

My right hon. friend alluded to an Order in Council of the 3rd of December last by which the Minister of Militia was authorised to discharge persons notwithstanding that their exemption might have been refused by the tribunals. I am rather of the opinion that the Minister of Militia and Defence, as head of the military forces of this country, has that right without any Order in Council; but the Order in Council which was passed on that occasion was precisely in line with the principle enunciated when the Military Service Bill was introduced into this House last session. We endeavoured to safeguard the Administration of that Bill in every way. We endeavoured to safeguard it by making provision for a great number of tribunals throughout the country, by the provision of appeal tribunals, by the provision of a Central Appeal Judge. Perhaps we provided too many tribunals. The Act may require amendment. Perhaps it would have been better to create a simpler procedure. But we were breaking new ground, and we desired that every community in this country might realise that its rights would be adequately protected. The hundreds of tribunals, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, were composed of men upon whom new duties had been imposed and their decisions were not consistent; they varied. I am not saying that by way of criticism. Nothing else could have been expected. The Minister of Militia and Defence, under the Order in Council in question, had a certain right to discharge men if he came to the conclusion that their service was of more value to the people of this country in the occupation of agriculture than in bearing arms at the front. As a matter of fact, he has not discharged any men at all, but he has given to some men leave of absence for a certain period in order that their work in the industry of agriculture may be carried on to the great good of this country. That is the whole story from first to last, and I am perfectly content to leave our action to the judgment of the fair minded majority of this House.

I do not propose to deal further with the issues of the recent election, but it might be worth while for me, before speaking of the programme of the Government as outlined in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General, to inform the House of what has been accomplished by this Government during its period of office. It was formed on the 12th day of October last, and if one eliminates the period during which its members were engaged in the election contest, it will be seen that there has been a period of something less than four months for actual work of administration. I submit to the House that the record which this Union Government has made during that time is one that can be presented to this House and to the country with some confidence. A great many of these matters to which I am about to allude have already been made public, but I hope the House will bear with me if I make a short resumé in order that we may realize all that has been done during the brief period since we assumed office.

In the first place, we have formed two committees of the Cabinet. One of those committees is presided over by my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who is vice-chairman; I am nominally chairman, but the labours have very largely devolved upon him, and I do believe the country owes him a debt of gratitude for the enormous amount of work which he has accomplished in so short a time, and for his services to the public in many matters to which I am about to refer. The War Committee of the Cabinet was established for the purpose of co-ordinating the efforts of the several departments of the Government in the prosecution of the war. It was desired by means of that machinery to ensure the maximum of effort with a minimum of expenditure, and generally to throw the full power of Canada into the war. The Order in Council creat-

ing the committee has been laid on the table of the House, and hon. gentlemen can see in detail what were proposed as its duties.

Another committee was formed called the Committee on Reconstruction and Development, of which my hon. friend, Hon. A. K. Maclean, is vice-chairman. He has devoted much attention and study to the duties thus entrusted to him. That Committee was established for the purpose of making recommendations respecting transportation, methods of raising revenue, encouragement of thrift, conditions of labour, the service of womanhood both during and after the war, and other cognate matters.

Now as to what we have actually done since these committees have been formed. One of our first acts was the creation of a Department of Immigration and Colonization, over which Mr. Calder presides. Up to the present, there has not been opportunity for any great work of organization or development in that Department Nevertheless, the minister has surveyed the general aspects of the problem, and more than that, has discussed them pretty thoroughly with the provincial governments. He is assured of the co-operation of every provincial government of Canada in his work, and it is hoped, and indeed expected, that at a later date, further conferences will be held at which plans will be more fully matured and discussed.

There was cast upon us immediately the administration of the Military Service Act. We all realize that in certain communities in this country there was a very strong public opinion against the principle which was embodied in that Act, and the numerous appeals which were provided for made its operation more difficult than was anticipated when it was passed. Very elaborate regulations have been prepared by the Military Service Council from time to time, and have been approved. These will be discussed, it may be, in due course, but in the meantime it is enough for me to say that since the Act was proclaimed, about the 13th October last, we have enlisted in Canada 36,342 men, and 26,839 have been sent overseas during that time. Of 36,342 men so enlisted, 28,396 were enrolled directly under the Military Service Act, and 7,946 have been obtained through the British-Canadian Recruiting Mission in the United States. I should further add that of the 28,396 men so enrolled, 3,895 have been apprehended for failing to report.

I feel it my duty to add that our forces in France are maintained to-day at full strength. The Canadian Expeditionary Force in France was never at greater strength than to-day, and more than that, it was never more determined or more confident.

The Minister of Overseas Service has given attention to the return of men to Canada who are not fit for active service, and a recent cable from him informs me that he expects to return to Canada within the next few months from 20,000 to 25,000 men. He gives me further particulars in a letter, dated the 24th day of February last, and received only a few days ago, in which he discusses the subject. He says:

> As I cabled you a few days ago, in view of the labour situation in Canada, and in the interests of economy, I have insisted upon as many as can be spared and who are in low categories, being returned. I have had an Officer, Col. J. A. Gunn, D.S.O., who has special qualifications, appointed, under the Adjutant-General, to go through the forces for the purpose of combing out such men.
>
> There is always room for a very large number of men who are in categories B2 and B3, and who are not fit for the trenches, to be used in connection with work in hospitals, road-making, and in a hundred and one other ways, and whose services are necessary. At the same time I think it justifiable that not too many of these men should be retained over here, not only for the reasons I have named but in order that there will be fewer to transport when the war ends.

We have taken up the question of the registration of the manhood and womanhood of Canada. This has been the subject of more than one conference with labour organizations. A Registration Board has been established under the chairmanship of Senator Robertson; it is proceeding actively with its work, and we hope for good results in the not distant future. The services which this board will perform will be useful for a great many purposes. It will be useful in the co-ordination and maintenance of essential industries. It will be useful for the purpose of giving us a fuller enumeration than has hitherto been available of those persons throughout Canada who are subject to call under the Military Service Act.

The increased production of food is a vital question, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) has worked at that problem with the greatest possible industry and with very great ability. He has taken up the subject with the provincial governments and has secured thorough co-operation on their part. I could not do better than give to the House the substance of a memorandum which I asked from him to-day. The memorandum contains the following information:

> At the conference of the provincial premiers on the 15th and 16th of February last, a plan

was submitted and generally approved by them, respecting greater production of cereals and meats in Canada.

Later the Food Board, which is composed of Mr. H. B. Thomson, Hon. C. A. Dunning, and Mr. J. D. McGregor, and which is supervising the work of greater production in Canada had a conference with representatives of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture of Eastern Canada. After discussion it was concluded that the most effective method of attaining the end desired would be secured through having the work in each province carried on and supervised by the Provincial Department of Agriculture, since this would provide the most effective means of adapting methods to the particular needs of the individual provinces. The Canada Food Board through general newspaper publicity, poster advertising in a limited way, and in bulletins and publications sent out in connection with food conservation, is attracting attention to the need of greater production throughout the Dominion. With the approval of Council, cash assistance has been promised to the various provinces as follows: Ontario $60,000, Quebec $60,000, Nova Scotia $30,000, New Brunswick $25,000, Prince Edward Island $5,000, British Columbia $15,000, Manitoba $25,000, Saskatchewan $35,000, and Alberta $25,000.

This money is to be expended, in a general way, in accordance with the memorandum submitted and agreed to by the Premiers. I shall read that memorandum in a moment.

The services of Dr. J. W. Robertson were secured to represent the Food Board in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Dr. Robertson has been in consultation with the Provincial Departments of Agriculture in these provinces as to the most effective methods of attaining the ends desired.

The Hon. Chas. Dunning personally took charge of the work in the Western provinces. While the Minister of Agriculture has not had an opportunity to consult with either of these gentlemen since their meeting with the Provincial authorities, from the information available their work may be summarized as follows: Ontario aims to secure organization down to county and municipal committees, particularly to assist in labour supply and distribution, and to bring home directly to the individual farmer the need of the greatest possible effort.

Quebec aims to secure similar organization and produce enough wheat to feed herself, and to greatly increase meat animals.

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have the same objective; also in each of these provinces to produce enough coarse grains to meet their own requirements for animal feed. The Minister has no definite report from Dr. Robertson as to what extent organization is being proceeded with.

WESTERN CANADA.

Alberta is divided into sixteen districts, each district under the supervision of a greater production agent, and these again centrally supervised. Steps are being taken—

1. To insure supplies of seed.
2. To find out help that is necessary.
3. To secure tenants for unoccupied land.
4. To arrange definitely with farmers for the breaking of new areas of their holdings for 1919 crop.

A Provincial Labour Bureau has been established and generally, work is being assisted by public meetings.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Saskatchewan.—Over two hundred meetings arranged throughout the province. Many of them have already been held. Steps taken to secure all available labour from towns and cities that might be of use on the farms and distribute it through a Provincial Labour Bureau.

Manitoba.—Practically the same.

British Columbia.—No reports received as yet, except in a general way that every one is alive to the need and putting forth as great an effort as possible.

GENERAL.

The Dominion has further assisted by the purchase of a thousand Ford tractors, which will be distributed in the next two months; by securing seed supplies and distributing them to the provinces; by taking the necessary steps to ensure a supply of garden and root seeds, and by making the necessary arrangements with the United States authorities for the securing of the supplies of corn suitable for seed.

Reports to hand indicate that the acreage in Western Canada this season will be the largest ever planted, and plans are being considered and worked out now with a view to having as much new land as possible broken up during the present year for crop in 1919. In a general way, the aim is to concentrate on cereals and meats.

LABOUR.

The movement for the enlistment of 25,000 boys throughout Canada under the auspices of the Y.M.C.A. and Soldiers of the Soil is now definitely under way. This includes boys from the age of 15 to 19. Methods to secure, by voluntary enlistment, men from towns and cities for work on farms will be worked out.

Now the memorandum which was presented to and approved by the provincial governments, to which I alluded a moment ago, reads:

The Provincial Government in each province to constitute itself a War Committee for production, to work in co-operation with the Canada Food Board.

Aims.

1.—a. To plant this Spring every acre possible of wheat, oats, barley and rye.

b. To bring into cultivation every acre possible of new land for crop in 1919.

c. To increase cattle, hogs and sheep to the greatest possible extent.

2.—a. To secure cultivation of gardens and vacant lots in towns and cities with a view to raising the maximum amount of vegetables.

This should be accomplished through the municipal or existing organizations in such manner as will ensure proper supervision.

b. By encouraging every householder in small towns and villages to secure and raise one pig through the season, with a view to utilizing all garbage for food.

Methods.

1. Provincial Governments to see that the proper quantity of seed is available and distributed in their Provinces.

2. Provincial Governments to undertake the work of ascertaining the form of assistance which may be required by their farmers in order to secure the breaking, in 1918, of a definite increased acreage of new land more

than would normally be broken for crop next year.

3. Assistance of Provincial Departments of Agriculture in taking orders for tractors and forwarding same to the Canada Food Board, Ottawa.

a. Assistance of the Provinces, through their Educational Departments in making teen age boys available by providing that such boys shall not lose their educational standing through absence from school for the purpose of working on farms.

b. Co-operation by Provincial Governments in securing the teen age boys as recruits for the Soldiers of the Soil, by means of lectures in every Public and High School to show the boys the necessity of getting out on the farms and helping the labour situation.

c. By voluntary enrollment in all cities, towns and villages of persons able to work on the land.

4.—Arouse the people to the need, by way of public addresses, and organization, through municipal machinery, with a view to having committees working in every municipality and township.

a. By frank statements from time to time of the seriousness of the situation, giving definite facts in respect thereto.

b. By a series of addresses in each Province from the Premier, members of the Provincial Governments, and other prominent citizens.

c. By requesting the clergymen of every church in Canada to preach two sermons in March on this question, urging increased food production to save people who may otherwise starve.

d. By enlisting the assistance of all newspapers to keep this need continously before the public.

e. The Canada Food Board to continue to supply reading matter to newspapers, to circularize boards of trade, societies of all kinds, women's associations, and other organized bodies.

I am confident that the thanks and congratulations of the House and the country will be extended to the Minister of Agriculture for the good work which he has carried on, and which has resulted in the organization thus described.

In connection with this, I should inform the House that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs has also taken into account the very urgent need for increased food production during the present year and has taken effective action.

Under an Order in Council passed on the 16th day of February the minister recommended as follows:

That Mr. W. M. Graham, Inspector of Indian Agencies, South Saskatchewan Inspectorate, be appointed a Commissioner for the Department of Indian Affairs, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, with the following duties and powers—

To make proper arrangements with the Indians for the leasing of reserve lands, which may be needed for grazing, for cultivation or for other purposes, and for the compensation to be paid therefor;

To formulate a policy for each reserve.

To issue directions and instructions to all inspectors, agents and employees in furtherance of that policy.

To make purchases and engage or dismiss any extra or temporary employees and market the yield of grain and live-stock, and in effect to have the sole management of this work subject to the approval of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to whom he shall report fully at close and regular intervals.

The minister further recommends that the said Commissioner be authorized also to make recommendations to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, looking to the greater efficiency of such of the Indian service in the said provinces as is not related to the said special work.

The minister believes that in this way it will be possible to bring larger areas under cultivation and produce grain and meat supplies of great value.

The minister recommends further that, pursuant to the provisions of the War Measures' Act, 1914, and of all other authority in that behalf, the sum of $300,000 be advanced from the War Appropriation to the Department of Indian Affairs for the purchase of agricultural machinery and implements, seed and live-stock, fence wire and other supplies and for rentals, salaries, and expenses necessary for the undertaking, the said amount to be refunded to the War Appropriation from revenues arising from sales as they accrue; all expenditure and revenue to be treated in the usual way and all accounts to be audited by the Department of Indian Affairs and by the Auditor General.

Under this Order in Council active steps have been taken. The memorandum submitted by the department is as follows:

The Department of Indian Affairs and Commisioner W. M. Graham have undertaken vigorously the work outlined by the attached Order in Council. Mr. Graham has already visited the chief reserves in Alberta and Saskatchewan and has interviewed agents and inspectors, has taken the necessary preliminary action to obtain surrenders from the Indians and has had authority to inform them that land may be taken without surrender under the War Measures Act for temporary use. We have insured that every acre ready for cropping will be seeded this spring; tractors and ploughs have been purchased to break land for next year's seeding.

The department has received many applications direct and through Commissioner Graham for the lease of grazing lands, and these are being promptly dealt with, and much of the rich natural grazing on Indian reserves will be utilized by settlers and ranchers.

Mr. Graham has already purchased 150 two-year old steers and 120 sows and distributed them on Indian reserves.

Like measures are being taken throughout Ontario, and it is hoped that the purpose of the Order in Council will be met:

1. The Indians will have under crop every available acre, and will increase their breaking.

2. By the use of tractors a large acreage will be made available for next year's crop.

3. The natural advantages for grazing throughout the Territories will be made available to ranchers and settlers who have cattle to feed.

I dwell upon this work with some particularity, because I cannot emphasize

too strongly the absolute, urgent, vital necessity of increased production of food in Canada during this year and next year. I absolutely agree with what my right hon. friend said a moment ago, that the issue of this war may depend upon food production in the United States and in Canada, and I hope that every member of this Parliament, everyone within sound of my voice, will lend his aid and his influence to this all-important movement in order that the purposes of the Allied nations may thereby be assisted, and, I hope, rendered triumphant.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Further, with regard to food conservation, Mr. Hanna, about the time that he resigned his duties as Food Controller, made a very elaborate report of his work up to that time. I shall not pause to dwell upon it; it will be laid upon the table of the House in the near future. Mr. Hanna brought to a very difficult task, indeed, an unusual energy and great ability. I am confident that hon. members, when they read his report, will have, perhaps, a greater appreciation of the work performed during his tenure of that office.

5 p.m.

Now, I come next to the question of shipbuilding, and for this reason, that, although we may raise troops, and although we may provide food, nevertheless the troops cannot be transported overseas to perform their service, and the food cannot be made available for Great Britain and the Allied nations unless there are means of transportation across the Atlantic. Before alluding to what the present Government has done in its shipbuilding policy, the House will be interested to know what has been accomplished by the British Government through the Imperial Munitions Board, and what work is now being carried on. The Imperial Munitions Board have undertaken to construct—and I believe all these ships are now under construction—43 steel ships of a tonnage of 211,300 dead weight, and 46 wooden ships of a tonnage of 128,800 dead weight. The cost of the steel ships is $40,000,000; the cost of the wooden ships is $24,500,000, or $64,500,000 altogether. The total number of ships is 89, and the total tonnage is 340,100. The first vessel, a wooden vessel, will be launched in the month of May and will be put immediately into commission.

I have asked the Minister of the Naval Service to give me a memorandum of what has been done in carrying out the policy upon which the present Administration embarked last autumn. An appropriation of $25,000,000 has been authorized, so far as Council was able to authorize it, for the present year, and the memorandum which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House is as follows:

Referring to the recently announced policy of ship construction undertaken on behalf of the Government by this Department, the intention is to confine at present the awarding of contracts for the construction of steel ships to yards already established and actually engaged in constructing steel ships. The yards equipped and at present engaged in constructing steel ships are as follows:—

Canadian Vickers Limited, Montreal, Que.

Davie Shipbuilding Company, Quebec.

Kingston Shipbuilding Company, Kingston, Ont.

Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ont.

Polson Iron Works, Limited, Toronto, Ont.

Dominion Shipbuilding Company, Toronto, Ont.

Midland Shipbuilding Company, Midland, Ont.

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, Port Arthur, Ont.

British American Shipbuilding Company, Welland, Ont.

Canadian Allis-Chalmers Company, Bridgeburg, Ont.

Wallace Shipyards, Limited, Vancouver, B. C.

J. Coughlan and Son, Vancouver, B. C.

The estimated combined capacity of these several yards is approximately 250,000 tons per year. All of these yards with the exception of the Kingston Shipbuilding Company are at the present time fully occupied in constructing ships for the Imperial Munitions Board or for the Government. As the ships under contract for the Imperial Munitions Board are completed and the building berths become vacant, they are to be immediately occuppied by the Government.

When the Government launched its programme of shipbuilding, two berths only at the yards throughout Canada, were vacant, one of these was at the yard of Canadian Vickers, Limited, Montreal and one at the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company's yard.

A contract has been placed with Canadian Vickers, Limited for the construction of a steel vessel of 4,300 tons deadweight capacity, the keel of which has already been laid and considerable construction work begun as well.

A contract has already been concluded with the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company's yard for a ship of 3,750 tons deadweight capacity, the materials for which are in the course of delivery. Both of these vessels will be in commission before the close of navigation next fall.

The next building berth to become vacant will be in May next at Canadian Vickers, Limited. On this berth it is proposed to lay down a ship of 8,100 tons deadweight capacity, which vessel will also be completed and in commission before the end of the year.

Two berths will become vacant at the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company's yard at a later date in May. These berths will be at once occupied with ships of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity each, for which the material is now under order. While the builders hold out hope that these vessels may be ready before

the close of navigation, it is not expected that they will be in commission before the opening of navigation, 1919.

The Wallace Shipyards, Limited, Vancouver, will also have a berth vacant in May. A contract has already been concluded with this Company for laying down a ship of 4,300 tons deadweight capacity. The material for this ship has been ordered and the Company undertake to prosecute the work vigorously and complete the vessel ready for commission before the end of the year.

The British American Shipbuilding Company of Welland, Ont., expect to have berths becoming vacant as follows: one in June, one in August, one in October and one in December. It is proposed to occupy these berths as they become vacant with the construction of ships of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity for which delivery is promised on the opening of navigation, 1919.

The Midland Shipbuilding Company of Midland, Ont., will have two berths vacant in November next. These will be occupied with the construction of two ships of 3,000 tons dead weight capacity each, for which delivery is promised early in the summer of 1919.

The Polson Iron Works, Limited, Toronto, represent that they will have four berths vacant in October next. It is proposed to occupy these with the construction of four steamers of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity each. Delivery of these ships is promised for the summer of 1919.

Canadian Allis-Chalmers, operating at Bridgeburg, Ontario, will have berths becoming vacant as follows: one in June, two in September and one in November. It is expected to place contracts with this company as the berths become vacant for steamers of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity each. Delivery of the first of these is expected before the close of navigation this year and of the balance during the summer of 1919.

The Davie Shipbuilding Company, Quebec, will have two berths available in August and two additional before the close of navigation. It is proposed to place contracts for these berths for ships of 5,100 tons deadweight capacity. Delivery of the first of these ships is expected in August, 1919, and the others before the close of navigation, 1919.

The Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, Port Arthur, Ontario, will have two berths becoming vacant in July and two before the close of navigation. It is proposed to occupy these berths with ships of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity. Delivery of all of these vessels is expected on the opening of navigation, 1919.

Messrs. J. Coughlan & Son, Vancouver, B.C., are fully occupied in the construction of ships for the Imperial Munitions Board and are not likely to have any vacant berths during the present year. They expect, however, to have some berths become vacant early next year. As berths become vacant, it is proposed to occupy them in the construction of ships of 8,100 tons deadweight capacity.

On this programme of ship construction, the Marine Department is looking forward to have four steamers of the combined tonnage of 23,500 tons in commission before the end of the present year; and, while it is somewhat difficult so far in advance to accurately estimate the work that may be accomplished during the year 1919, it is fully expected that an additional 50 ships with an aggregate tonnage of 235,000 tons will be in commission.

The Government programme of construction contemplates the construction of three types of vessels. One type will comprise vessels of 3,000 tons deadweight capacity. Another type 5,100 tons and another type ranging from 8,000 to 10,000 tons. The general features of these various types will be based on the latest types of standard cargo vessels adapted for bulk or general cargo with loading and discharging facilities in accordance with the best practice. The vessels will be designed to Lloyds highest class, the British Board of Trade and Canadian steamboat inspection requirements and will have a sea speed of 11 knots.

All arrangements have been concluded with the United States authorities for purchasing in that country all the steel plates, the boiler plates and sections required for carrying out the Government programme up to June, 1919. This steel has been purchased at the price fixed by the United States Government for the steel requirements of the United States Shipping Board. These prices are substantially lower than the prices Canadian shipbuilders have been obliged to pay from time to time during the past twelve months and represents a very large saving in the construction price of ships.

The purchase of this material in the United States was made necessary by reason of the fact that plates and shapes required for the construction of ships are not at the present time manufactured in Canada. The manufacture of all materials required for the construction of ships, more particularly plates and shapes is, however, under consideration by the Government and it is hoped that the materials for this purpose eventually will be manufactured in Canada.

I should like to express here this Government's appreciation of the assistance which was thus rendered by the Government of the United States in enabling 80,000 tons of steel to be purchased at the same price as that which is paid by the United States Shipping Board. Otherwise there would have been a greatly increased cost to this country.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I presume all the money required for our own shipbuilding will come through the ordinary channel, but may I ask, who furnishes the money for the Munitions Board? I understand it is guaranteed or paid by the Canadian Government on the security of Great Britain, but who controls it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The British Government are paying for the ships; and they control their construction.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, I know that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The contracts have been placed by the Imperial Munitions Board and the British Government will make the payment. Provision for the money in the meantime will have to be made, as best it may, by efforts very largely on this side of the Atlantic.

Sir SAM HUGHES: By Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By Canada, with possibly some assistance through the credits obtained in the United States.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has Canada any control over the Munitions Board with respect to the money advanced by Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. We do not undertake to control that in any way, if I understand my hon. friend correctly. When a request comes from the British Government, we assist in providing advances of money for this and other purposes. We have done so in the past to the utmost of our ability and we shall continue to do it. I may say that the demands upon us in connection with payment for food, munitions and other war necessaries will be very heavy this year.

The Government also took up the question of prohibiting the importation, manufacture and transportation of intoxicating liquors. There is prohibition of the sale in every province of Canada except the province of Quebec, and prohibition will go into force in that province on the 1st of May, 1919. By an Order in Council which was passed on the 2nd of November last, the Governor in Council forbade use in the distillation of potable liquors of grain or any substance that could be used for food. On the 27th of November last an Order in Council was passed restricting the quantity of malt that can be used for brewing. By an Order in Council passed on the 23rd of December, and by amending Orders in Council, the importation of liquors was forbidden unless purchased before the 24th of December, and shipped on or before the 31st of January last. By an Order in Council approved on the 11th of March the manufacture of intoxicating liquors was prohibited in every province in Canada after the 1st of April, except in those provinces where the sale is still permitted and to the extent to which it is permitted; but the manufacture of intoxicating liquors containing more than 2½ per cent alcohol is absolutely prohibited after the 31st of December, 1918. The same Order in Council forbids the transportation of intoxicating liquor into any area where the sale thereof is contrary to law. The use for sacramental, medicinal, manufacturing and commercial purposes is excepted, and appropriate provisions are made for the appointment of licensees from whom liquor for these purposes can be obtained.

I next come to Orders in Council and regulations restricting excessive profits in several industries. A great many hearings were given to the representatives of one of the industries. Very difficult questions arose. The restrictions which have been imposed are pretty severe. So far as the packing houses are concerned, all profit above 11 per cent is taken by the State, and the remaining profit is still subject to taxation under the Business Profits Act. Therefore the highest profit which any packing house in Canada can retain under these regulations is 10 per cent upon the actual capital. Doubtless, these regulations will be the subject of further explanation and discussion before the session is over.

Civil Service reform was taken up immediately after the formation of the Government, and the Civil Service Commission was requested to report the necessary measures for extending the Civil Service Acts to the Outside Service. I returned to Ottawa on the 10th of January, and I ascertained that a great many difficulties had been encountered in proceeding by Order in Council. The Civil Service Act of 1908 provides that the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council published in the Canada Gazette, bring the whole or any part of the Outside Service under the provisions of the law governing the Inside Service. I discussed that provision with the Civil Service Commission, and after very careful consideration they came to the conclusion that it would be absolutely impracticable to proceed in that way. It must be remembered that there are many thousands of employees in the Outside Service. I have a memorandum from the Civil Service Commission under my hand, and if time permitted I would read it to the House. As an illustration of the considerations which it puts forward, I may observe this: The Inside Service is constituted in three divisions—and the salaries are fixed in each division. The duties assigned to each division are also defined. But if you go to the Outside Service you find there is no such classification. For instance, as pointed out in this memorandum, the present scale of salaries for collectors of customs runs from $300 to $4,500, and for deputy collectors of Inland Revenue from $400 to $1,700. There is no salary in the Inside Service as low as $300 or $400, nor as high as $4,500, and though some officers in the Inside Service receive as much, it has in each such case been specially voted by Parliament. An important part of the remuneration of railway mail clerks is mileage, but there is no provision in the Inside Service scale for any such remuneration. The duties of members of the Outside Service are exceedingly varied. They range from services performed by labouring men to duties of the

highest responsibility and importance. It became absolutely certain therefore, upon a consideration of the whole matter, that it could not be adequately or finally dealt with by Order in Council. Therefore the Governor in Council passed an order making provision as a matter of policy, pending the enactment of the necessary legislation. This Order, passed on the 13th of February last, provides that in future no appointments shall be made to the Outside Service except upon the recommendation and with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. There has been some criticism as to the delay in passing that Order in Council. I can only say that the duties which have been imposed upon this Government have occupied all our waking hours, and those waking hours have been pretty long. For myself, I returned to Ottawa on the 10th of January, and that Order in Council was passed on the 13th of February. We did not succeed in passing the Order in Council with regard to packing houses until the 9th of March, although we gave it all our time and energy, and we did not succeed in passing the final Order with regard to prohibition until the 11th of March. So I think that any criticism based on the suggestion that there has been undue delay is one to which no great weight should be attached.

The question of the demobilization of our troops has also been taken up and attentively considered both here and overseas. That subject will be discussed at the proper time. Perhaps hon. gentlemen do not realize that it will take from a year to eighteen months to bring our troops back from overseas—three hundred thousand men or thereabouts—at the conclusion of the war. Very serious questions will be involved in the considerations which have to be taken into account. We shall give them the best attention that is possible.

A more exact demarcation between military and civilian control in respect of the troops who have already returned and in respect of those who will come back in the future, has been effected. This has been accomplished by an Order in Council which has been placed upon the table of the House. The principle therein embodied is that the Department of Militia and Defence shall retain control of the men until they are discharged from military service, and after they are discharged from military service they shall be taken in hand, so far as they may require care and assistance, by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, a new department which has been created for that purpose. The Military Hospitals Commission is in future to be called the Invalided Soldiers' Commission. So far as the care of men in hospitals is concerned, the work formerly undertaken by the Military Hospitals Commission has been curtailed, because the Department of Militia and Defence takes absolute and full control of men in hospitals until the time of their discharge. After they are discharged they come under the attention of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment and of the Invalided Soldiers' Commission. That commission now has greatly extended powers and duties, because its responsibilities will in the future extend not only to men in hospitals, but to all men who return to Canada from overseas after having seen service at the front. Perhaps the scope of the Military Hospitals Commission has not been fully understood and appreciated in all parts of the country. The work which they have undertaken is of great magnitude; in many respects they have given a lead to other nations. I may point out that they have established an artificial limb factory at which already 1,051 cases have been considered; a school for massage, a school for instructors in remedial gymnastics, and various courses in re-education. They have established on a commercial basis industries such as a planing mill, a furniture factory, machine shops, motor mechanics and farm tractor operation, a woollen mill, a power station. They give commercial instruction, instruction in dairying and in truck and glass gardening. Hon. gentlemen will realize, therefore, that their work has been very extensive and productive of great good. It will have still greater scope for usefulness in the future.

Now I come to the Canadian War Mission which was established at Washington a month or two ago. Mr. Lloyd Harris, who was a member of this House from 1908 to 1911, is the chairman of that commission, which was established in view of the importance of co-operation between the two countries and of utilizing and conserving for a common purpose the resources of Canada and the United States. The gentlemen whom Mr. Harris has associated with him in the work of that mission are men of wide experience and valuable business training, and I can assure the House that the mission has already amply demonstrated its usefulness.

For a similar purpose we have established at Ottawa a War Trade Board, which corre-

sponds in its functions very largely with the War Trade Board which has been established in the United States. It is under the chairmanship of Sir George Foster and Mr. F. P. Jones is vice-chairman. It is to see that materials are not wasted in non-essential industries and to make recommendations with regard to the regulation of imports or exports. It is to see, in co-operation with the War Trade Board of the United States that the resources of the two countries which should be used for essential war purposes shall be so used and not devoted to less important purposes. It has other important powers and duties which are set forth in the Order in Council. The gentlemen who compose it are men of great ability and experience; they are devoting their full time and energy without remuneration to the work, and I am confident that they will render excellent service to the country.

In addition, we have given our attention to abolishing patronage absolutely in respect of all purchases. Hon. gentlemen who were members of this House in the last Parliament will recollect that in the spring of 1915 the War Purchasing Commission was established for the purpose of controlling the purchase of all articles required by the Government for the purposes of war. It has done good work and given excellent service; the gentlemen who compose it have given their services freely and voluntarily as a patriotic duty. We have passed an Order in Council that not only war purchases but purchases of all articles, commodities or materials required by the Government shall be made through the War Purchasing Commission and by tender and contract.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who are the members of the commission?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hon. H. Laporte, of Montreal, chairman; Mr. Gault, of Winnipeg, and Mr. Gundy, of Toronto. On the retirement of Sir Edward Kemp from the board when he went overseas, Mr. Laporte was appointed chairman, and Mr. Gundy became the third member of the board.

We have had under our consideration necessary relief in connection with the appalling disaster at Halifax. I shall speak more fully as to this at a later date. A commission was appointed of three very capable men, Mr. T. S. Rogers, Judge Wallace and Mr. Fowke, who are devoting their whole time to the work. Recently they made a report, which has been laid on the table of the House, and later in the session, the Government will have certain proposals to present with respect to relief. The principle which has been adopted is to make restitution to small householders whose claims are not more than $5,000, and in respect of claims above $5,000 to proceed upon the principle of just and reasonable relief, not upon the principle of restitution.

The Minister of Railways and Canals has had under very serious consideration the provision of rolling stock and equipment for railways. We are confronted with the immediate acquisition of some ten thousand miles of railway, which will bring the total state railway mileage of this country up to about fifteen thousand. It is useless for us to have that railway unless it is properly equipped. The great crops that we hope for during the present year and next year, which are so essential for war purposes, must be transported—and, more than that, expeditiously. Full details of what we propose will be given at a later date.

I should also mention that the Soldier Settlement Board has been established under the Act passed last session. The Minister of the Interior is devoting a large part of his time to the administration of the Act. The members of the board are, I believe, presently proceeding to the western provinces in order that they may have under their immediate supervision the arrangements by which soldiers can be placed on the land during the present year.

Negotiations have been entered into with the United States in regard to certain matters of difference respecting the fisheries. It is too late for me to speak of this as I intended to do. The Order in Council embodying the results have been placed on the table of the House. I believe that the results are in the interests of both countries, especially as they assist in the production of a greater quantity of food than would otherwise be possible.

With respect to fuel control, we have had very important and difficult questions to deal with, and we found it necessary in this country to place ourselves upon an equality of inconvenience with the United States of America in respect to certain restrictions. I do not think the Canadian people complained of that. As a matter of fact, they would have no reasons to complain of it. In so far as the provision of fuel is concerned, the United States Government treated Canada precisely in the same way as it treated all the States of the Union, and we should have the most grateful appreciation of the attitude of the United States in that regard. So when, in the judgment of the Government of the United States, it became necessary

to impose certain restrictions in that country, we could do no less than impose corresponding restrictions here. We have done that; and subsequently we have had conferences with the provincial governments with regard to the intensely vital question of fuel supply for the present year. The House may anticipate that at no distant date new regulations of a very comprehensive character will be placed before it by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

There has also been effected with the United States a Military Service Convention, the text of which will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is ratified. The services of Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, and of Col. MacInnes of the Department of Militia and Defence were requested by the Government and these gentlemen proceeded to Washington. There had been a great deal of delay previously in reaching a conclusion, but after a visit of a week or ten days they were able to arrive at an understanding which, I think, is in the interest of both countries, and which the governments of both countries regard as fair and reasonable.

In addition to all that I have mentioned, we have had a great many conferences first and last, during the past three or four months. We have had two formal conferences with the Labour organizations and a great many informal conferences. We have had the conference, to which I have alluded, with the provincial governments. There has been a conference with the Women's organizations. We have had conferences with the returned soldiers' organizations. At every one of these conferences interesting and important questions were taken up and, on the whole, I believe that satisfactory results were reached.

Mr. BUREAU: It has been stated that there has been an agreement between the United States Government and the Canadian Government in regard to enrolment for military service. Very often Americans who are working on this side of the line ask whether under this agreement they can enlist with the Canadian forces or whether they must go to the United States in order to enlist. Can the Prime Minister answer that question before the text of the convention is laid on the Table?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend will find there are satisfactory dispositions with regard to that in the convention. Without having the actual text of the convention before me, I should not care to give a definite answer to my hon. friend, but I shall be glad to see that a copy of the convention is sent to him personally as he is interested in the subject.

I have imposed myself to some extent upon the patience of the House in giving these details as to what our work has been during a period of somewhat less than four months. It seems to me important that the House and the country should know as precisely as possible what has been done. I have only enumerated these matters; I have not elaborated them at all. Fuller and more detailed information will be given later in the session. This is intended only as a brief resumé, but I think it will convince hon. gentlemen and the people of the country as well that during their period of office the Government has not been idle. And I have not by any means spoken of every problem that has engaged the attention of the Government during that time. There has been the question of railway rates and railway taxation. There is the question of railway nationalization. There are many other questions.

With respect to the financial and commercial stability of the country, the House may be interested to know that the importations for eleven months ending 28th February amounted to $875,266,149; that the exports during the same period were $1,482,450,816; that the total foreign trade of the country during those eleven months was therefore $2,357,716,965, and that there was a favourable trade balance of $607,184,667. The exportation of our foods this year will depend upon the crops. I have spoken of the difficulty connected with the provision of finance, and hon. gentlemen will realize that in a moment. Suppose, as seems likely, that we shall have this year an exportation to Great Britain of $800,000,000 in excess of our importations from that country. Provision must be made for payment. Those supplies are vitally necessary for the use of Great Britain and the Allied nations.

Mr. MURPHY: That would be an excess?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. That is supposed to be a reasonable estimate, although it is only an estimate, as my hon. friend will understand. It is based upon the experience of the past two years. It is equally important to our people that provision should be made to pay for their productions. I hope hon. gentlemen will realize that the financial problems thus presented for the consideration of the Government are of no mean order.

I have already alluded to the fact that the Government proposes to introduce a Bill at the present session for the purpose of extending the franchise to women. A

notice of that Bill is already on the Order Paper, and we intend to proceed with it as soon as possible.

With respect to our part in this war, I again repeat that the Canadian Force in the battle line to-day is numerically as strong as ever it has been. The military authorities inform me that I ought not to disclose even to this House the actual number of men who are to-day fighting in the Canadian ranks. We have not only the fighting unit at the front which, since the close of the last session, has notably distinguished itself at Passchendaele, where it accomplished precisely what it undertook, and where, in the face of enormous difficulties which required the most thorough preparation and organization to overcome them, it exhibited the greatest resourcefulness and heroism—we have not only that fighting unit at the front which has brought honour and renown to this country from first to last; but we have other almost equally important corps, the railway construction corps, the forestry corps, and the men in the flying service. We have paid a great price for what has been accomplished, and it is with a very sorrowful pride, I confess, that one can reflect upon what the Canadians have achieved in this war and upon the price which they have paid. The casualties are as followws:

Killed	25,744
Died of wounds	8,612
Died of disease	1,901
Total	36,257
Wounded	105,250
Prisoners of war	2,757
Presumed dead	3,845
Missing	937
Total casualties	149,046

Sir SAM HUGHES: If that statement goes out without giving the number of returned men people will get the idea that we have lost that number, whereas a great many of these men have returned to duty, I believe.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is quite right. A great many of those who were wounded have returned to the front. I was not speaking in the sense, which, as he fears, might be attributed to the figures, but I was giving an enumeration of the total number of wounded, and I am grateful to my hon. friend for his suggestion.

I have spoken of the force at the front as being numerically not less strong than ever it was before. I know that it is quite as efficient, as determined and as confident as ever it was, and that is saying a good deal. The temporary breakdown in the eastern theatre of war has not discouraged our men one whit. We had great expectations as to what might have been accomplished in the eastern theatre during the past year. Those expectations have been disappointed, but, on the other hand, we have had thrown into the scale the enormous power and resources and the wonderful spirit and invincible determination of the United States of America, our nearest neighbour and Ally. That, I am confident, will much more than compensate. Besides that, let no one absolutely despair of what Russia may do in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One might liken Russia to a giant, manacled for a long time, whose manacles have been suddenly stricken off; he has not yet gained control of his limbs, and endeavours to struggle to his feet. He bruises himself, and, perhaps, overturns those who would like to help him, but eventually he does gain his feet. I am confident that Russia will eventually gain her feet and again take her part as a great nation in the affairs of the world. Let us remember that these people have been denied liberty for centuries, and so they may be pardoned for not knowing, in the first instance, what they should do with their new found freedom. During the past three or four years I have met on various occasions a very intelligent young man from Russia. He came before he knew how to speak English to the United States of America, where he is now employed. I have talked to him of Russia from time to time. He is, perhaps, from thirty to thirty-five years of age. He told me that his father and mother were serfs in their youth, that his father had had his clothing stripped from his back, and the knout applied until the blood ran, for some trivial offence. There was no remedy or redress in the law for that man because he was a serf, and in very truth a slave. When new-found liberty comes to such a people, can you be surprised if for the moment they do not know what to do with it? I venture to believe and earnestly to hope that Russia will find herself in the early future, and will never become permanently subject to the economic or other domination of Germany or of the Central Powers.

Now I have nearly done, and I must apologize to hon. gentlemen for trespassing so long on their patience. Our own course in this war is entirely clear. Germany's war aims have been absolutely unmasked, since the successes which have come to her in the Eastern theatre of war. When

war was first declared, we heard her ruthless statement as to why she had undertaken it. It was openly confessed that it was a war of aggression, that it was undertaken as a national and profitable business enterprise, and that Germany would achieve her ends. Later on, the tune was somewhat changed, but in these later days the old tone of domination has been resumed, and we know that Germany does indeed seek to dominate the world. We are far removed from the theatre of war, and perhaps we do not quite adequately realize what the issue of this war means to us. I said to some gentlemen who came to speak to me a few days ago about some fiscal question, "Production of food in Canada is more vital to you than any other matter that is of concern to you at the present time. Upon the production of food in this country may depend the issue of this war, and upon the issue of this war depends the question whether you shall not come under such an economic domination as would render your industries of little value to you, if not absolutely valueless and worthless." Perhaps we in Canada, far removed as we are from the scene of active operations, do not quite comprehend at all times how closely the issue of this war does concern us. Notwithstanding any disappointments that have met us in the Eastern theatre, I am as profoundly convinced as ever that the Allied cause must triumph, for in it is involved the future of the whole world, the future of civilization, of liberty and democracy. There is much talk of peace in these days.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Too much.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But I should consider all our sacrifice in vain if we did not achieve such a peace as would assure the world against intolerable and ruthless aggression in the future. May I not quote once more the well-known words of the great American, President Lincoln. "We accepted this war for an object, a worthy object, and the war will end when that object is attained. Under God, I hope it never will end until that time." That I believe to be the feeling of the people of Canada from Atlantic to Pacific.

So in the face of disappointments, however severe, let there be no faint hearts among us. Among our men at the front there is absolutely no doubt as to the issue. Among them one encounters a spirit of determination and confidence which may well serve as an example to us. Like them, let us look ahead and not behind us. Let us confront the issue with steady resolve. Let us undertake our duty and carry on our work in the same spirit and with the same unselfish devotion as our heroic countrymen who hold Canada's battle-line beyond the Atlantic.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, in the last Parliament it was my privilege to congratulate you, Sir, when you were first chosen to fill the position of Speaker of this House. To-night it is again my privilege to offer you my felicitations on having been selected for a second time to preside over the deliberations of this assembly, and in doing so I feel that I may avail myself of the opportunity to say that you can at all times count upon the hearty co-operation of my fellow-members on both sides of this House to assist you in the discharge of the important duties attaching to you high office.

By way of expediting the business of the House, and in order to facilitate the work of the Government in pressing forward Canada's part in the war, I have a suggestion to make, which, if adopted, will, I am convinced, attain both those ends. My suggestion is that the hour for the meeting of Parliament should be changed, and that, instead of assembling at three o'clock in the afternoon, this House should meet at one o'clock, and sit continuously until six o'clock, or later, if necessary, and that night sessions should become the exception rather than the rule.

I have given this suggestion a good deal of thought, and I have discussed it with others who have had fairly extended experience in the work of Parliament. Their belief coincides with my own, that if the suggested change were made the members of Parliament would bring to the consideration of public business a capacity, both mental and physical, for sustained work that, under our present procedure, grows increasingly less as the session advances and night sittings multiply. The public business itself would be more expeditiously and more satisfactorily disposed of, the members of the Government would have more time to devote to the work of their respective departments, and those who, either in an official capacity, or as members of the press gallery, are obliged to report the daily proceedings of

Parliament and of its committees, would be afforded seasonable hours in which to perform their work.

Such a change as the one I have suggested would correspond, in a general way, with the rule that prevails in the United States Congress. If it were adopted, the mornings from 9.30 to 12 o'clock could, when necessary, be devoted to the meetings of committees, and the members of the House, when not so engaged, would have ample time to attend to their correspondence and to perform other duties. In any event, their evenings, as a rule, would be free, and that would give them opportunity to dispose of any arrears of work. The proposed change would practically do away with night sittings, and would in the long run provide Parliament with more working hours, by reason of the increased length of the afternoon sittings, than does the present system. Speaking solely for myself, I make the suggestion now, so that, if there is an earnest desire to expedite public business this session, the necessary change can be made, and Parliament, like any other business institution, will transact its business within what are generally recognized as business hours. There is no question in my mind but that the long and unnecessary night sessions do not conduce either to proper consideration of public business or to economy in public expenditure.

At the opening of the first session of a new Parliament it is to be expected that frequent echoes would be heard of the election from which that Parliament has but recently emerged. Even in war time that is bound to be the case. Thus far in this debate we have heard several echoes of the late general election, but it is significant that, neither in the speech from the Throne nor in the speeches from the Government side of the House, has there been any echo heard of the race and religious issues that were deliberately raised by certain members of this Government and by their supporters, on the platform, in the pulpit, and in the press, for the express purpose of setting race against race and creed against creed, in order that, in the resulting turmoil and fratricidal strife, they might snatch a lease of power, and so gratify ambitions that set a higher value on attaining public office, no matter how secured, than upon the promotion of national unity in the face of a foe whom these same gentlemen pretend we are fighting in order to assert the rights of small nationalities and to enforce the principle of national self-determination. These omissions, Sir, it shall be my endeavour to supply before I resume my seat.

Last year during the debate on conscription I appealed to the right hon. gentleman who was then, as he is now, the leader of the Government, not to proceed upon the line he then purposed following, but to adopt some one of the alternative proposals that emanated from this side of the House, in order to keep Canada united both at home and abroad. The appeal that I made was unheeded. Similar appeals from other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House met with a like reception, and while time has already vindicated those who made the appeals to which I refer, time has not, and time will not for many a day to come, eradicate the evil results of the late election. Canadian Prussianism, as practised throughout the campaign, has done quite as much harm to our national life as German Prussianism could do, if it were set up in our midst and imposed upon our people by force of arms.

For, Mr. Speaker, mark what has happened and what is in store for us. The seeds of distrust and hatred were sown wide and deep; the crop will not be of this year's harvesting nor of next; nor, in my belief, will it be gathered within the present generation; for, Sir, I venture to say that long after all those who engaged in sowing these seeds shall have passed away the fruits of their evil labours will continue to spring up to the confusion, embroilment, and division of Canadians who will have to deal with the survivors and the descendants of the three millions of people who either were disfranchised or whose religion was attacked and insulted for the miserable purpose of gaining a victory at the polls.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Now, Sir, so that there may be no doubt as to my position, let me say at once that I have no quarrel with those who in the late election supported the Government in the honest belief that conscription was the only way to secure reinforcements for the troops at the front; in the honest belief that conscription would be promptly, uniformly, and honestly enforced if the Government were returned to power, and that 100,000 men to relieve the men in the trenches would be sent to the front as soon as the Government was installed in office. To induce such beliefs the most lavish promises were made on behalf of the Unionist candidates, and as I have said, with those who believed in such promises and who supported the Govern-

ment on account of them, I have no quarrel. But the number of such persons is very small when compared with the total number who supported the Government for other and very different reasons.

Now, let me mention in general terms what those other reasons were. Briefly they were that Union Government would isolate Quebec and prevent the French and the Catholics from ruling Ontario and the rest of Canada; that the Pope and the Catholics generally were not in favour of the Allies in the present war; and, finally, that the issue was one between Protestantism and Catholicism, and that all who did not support the Government, as representing Protestantism, were slackers, traitors, and pro-Germans.

The campaign leading up to the open attack on Quebec and the French, as well as upon the Pope and the Catholics, with all of whom Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party were constantly bracketed, was widespread, thoroughly organized and lavishly financed. Within the compass of a speech, it is not possible to deal with all the ramifications of the conspiracy, and I must therefore confine myself to a few only of its many outcroppings.

Those who were members of the last Parliament know to what an extent the ranks of the Liberal party were honeycombed by race and religious appeals and I need not dwell on that aspect of the conspiracy against the Liberal party and its leader. While that conspiracy was in progress within this House, there appeared in the Parliamentary press gallery a new correspondent, evidently a stranger. In reply to inquiries I was informed that the stranger was the representative of the Christian Science Monitor of Boston. Upon expressing surprise that a religious paper like the Christian Science Monitor would go to the trouble and expense of sending a representative to Ottawa to report parliamentary proceedings I was further informed that the intention was to launch an anti-Catholic campaign that would fit in with the Government's preparation for the approaching general election. Of the correctness of that statement, proof was soon furnished by the appearance in the Christian Science Monitor of anti-Catholic, anti-French, and anti-Laurier articles, which later were reproduced by the Ottawa Citizen, the Toronto dailies, and other newspapers that were all smitten about the same time with a severe attack of a disease which, for lack of a generic term, and with apologies to medical nomenclature, I may describe as "Papalphobia." Following this outbreak, certain gentlemen closely identified with the Christian Science Monitor visited Ottawa and after a council of war with their Ottawa friends, were introduced, I am informed, to the right hon. the Prime Minister. What took place at that interview is immaterial, but what followed the interview is of very decided public importance. Early in October, 1917, a written memorandum issued from the office of the Prime Minister to the other members of the Cabinet, urging them to subscribe for the Christian Science Monitor for their respective departments. The reason given for exercising this particular kind of war economy——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: —was that "the Christian Science Monitor frequently has very useful and interesting articles respecting Canadian affairs," and that it was "being subscribed for in the Privy Council office." The only articles on Canada that the Monitor was publishing at the time were anti-Catholic tirades, and these the Prime Minister, in the words of his office memorandum, found "very useful and interesting." There is, therefore, no room for doubt as to where the Prime Minister stood in the matter.

Now, Sir, I have heard of people being bribed with their own money but this is the first and only time I have heard of people furnishing money to finance attacks upon themselves, as the Catholics of Canada undoubtedly did when the Prime Minister had the Christian Science Monitor placed on the subscription list of the several departments to be paid for out of public funds—funds contributed by Catholics equally with members of all other denominations.

But it must not for a moment be thought that the Christian Science Monitor enjoyed any monopoly in its chosen field. Quite the contrary. The English press of Canada, with a few honourable exceptions, joined in the hue and cry, and the Pope, Quebec, the Catholics and Laurier were the texts of their daily assaults. Nor was the campaign confined to the Tory press; it extended also to their Unionist confrères. The Toronto Globe was as mendacious as the Toronto Mail and Empire. The Toronto Star was quite as shameless as the Toronto News. And while the madness was at its height I am told that casual visitors to the Globe office, who were regarded as receptive to the new propaganda, were taken into the business manager's room, and there with

doors closed and a nervous watch on the windows, and in bated breath, Mr. J. F. Mackay would expatiate on the machinations of the Pope and the necessity of defeating them by defeating Laurier If the visitor did not appear to be sufficiently impressed, he was passed on to Mr. J. E. Atkinson of the Star, who would then exercise his slimy arts to complete what the less adroit Mr. Mackay had begun. And so the game was played throughout the land.

All this, Sir, was bad enough, but the turning of the churches into political cockpits was the crowning infamy of the whole campaign. Their pulpits were thrown open to laymen as well to clergymen; and in some cases were occupied by individuals more competent to expound the doctrines of the Sodomites than to preach the gospel of the Prince of Peace. And why was all this done? Merely to arouse the rest of the country against Quebec and the Catholics for the sake of winning the election. Mr. Speaker, was there ever such a defilement of the House of God in any other land under the sun? I know of none, and for the sake of Christianity itself I hope there has been none.

Lest the women voters were not as highly inflamed as their male relatives, special appeals to their fears and passions and prejudices were made on the eve of the election. Perhaps the most inflammatory of these appeals, as it certainly was the most grotesquely false, was published by the Canadian Home Journal in its December issue. After moralizing on the tragic importance of the issue to be decided on December 17, it proceeded thus:

> Germany's reptile diplomacy uses many agencies in many lands, and the most important agency that it is to-day using on Canadian soil is the Roman Catholic Church.

No proof of this outrageous statement is offered, or attempted to be offered, but it is followed by these equally brilliant gems:

> Lamentable as the fact is it is nevertheless a fact to be faced. As a consequence we find Roman Catholic Churches in Canada head centres of activity to place in power those whose policies aim at the withdrawal of Canada from the war, the desertion of our soldiers at the front and the betrayal of Great Britain.

And listen to this Mr. Speaker:

> By what promises and devices the Kaiser's Government has secured the support of the Roman Catholic Church is not wholly clear.

Not then and not now.

> He has promised to restore the Temporal home of the Pope in Europe and if victorious to extend his influence to South America.

> It is altogether probable that he has promised his aid in extending the powers the Church now enjoys in the province of Quebec to all Canada.
>
> The women of Canada are religious by nature. They are the backbone of our Churches. Let them remember what is at stake.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his candidates exalt the traitor and contemn the soldier. It is for the womenfolk of the soldier to give them their answer at the polls.
>
> Canada is menaced by open foes in Europe and insidious foes at home. To vote for Union Government is the woman's paramount duty,—the duty of the hour.

Mr. Speaker, could anything be more dastardly or criminal than the article from which I have just quoted?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURPHY: And yet the writer of that article not only goes unpunished but I have no doubt he enjoys many a chuckle over his contribution to the devil's brew with which the Union Governmen filled, and maddened and misled a too-credulous public.

So that no doubt may remain in the mind of any honest man or woman as to the issue upon which the Union Government sought and obtained office, let me quote from a full front page article which appeared in the Orange Sentinel of December 20th, 1917, under the caption, "Sound the Loud Timbrel":

> A crushing defeat for the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec and their allies in the other provinces is the result of the polling on Monday.
>
> The whole election campaign was fought upon the lines of the programme of the Orange Association. For the first time in the life of the dominion a union Protestantism followed the lead of the Orangemen of Canada to a magnificent victory over reactionary forces whose triumph would have disgraced the country. The great Order which the Sentinel represents has reason for gratification in having at last won that recognition from the Loyalists of the country which it has long deserved.

There you have a declaration after the event written by a gentleman who was endorsed by the Prime Minister as his candidate in West Toronto, and who now represents that constituency in this House. The Prime Minister has not in any way challenged or repudiated that declaration. As he endorsed the candidature of the man who wrote it, he will be held to have endorsed the declaration as well, and the public will judge him accordingly.

In view of the facts that I have presented, what becomes of the hollow pretense that the Government's election appeal was solely for the purpose of obtaining re-inforcements for the boys at the

front, and to maintain Canada's part in the war? The article in the Orange Sentinel, with the Prime Minister's endorsement, supplies the answer to that question.

I have illustrated the attitude of the Unionist party towards the Catholics of Canada for daring to oppose them. Let me now show you that a Catholic who supported them met with no better or different treatment. Reading again from the article in the Orange Sentinel of December 20th, 1917. I quote the following:

> It is unfortunate that throughout the English-speaking province, the one element which stood solidly behind the Laurier party is composed of men who belong to the Roman Catholic Church. That was the backbone of the Laurier organization in Ontario. Apart from Bishop Fallon none of the higher Clergy of this province gave any indication of friendship for the Unionist Government.
>
> There is every reason to believe, however, that his motive in supporting Union Government was largely a desire to punish those who have pursued him for twenty-five years.
>
> Therefore his action cannot be taken as an indication of the sentiment either of his brother Bishops or of the faithful among their flock.

It would be a thousand pities, Mr. Speaker, to spoil by any superfluous comment such warm-hearted appreciation by a leader of Unionism of the help proffered by His Lordship of London to the Unionist party. I will therefore merely repeat my previous observation that the article was written by the Prime Minister's personally endorsed candidate, and the Prime Minister's approving silence for three months shows that he also endorses the article itself.

As it is my desire to place on record for the information not only of Canadians of to-day, but of Canadians of the future as well, all the data requisite for an understanding of the Union Government and the character of its election campaign, I realize that my task would be only half done, so far as Ontario was concerned, if I did not give the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) full credit for his share in the attacks made on the leader of the Liberal party and on the Catholics of this country. To fully appreciate that hon. gentleman's contribution it will be necessary to go back a few years to get the proper setting for a correct view of his more recent performances.

Let me premise, Sir, by saying that there was a time when, through lack of information, I regarded the hon. member for Durham as an unselfish servant of the public. To-day, in the light of information supplied from a hundred sources, I desire to make reparation to those whom I laboured to convert to my mistaken opinion by exposing, as briefly as possible, the facts relating to the hon. gentleman's public career as I now know them. Desiring at the same time to be fair to the hon. gentleman, I propose to take as the standard of judgment that ought to be applied in his case a standard that has been supplied by himself. Let me explain where that standard is to be found.

Speaking at North Bay on the 6th December last, the hon. gentleman arraigned the leader of the Liberal party and the people of Quebec for their alleged attitude towards the war, and for the moment I do not intend to make any further use of his speech than to cite the basis on which he laid his charge. I will return to the speech later on. The basis of his charge on the occasion to which I refer was the lack of sacrifice on the part of the people of Quebec. A man who will make such a charge as that should stand on very firm ground with regard to his own record in the matter of sacrifice, and if he does not so stand then it were better for him to have remained silent. Now let us see what the hon. gentleman's record is with regard to sacrifice.

Briefly stated, Sir, it is this: that while he preaches the gospel of sacrifice for others, he has consistently garnered and pocketed the fruits of selfishness for himself. As you are doubtless aware, Sir, the cult of commercialized Christianity, in Ontario at least, has been placed on the basis of an exact science. The three great exponents of that cult are John Wesley Allison, Joseph Wesley Flavelle and Newton Wesley Rowell. Ego is their god, autos their creed and moi-même their practice. In point of fact, Sir, they are the three great Canadian Sinn Feiners. In our political annals an infamous immortality was conferred on John Wesley Allison by my friend the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in connection with fuses and shells. A like service was performed for Joseph Wesley Flavelle by Food Commissioner O'Connor and Mr. George W. Kyte, late member for Richmond, N.S., in connection with bacon and eggs. And, Sir, it is my purpose to convince you and the country that Newton Wesley Rowell is well worthy of the place the public has assigned him as the third member of that delectable trinity.

Not to go further back than the days of the Ross Government in Ontario, it may be recalled that the hon. gentleman was very active in his support of that administration, but his support entailed no sacrifice; quite the reverse. Through it he managed to secure an appointment as solicitor

for the Government at the time that the loan of $2,000,000 was made to the re-organized industries that Mr. F. H. Clergue had established at Sault Ste. Marie; and by reason of representing the Government he secured another solicitorship with one of the companies concerned in the reorganization, and he held the two positions at the same time. When obliged to give up one of these positions, he was replaced by his partner, Mr. Thomas Gibson. My information is that as the result of his supporting the Ontario Government of the day and of his securing the positions mentioned, the hon. member for Durham increased his savings by an amount in excess of $100,000 within a period of four or five years. But the exact date is immaterial; so also is the length of time during which it was accumulated. The material thing is that it cannot be pretended that the hon. gentleman's active support of the Ross Government entailed any sacrifice on his part.

Now, Sir, what happened when the hon. gentleman entered the provincial field of politics? With his usual presence of mind he arranged with his friends to form a committee for the purpose of raising a fund to guarantee him against any loss while engaged in his work as provincial leader. Mr. A. E. Ames, of Toronto, was chairman of the committee, and in addition to Sir Joseph Flavelle, the contributors included several other Toronto gentlemen. The fund itself was called the "Secretarial Fund" and I am informed that it varied in amount from $9,000 to $11,000 a year. Again, the exact amount raised in any one year is immaterial; the point it establishes is that as provincial leader the hon. member for Durham was protected against any sacrifice whilst he retained that position. In other words, the hon. gentleman had placed his political services on precisely the same basis as that on which Sir Joseph Flavelle while Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, sold bacon for the soldiers to the British Government, namely, that the bacon would be supplied only after he had secured an undertaking to indemnify his company against all loss. Truly, Sir, it is perfectly wonderful how commercialized Chistianity sharpens a man's sense of business.

A little over a year ago the hon. member for Durham and his press agent paid a visit to the battlefront. The trip was well advertised, as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) will recall. The member for Durham got many cable

mentions out of it, but did he pay the expenses of the trip? Not he. The expenses were paid by the hon. gentleman's Toronto friends, who contributed, I am told, a sum in the neighbourhood of $3,750 for the purpose. Once again there was no sacrifice on the part of the hon. member for Durham.

Without multiplying illustrations, it may be said that the contributions of Sir Joseph Flavelle and others to the hon. gentleman's several funds were made for the purpose of advertising, financing and placing the hon. gentleman on the political market in precisely the same way as Sir Joseph Flavelle advertises, finances and places his bacon and eggs on the commercial market. There was no sacrifice of any kind involved; it was simply a matter of business—of cool, calculating business, at that. Therefore I submit that it scarcely lies in the mouth of the member for Durham to attack the people of a whole province for their lack, or alleged lack, of sacrifice.

Let me now return to the hon. gentleman's speech at North Bay on the 6th of December last. In part, that speech was a suppression of the truth; in part, it was a statement of shabby falsehoods; in its entirety it was precisely the kind of speech the hon. member for Durham would make on an occasion when he was true to himself. For instance, the hon. gentleman pretended that he had been faithful as a follower of Sir Wilfrid Laurier until the Liberal leader declined to support conscription. Nothing could be further from the truth. The hon. gentleman engaged for several years in a conspiracy to supplant Sir Wilfrid Laurier as leader of the Liberal party. In this conspiracy he was aided by Mr. J. F. Mackay of the Toronto Globe, Mr. J. E. Atkinson of the Toronto Star, Mr. W. E. Rundle of the National Trust Company, Mr. J. H. Gundy, of Wood and Gundy, brokers, Colonel F. H. Deacon, of F. H. Deacon and Co., brokers, Mr. G. Frank Beer, and others, whose names it is not at the moment necesary to mention, but which I have in my possession.

The procedure was something like this: the provincial Liberal party was to exist only in name, while the active body would be a Rowell party, financed from the "Secretarial Fund" and having its organizers and field workers with their press agency and such social and moral reform agencies as might be gathered in through the activities of those who were working in co-operation with the member for Durham to oust Sir Wilfrid Laurier from the leadership of the Liberal party.

Then, there were lunches and dinners at Toronto, to which decent Liberals were sometimes invited, and at which the plot would be more or less openly referred to in proportion as it was deemed safe by the plotters to show their hostility to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Following one of these Imperial gatherings a demand was made that Sir Wilfrid Laurier be asked to name Mr. Rowell as his successor in the leadership of the Liberal party, but the gentlemen who were thus approached laughed the silly proposal to scorn. At another stage of the conspiracy, it was planned to bring about a change in the directorship of the Toronto Globe, so as to hurry on the replacing of Sir Wilfrid by Mr. Rowell at Ottawa and the installation of Mr. Atkinson as Mr. Rowell's successor at Toronto. But that too miscarried, and for several days afterwards the telephone line leading from Mr. Mackay's office to Mr. Atkinson's office sagged heavy with moist regrets. But when conscription appeared on the scene and Union Government loomed up—ah, there was the chance so long denied. And, having failed to dislodge Sir Wilfrid, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) and his entourage of pork packers, trust magnates, brokers and disappointed journalists transferred their attentions to Sir Robert Borden and Union Government, both of whom they are following closely and unselfishly as numerous appointments to influential commissions, fat advertising contracts and handsome brokerage on Victory war loans all amply demonstrate.

In view of these doings, Sir, you are not surprised that I should stamp as false and hypocritical the pretense of the hon. gentleman at North Bay that he had been a follower of Sir Wilfred Laurier until conscription became an issue. The very reverse was the fact, and the proofs were known to hundreds of people throughout the Dominion.

Another characteristic distortion of the truth on the part of the hon. gentleman was his statement at North Bay regarding the alliance between the Nationalists and the Conservatives in 1911. Here are his exact words as reported in the Toronto Globe of December 7, 1917:

> As Liberals we have claimed that the surrender in the year 1911, of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec to the Nationalist-clerical influence was a grave national blunder, from which we have suffered through the whole period of the war.

You will observe, Sir, that the hon. gentleman would have his audience and the public believe that the alliance with the Nationalists was made only by the Quebec wing of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman, when he made that speech, was speaking in the district of Nipissing, and how his audience must have smiled as they listened to him and recalled the reception extended by his cabinet colleague, Hon. Frank Cochrane, by Senator Gordon and other Ontario conservatives, to Mr. Henri Bourassa, the Nationalist leader, when that gentleman, on Mr. Cochrane's invitation, went to Nipissing to assist the Conservatives in 1911, and when, to use Senator Gordon's own words, they "presented him with the keys of Northern Ontario."

But this Ontario-Conservative alliance with the Nationalists was not the only embarrassing thing that the hon. gentleman's statement was intended to conceal. It was primarily intended to conceal the fact that Sir Robert Borden, the gentleman, whom the hon. member for Durham now acknowledges as his leader, was in active personal alliance with the Nationalists in 1911. The hon. gentleman must know, if he knows anything about our recent political history, that in the campaign of 1911, his present leader went to the province of Quebec and in the counties of Shefford and Missisquoi appealed for support for candidates who were pledged to the Nationalist programme, a surrender, according to the hon. gentleman "from which we have suffered through the whole period of the war." Why then is he not honest, and why does he not place responsibility upon his present leader and not upon the Conservative party of Quebec? The reason is quite obvious; to be honest and place responsibility where it belongs would mean the destruction of the reasons the hon. gentleman has given for entering the Union Government, and that it goes without saying, he cannot afford to do. He, however, is on record at another time and place in such condemnation of his present leader and some of his Union Cabinet associates with reference to this very Nationalist alliance that I propose to place that record on Hansard.

Upon reference to the published proceedings of the annual meeting of the Ontario Reform Association held at Toronto on November 24, 1916, I find that the hon. member for Durham was present and that he spoke at that meeting. My information also is that he revised, if he did not actually draft, a resolution condemnatory of the alliance of his present leader with the Nationalists, and that resolution was unanimously adopted in these terms:

> Whereas, the Conservative party under Sir Robert Borden deliberately allied itself with

the Nationalist party in Quebec under Henri Bourassa upon their avowed policy of non-participation in the wars of the Empire to endeavour to procure the defeat of the Liberal administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and

Whereas, following the success of this unholy alliance Sir Robert Borden publicly recognized and included in his Cabinet men selected by Henri Bourassa, Armand Lavergne, and their associates, and,

Whereas, this alliance helps to explain the weak and vacillating policy of the Government in connection with the war, and

Whereas, Sir Robert Borden still retains in his Cabinet two intense Nationalists, Blondin, the most rabid of them all, and Patenaude, a former Nationalist organizer,

Be it therefore resolved, that we, the Liberals of Ontario, in our annual meeting assembled, desire most emphatically to condemn the continuance in this trying time of war, of this unholy Conservative-Nationalist alliance, as unfair to Canada and inimical to the best interests of the Empire.

Thus spoke the hon. member for Durham in November, 1916. Less than a year later he had become a follower of the Sir Robert Borden whom he had so vehemently condemned, and a Cabinet colleague of the Mr. Blondin whom he had so roundly denounced. And following all this he had the impudent hardihood to pretend in his North Bay speech that it was only the Conservatives of Quebec who were in alliance with the Nationalists. That statement, viewed in the light of the facts which preceded it, furnishes another illuminating example of the hon. gentleman's standard of political morality.

Having gone into the realm of fiction for his facts, it is not surprising that in the further course of his North Bay speech, the hon. member for Durham made some extraordinary statements about patronage. In effect, the hon. gentleman said that patronage had been abolished, and just about the time that he made that statement he had sent as his agent to the city of London, Col. F. H. Deacon, who, as the representative of the minister, offered to a prominent Liberal of that city, as a bribe to induce him to desert the Liberal candidate, the chairmanship of the War Purchasing Commission, formerly held by Sir Edward Kemp. In view of the urgency of the matter Col. Deacon reported the result of his interview at London by telegraph to the minister. That telegram was written by Deacon in the presence of three leading citizens of London, and I am informed that telegram is still preserved. Deacon's offer was rejected, but Deacon's agency was established by written proof furnished by Deacon himself.

The mention of the mere outlines of this one transaction discloses the peculiar view

[Mr. Murphy.]

the hon. member for Durham entertains of patronage. But, brief as has been the hon. gentleman's career in Dominion politics, this incident does not by any means stand alone. Hard on its heels, the hon. member for Durham deputed Mr. G. G. S. Lindsey of Toronto to interview sundry Liberals and ascertain if they thought the public would stand the appointment of one of the members of the present Government to a place on the Ontario Supreme Court bench. Possibly the hon. gentleman may not regard that as an exercise of patronage. If he does not, then he will certainly not regard the sending of Mr. J. F. Mackay to eastern Ontario to urge Liberal candidates to desert their leader by pointing out the advantages by which their treachery would be rewarded, as an exercise of patronage.

But, whatever his view may be of the authority that he deputed in the two latter cases, there can be no doubt about the exercise of patronage in the case of Mr. Robert A. Mulholland, who was bribed to make way for the hon. gentleman as a candidate in the county of Durham, by the promise of a seat in the Senate. That bribe has been paid within the last week by Mr. Mulholland's appointment to the Senate. Realizing that the appointment would shatter the last remaining pretense that patronage had been abolished, the Government adopted the unusual course of handing out an official statement of the reasons for Mr. Mulholland's appointment. The official reasons were an official lie, which stirred the honest indignation of The Toronto Telegram, and that paper, in its issue of March 14, thus deals with the incident:

Partyism a better Pay Boss than patriotism.

A patriot gives up the best years of his life to secure liberty for the world. A partisan gives up a parliamentary nomination in Durham county to secure a seat in the House of Commons for Hon. Wesley Rowell.

The patriot's reward is the probability of death or wounds and the certainty of sacrifice, all for $1.10 per day.

The partisan's reward is a seat in the Senate of Canada with a capitalized value of $50,000, and an earning power of $2,500 per annum.

In the same issue, The Toronto Telegram, after detailing the case of a Canadian Pacific Railway engineer who was earning a good salary, and who enlisted and went to the front, was wounded and had both his legs amputated, thus proceeds:

Brave names fill the muster roll of Canada's soldiers. The C.P.R. engine driver is not singled out as an unusual example of sacrifice. The maimed figure of that C.P.R. engine driver, with his ringing laughter, his bright smile and unconquered spirit, represents one form of patriotic service.

The candidate who removed his ambition from the path of Hon. Wesley Rowell's progress to an Ontario seat in Parliament represents another form of patriotic service, or patriotic endeavour, to quote the now immortal words of Sir Robert Borden.

The soldier who gives up both legs and an earning power of $200 or $250 per month for his country's sake will be requited with a pension of $600 or $700 per annum.

The candidate who gives up a parliamentary nomination for Hon. Wesley Rowell's sake is requited with a life interest in a seat in the Senate. That life interest has a capital value of $50,000. An official statement carries the authority of Sir Robert Borden into a declaration that a senatorship worth $2,500 per annum is the modest reward of Hon. R. A. Mulholland's patriotic endeavours.

If every Canadian who can equal or surpass Mr. Mulholland's creditable record of "patriotic endeavour" is to go to the Senate, the home of that august assembly will soon be overcrowded worse than a Toronto street car around 6 p.m. If a $50,000 senatorship illustrates Sir Robert Borden's idea of a scant reward for Hon. R. A. Mulholland's "patriotic endeavours," the "patriotic endeavours" of the C.P.R. engineer and hundreds and thousands of other Canadian soldiers is the marble of true and noble sacrifice. That marble is spoiled with the mud of Sir Robert Borden's words of excuse for the traffic in senatorships that is still being carried on at Ottawa.

As you will observe, Sir, the Toronto Telegram takes no stock in the Pharisaic pretense of the hon. member for Durham that patronage has been abolished. Neither do I; neither does any sane man who has any knowledge of the crimes for which patronage is responsible in connection with the office of the Director of Public Information; with the office of the Food Board, and its staff of nearly one hundred highly-paid employees; and with the office of the Central Appeal Judge, under the Military Service Act, and its staff of nearly seventy highly-paid employees. Later on, there will be occasion to ventilate these crimes, and I will not dwell on them now.

But reprehensible as were the statements with which I have already dealt in the hon. gentleman's North Bay speech, they were mild and inoffensive, indeed, when compared with his slanderous and unjustifiable attack on the members of the religious orders who came from France to Canada and who were here at the outbreak of the war. Let me devote a few minutes to an analysis of the statements made by him in that same speech in regard to these men. After he had denounced the attitude of the Quebec Nationalists towards the war, the hon. member for Durham said:

In this attitude they were undoubtedly encouraged and abetted by the members of the religious orders from France who found an asylum in Canada, and used that asylum to undermine Canada's strength in the struggle.

This atrocious statement was made without a syllable of truth to support it. When challenged for proof, the hon. gentleman, after the manner of the tribe of Ananias, remained silent. On December 15, 1917, The Catholic Record of London publicly challenged the hon. member for Durham to bring forward a shadow of proof for his assertion; the hon. gentleman did not respond. At a later date this challenge was repeated by The Catholic Register of Toronto; but again the hon. gentleman remained silent. The fact that his statement in its foulness and falsehood was adopted and repeated by Mr. Stewart Lyon, of The Toronto Globe, does not in any degree mitigate the offence of the hon. gentleman for having gratuitously slandered both the living and the dead. Neither the hon. member for Durham nor Mr. Lyon could produce any proof, because proof there was none.

Not satisfied with one slander, the hon. gentleman uttered another when he thus further referred to the French religious in Canada:

It is a misfortune that they did not follow the example of the priests of the Catholic church in France, who threw themselves into the struggle of their people to preserve their national existence.

In these words the hon. member for Durham pictured the French members of the religious orders as remaining in Canada and shirking their duty to France. That statement, Sir, is even more wickedly untrue than the former one. The facts were available to the hon. gentleman as they were to any other person who would seek them; but the facts would not suit the hon. gentleman's purpose, and so he coolly ignored them. Now it is my intention to give the facts to the House and to the country, so that the truth may be known about a body of men whose courage, devotion to duty and self-sacrifice in the present war stamp them as worthy to follow in the footsteps of that noble band of French missionaries who first made this land known to Europe and blazed the way for its colonization and development.

As a result of inquiries instituted both in Canada and overseas, I have been favoured with authentic statements giving in detail full particulars about the French religious orders who were wantonly slandered by the hon. member for Durham. It would unduly burden the record, and take up too much time if I were to place all the details on Hansard, and for these
9 p.m. reasons I shall summarize my information, and mention only a few names of the hundreds that

have been sent to me. But the records themselves I will preserve so that they may be available for future historical reference. It is to be kept in mind that the figures which I am about to submit relate only to French subjects who were members of religious orders in Canada. I will begin with the Franciscans. At the outbreak of war practically the entire body of French Franciscans left Canada and returned to France to do their duty. In the whole Dominion of Canada, I am informed, there now remain but six French Franciscan priests, and that these six are exempt from military service on the ground of age or physical unfitness. Those who returned to France were assigned to various war duties, and 32 of them went into the trenches. Of these three have been mentioned in the Orders of the Day, two have been decorated with the Military Medal, one has received the Cross of the Legion of Honour, one has been wounded and discharged, and one was killed on the field of battle, after he had been twice mentioned in the Orders of the Day, and had received the military medal.

From "L'Institut des Frères de l'Instruction Chrétienne" twenty-five members returned to France and entered the French army. Of those, four have been decorated and mentioned in the Orders of the Day, four have been wounded, one was taken prisoner, one who was twice wounded, has been missing for three years, and is assumed to have died of his wounds; and two were killed on the field of battle.

In addition to the Canadian members of the Jesuit order who are chaplains in France, five French Jesuits went back from Canada to join the French army. Of these two were killed in action.

All the members of the Congregation of the Holy Cross who were French subjects answered the call to the colours. One was wounded twice, and returned again to the front. One has been reported "missing" for over a year, and is assumed to be dead or a prisoner, and three others are still fighting in the trenches.

The Fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost sent three of their members to the French Army, and a fourth is on his way to France. One of those who returned to France was killed at the front, and another who is now seriously wounded has been decorated with the Military Cross, and was twice mentioned in the Orders of the Day.

The Trappists had only two French members of military age and both returned to France in 1914. One of them, Father Thomas, received two decorations, the Military Cross and the Military Medal, was twice mentioned in the Orders of the Day, and later, in rescuing a companion, suffered the loss of both eyes. To-day he is a teacher of the blind in France. The other Trappist who returned to his native country, was Father Hypolite, who is now fighting with seven of his brothers in the French army.

Of the 900 members of the Marist Order who have fought in the trenches, 14 French subjects went from Canada to France. Two of those were killed on the battlefield, six were wounded, one received the Military Medal, and all were mentioned in the Orders of the Day.

Les Peres de Montfort sent 15 of their French members back to France. Three of these brave men were stationed in the county which I have the honour to represent in Parliament. Of the 15 who returned to France, five won the Military Cross, five were mentioned in the Orders of the Day, one of them on three consecutive occasions; and one was killed on the field of battle.

From the Eudist Congregation, 17 of its members went back from Canada to France. Of these, three were wounded, two were mentioned in the Orders of the Day, two were decorated with the Military Cross, and four were honourably discharged from service.

The Brothers of St. Gabriel sent eight of their French members who were of military age, to serve in the French ranks. Four of them were wounded, four were decorated with the Military Medal, four were mentioned in the Orders of the Day, and one of them, Bro. Garrigues-Antonin, is the inventor of a wonderful field gun which has done great execution against the enemy.

The twelve French subjects who were members of the Sulpician Order went to France when war broke out, and immediately reported for duty. Seven went to France and later on served in the Lorraine, Verdun, Champagne and Saloniki campaigns. One of them was decorated with the Military Cross at Verdun.

With the Dominicans at Ste. Hyacinthe there were only two French members of military age when war was declared. These two went to France.

The Order of St. Sacrament sent to France the only one of its members who was not exempt on account of age or ill-health, and he is still serving as a chaplain at the front.

Four French members of the Order of the Holy Cross in Canada reported for duty at the beginning of the war, and one of them was wounded while fighting with the French army.

The Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul had only one French member eligible for military service. He joined the French army in 1914, and has been twice mentioned for bravery in the Orders of the Day.

The Missionaries of the Sacred Heart have been represented at the front by four French subjects who returned from Canada to serve in the trenches. One of them, Father Cadoux, was mentioned in the Orders of the Day for special bravery in rescuing the wounded under fire.

From the Capuchin Order, ten French subjects went back to France and joined the colours. Three of those men were killed on the battlefield, Father Albert, Father Edward and Father Justinian, all of whom at one time were stationed in Ottawa, and with two of whom I was well acquainted.

The Christian Brothers, at Montreal, are represented at the front by two of their French members, one of whom has been severely wounded.

From the Oblate Order in Canada, twenty-four French members returned to France, and they have served in the ranks with great distinction. One was killed on the battlefield, two died of wounds, four were decorated with the Military Cross, and several of the others were mentioned for bravery in the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker, the figures which I have just placed before you constitute a part only of what stands to the credit of the French Religious who went back from Canada to France to help their Motherland in this war. But, Sir, I submit that these figures are more than sufficient to refute the baseless statements made by the hon. gentleman from Durham at North Bay.

If the hon. gentleman's statements were not made for a wicked and malicious purpose, then by every standard of public and private honour he is required to retract what he has said, to offer an apology to the living and to make reparation to the memory of the dead. Should he hesitate or decline to do this, then he will stand self-condemned before his fellowmen, stripped of the last vestige of any claim to public respect or public confidence.

You will recall, Sir, that earlier in my remarks I referred to the part the Christian Science Monitor had played in the Canadian campaign against the Pope and the Catholics. If you are a reader of the New York press, you will be familiar with another phase of the same campaign which was carried on in the neighbouring republic. Among other things, the Christian Science Monitor and its imitators in the United States, as well as in Canada, alleged that the Pope was responsible not only for the disaster that befel the Italian army, but also for the disruptive propaganda that brought that disaster about. This amazing fiction was repeated apparently in good faith by F. C. Walcott, Assistant Food Controller of the United States. When convinced of his error, Mr. Walcott had the manliness to sign and authorize the publication of the following retraction:

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

New York, January 29, 1918.

Dear Mr. Iselin:

I desire to confirm what I at once wrote to Monsignor Lavelle on the 18th instant, namely, that I much regret a statement I recently made in this city at a conference to consider Food Conservation. My statement attributed to the Pope a measure of responsibility for the Italian disaster and for the disruptive propaganda which had brought it about. I repeated thoughtlessly and without previous reflection a rumor I had heard which I had not verified and which I am now convinced and believe was untrue. I have since read the categorical denial of Cardinal Gasparri, the Pope's Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the denial of Cardinal Bourne in London, and I have also read the statement recently made by Signor Orlando, the Prime Minister of Italy, in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, as follows:

"I deplore the accusations of a general character made by the Hon. Signor Pirolini against high ecclesiastical personages—accusations that tend to hurt the supreme spiritual authority—against priests and against the Catholic party. Such accusations are unjust and offensive, because as the public are aware, the Italian clergy, both high and low, have given noble and beautiful proofs of Italian sentiments, and the great mass of the Catholics have known how to reconcile the dictates of faith with their duties towards their country."

I therefore feel that it is my duty to retract the statement I made in regard to the Pope, which I do without reserve, and I would like to correct the unfortunate and erroneous impression my remarks tended to create.

You may give this letter such publicity as your committee deems advisable to counteract the effect of my statement and its repetition by those who heard my remarks.

May I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of my colleagues and myself of the uniform and effective co-operation which the National Food Administration has received from our Catholic fellow-citizens and the Catholic clergy?

I am
Very sincerely yours,

F. C. WALCOTT.

ADRIAN ISELIN, ESQ.
Chairman Catholic Laymen's Committee,
36 Wall Street, New York.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I have any further suggestion to make to the hon. member for

Durham it is that he should now be man enough to follow Mr. Walcott's example.

Before dismissing this part of my subject let me pay a tribute to a class of citizens whom we of the minority are anxious should not be confounded with those who have been false to the Liberal party and the Liberal leader. By contrast with these promoters of sectarian bigotry and national hate, there stand out in noble relief the Protestant Liberals who withstood the gales of passion and prejudice, who turned a deaf ear to the taunts of friends, to the sneers of neighbours, to the insults of opponents, and amid it all remained true to their political principles and their party leader.

These are the men, who within my lifetime, have been unshaken and unchanged, while there raged about them the storms of a dual language agitation, of a Jesuits Estates Act agitation, of an Equal Rights agitation, of a Ne Temere decree agitation, and, most recently, of an anti-French and anti-Catholic agitation. They are not only the pride of the minorities whose rights they have steadfastly espoused and defended, but they are the truest exemplars of Canadian citizenship and the only hope of the future —if hope there can be in the future of a country so race and creed-cursed as Canada is. If I have fault to find with others, I have only praise, and admiration and affection for them, and I deem this the time and the place to make such a declaration in their regard.

Now, Sir, let me turn to another subject. While the War-times Election Act was under discussion in this House last session, many predictions were made as to the irregularities and the crimes that would be sure to attend its operation. No matter how extravagant the prophecies may have seemed at the time, they fell far short of describing what actually took place in the election itself. With the exception of certain constituencies in the province of Quebec, there was no riding in Canada in which a contest took place that did not supply proof to justify all that was said about the War-times Elections Act by its critics in this House. In point of fact, irregularities and crimes were committed which it was impossible to forecast, and the record of these will in due time be presented to Parliament. Meanwhile, let me cite the views expressed by Premier Martin of Saskatchewan, prior to the date of the election, with regard to this notorious piece of war-time legislation. In a statement published on December 8th, 1917, Premier Martin expressed himself as follows:

> In regard to the War Times Election Act, I have already expressed my opinion with respect to the disfranchisement of certain classes of our people. I regard this feature of the act as un-British and un-democratic, calculated to create distrust and suspicion and to delay the Canadianizing of many of these people for a generation.
>
> Moreover, apart from the disfranchisement provisions of the election act, machinery is created which is in the hands of unscrupulous men and may be used in such a way as to win any constituency. This portion of the act renders possible the disfranchisement of any citizen living in western Canada. The Union Government should see to it that the election machinery provided is fairly used, they should see that every person entitled to vote is given an opportunity so to do. If they do not act honestly and fairly in the administration of their election machinery, my confidence in them will be shaken. They should also repeal the act at the first session of Parliament after the election.

As the greatest care was taken to exclude that part of Premier Martin's manifesto from the Government-controlled press in eastern Ontario, I will ask the privilege, Sir, of reading that last sentence again, in case my friends from the Prairie Provinces may not have heard me when I read it first

> They should also repeal the Act at the first Session of Parliament after the election.

While the views thus stated by Premier Martin were primarily intended for the benefit of his western friends, they attracted general attention on account of the fact that Mr. Martin had for several years been an honoured member of this House, and that many of his Liberal associates, particularly those who were intimate with him in this Chamber, regard him as a man destined to play a larger part in the affairs of the Dominion. That Premier Martin's fears as to the way the election machinery would be operated were well-founded will require only a few examples to prove. Let me take the first of these from a newspaper supporting the Government. The Evening Telegram of Toronto, in its issue of Monday, December 17th, 1917, thus referred to the way in which the Act had been applied in Toronto:

> Toronto's loyalty to the cause of Union Government was traded on by ward politicians. Patriots had temporarily overlooked the blunders or crimes perpetrated in the non-enrollment of so many disfranchised women. Laurier would have been aided by the public mention of these crimes.

Mr. Speaker, that sentence is so delicious, as exemplifying the peculiar type of mentality that exists only in Toronto, that I will read it again:

> Laurier would have been aided by the public mention of these crimes.

The article proceeds:

> Laurier cannot now be aided by the fullest proclamation of the truth that the whole system

of preparing a war-time voters' list in Toronto worked out as a disgrace to Union Government. The Union Government abolished patronage. That same Government was represented in Toronto by a small, incompetent organization. That organization left the Trail of the Serpent of Patronage over every move in the miserable game of playing with the manufacture of a war-time voters' list.

The appointment of the returning officers was Patronage.

The appointment of the enumerators was Patronage.

Toronto is disgraced by the Tragedy of the War-Time Voters' List. The joint authors of that Tragedy are the red-tape officials in Ottawa and the Patronage peddlers who pose as Conservative leaders in Toronto.

The language of the Toronto Telegram that the whole system of preparing the War-time Voters' List worked out as a disgrace to the Union Government exactly fits the case in scores of other constituencies as well, and yet this afternoon the Right Hon. The Prime Minister in his speech said that "there never was an election in Canada conducted more decently and fairly."

Now let us turn to the West and see what happened there. The most illuminating exposure of election misdeeds that has come under my notice was that contained in the speech delivered by the Hon. A. G. MacKay, of Edmonton, who spoke in that city in January last. That speech was published in full in the Edmonton Weekly Topics of January 11th, 1918, and it should be read by every person who is under obligation to familiarize himself with the possibilities of election crookedness under the War-time Election Act. It was followed by an article in the Edmonton Bulletin summarizing many of the details given by Mr. MacKay, and it will afford an idea of what went on generally among the election officials if I read a few paragraphs at the beginning of that summary, which were as follows:

The result of the polling in the electoral district of West Edmonton gives a substantial majority to the Hon. Frank Oliver as far as the home vote is concerned. This majority is entirely remarkable in view of the evident determination to disfranchise as many of the electors as would be necessary to win the election for the Government candidate. If he did not win it is only because the election officials fell down on their job. They could just as well have put enough on or left enough off to do the trick. Their only failure was they did not think they needed as many as they did. There are various ways of disfranchisement. One is by statute direct. That was done. Another is by empowering the enumerator to enfranchise and disfranchise. That was done. Still another is to so place the polls that they are out of reach of the voters. That was done. Still another is not to provide enough ballots at polls known to be favourable to the opposition. That was done. To deal only with the two last mentioned cases:

Grouard Poll No. 210.

There were 183 votes polled at Grouard poll No. 210, 153 for Oliver, 28 for Griesbach, 2 ballots were spoiled. The polling division extended for ten townships from south to north, and eight from east to west, that is, it was sixty miles by fifty, not including a vast northern and largely uninhabited area. The settlements within the area mentioned had been given seven polls at the provincial election last spring, and four in the elections of 1911. There were some 400 names on the voters' list. Whitefish Lake settlement, fifty miles by trail from Grouard, had been given a poll in the provincial elections, but no poll was given it in the recent election. Two voters traveled from Whitefish lake to Grouard and arrived in time to poll their votes, but five others who were on the way did not arrive until after the close of the poll owing to the day being very cold and stormy and the travel being consequently slow. The whole settlement, comprising about fifty voters, excepting the two mentioned, was effectually disfranchised by the refusal of a poll. From Indiana siding on the Dunvegan railway, where a number of fishermen were at work, the distance to the Grouard poll was over twenty miles.

The conditions at McLennan were almost exactly duplicated at Grouard. First, the people were disfranchised by the refusal of polls, and in case that would not be sufficient they were not given enough ballots. Only 150 ballots had been supplied at Grouard, although there were upwards of 400 names on the lists. The 150 ballots were exhausted about 2.30 p.m. After some delay the deputy returning officer permitted the use of substitute ballots by duly qualified voters. Thirty-three such ballots were used before the poll closed, and were counted by the deputy returning officer.

It may be mentioned that the Grouard settlement sent a very large proportion of men to the war.

Fahler Settlement, Polls 208 and 226.

The Fahler case has been stated in full already, but a resumé may be given. Fahler settlement occupies the greater part of the townships 77 and 78, ranges 21 and 22, west of the fifth meridian. Upwards of 400 homesteads are taken and a large proportion of the settlers are in occupation. The Dunvegan railway traverses the settlement from east to west. There were five polls in the settlement in the provincial election of last spring. No poll was given in the settlement at the recent election. The part of the settlement in range 21 was included in McLennan poll distant from six to eighteen miles. Range 22 was included in the Smoky River poll, distant twelve to thirty miles. An old trail through the woods had to be reopened to allow the voters to reach the poll at the Smoky. There was no population at the Smoky except two men at the railway pump house. A party of thirty-one voters of Falher left home on Saturday, cut their way through the woods, reached the poll at noon on Monday, and voted. Twelve others who left on Sunday failed to reach the poll on Monday. All these voters had to camp outside for four nights in bitterly cold weather.

And in the face of that the Prime Minister this afternoon said: "Never was there an election in Canada conducted more decently and fairly." The article proceeds:

The vote was 31 Oliver, 5 Griesbach. The Griesbach voters were the railway pump men and the officers of the poll. The Falher settlers tried to secure railway accommodation but were refused it.

The settlers in range 21 started for McLennan on Sunday morning and most of them arrived on Sunday night. There were only 100 ballot papers in the box. When these were all used, substitute ballots to the number of 81 were issued by the deputy returning officer. These were used by duly qualified voters in the regular way, but on the authority of what he gave as a wire from the returning officer the deputy refused to count these ballots, and they have not been counted, although they are in the box. The 100 regular ballots were counted, 94 Oliver, 4 Griesbach, 2 spoiled. After all the hardships they had endured nearly as many voters were disfranchised by shortage of ballots at the McLennan poll as were allowed to vote.

Such are a few of the examples of what happened in Alberta. The happenings in Saskatchewan were evidently similar in character, as may be judged by a paragraph from the Regina Leader. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) will be able to tell the House a little later in the debate whether the Regina Leader is able to speak for what happened in Saskatchewan. The article reads:

Now that the elections are over, and the results of the polling are fairly complete, one thing stands out with startling clearness, and that is, that not only was the War-Time Elections Act a huge mistake but it was absolutely unnecesary even as a political weapon.

Perhaps no one Province in Canada was harder hit by that un-British and utterly disgraceful piece of legislation than was the Province of Saskatchewan. Nothing in the past political history of this country so aroused and antagonized our people, British-born and foreign-born, Liberal and Conservative, Protestant and Roman Catholic, as that "scrap of paper" enactment. Feeling over the defeat of Reciprocity by the eastern Tories was as nothing compared to the feeling existing in this western country against the War-Time Elections Act.

And later in the same article the Regina Leader proceeds:

We repeat, the War-Time Elections Act was a mistake no matter from what standpoint it is viewed. It created hard feelings and division where there was no necessity of doing so and when no good object could be served thereby. It has given a serious, even dangerous, setback to the Canadianizing of our non-English-speaking citizens. It has shattered the confidence of these people in what was one of this country's greatest assets in securing immigration—belief in British justice and fair play and in the pledged word of all Governments under the British flag.

Now that the elections are over and Union Government sustained, one of its first acts should be to wipe this stain off our country's honour. The people of western Canada expect this; they have a right to demand it. They do demand it.

[Mr. Murphy.]

In view of the widespread condemnation of the War-time Elections Act and of the clear call for its repeal issued by Premier Martin and by other supporters of Union Government, I shall suspend further observations on the subject until the Government shall have declared what it intends to do in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, if I have devoted considerable time to a review of some of the men and the methods employed to bring about Union Government, it is not because I think they are the chief concern of the moment. They are not. The chief concern of the moment is that Union Government has been accomplished at the expense of the loss of the good-will and confidence of three millions of Canadians. Smarting under a sense of wrongs inflicted either through disfranchisement or through wanton attacks upon their religion, three millions of Canadians are to-day sullen and distrustful, and they are not to be reinstated in their former respect for constitutional Government by the huckstering that is going on in farm tractors, postmasterships, senatorships and customs collectorships. That sort of thing may be smart trading, designed to placate certain classes and individuals, but it is not constructive statesmanship such as Canada needs at the present moment.

While such is the need of the moment, the newspapers announce that the member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) and some other ministers are chafing to get away to a conference in London. Mr. Speaker, if these ministers are well advised they will pay attention to what needs very careful attention in Canada and they will let British statesmen look after Imperial affairs in London. It is idle to pretend that several Ministers have to run off to England to the neglect of pressing Canadian matters. The unity of this Dominion is of vastly more importance to us than the discussion as to where new boundary lines for some European country are to be laid down—a discussion at which Canadian ministers would, in any event, be mere onlookers. At present Canada is governed partly from London, but mostly from Washington. Only a few days ago we were called upon to acclaim the opening of a direct wire from Ottawa to Washington. Let none of my friends on the opposite side of the House grow nervous; for the sake of cabinet harmony I will not make any allusions to the no-truck-or-trade-with-the-Yankee-campaign of 1911. What I desire to point out is that the people of this country elect their

parliamentary representatives on the understanding that they will be governed from Ottawa; that Canadian public business will be transacted by Canadians in Canada. Hence, the duty of ministers, particularly at this critical period, lies in Ottawa and not in London; and if there be any business in London that cannot be transacted by letter or cable surely the High Commissioner can attend to it.

Mr. Speaker, it was an appreciation of conditions as they exist to-day that led Premier Martin to declare in his manifesto that

> There is a situation developing in this country which, if continued, will disrupt Canada.

And it was his keen realization of the need of national unity that caused him to add this:

> While there are men in the Government who were parties to the measures and the conduct which have thrown Canada into disorder to-day, still I have sufficient confidence in my friends who have entered that Government to believe . . . that they will put forth every effort to see that Canada is properly governed during the period of the war.

Before the present session shall have advanced very far it will be demonstrated whether or not the friends in whom Premier Martin expressed confidence will justify that confidence. If they do so by repealing the War-Time Elections Act, for which Premier Martin has specifically asked, and by adopting policies designed to bring people together rather than to keep them apart, they will have done much to repair the injuries from which the country is now suffering, and the continuance of which is alike inimical to national progress and to the part we all desire that Canada should play in this war.

Not only to Premier Martin's friends in the cabinet, but to all the members of the Government, to all the members of Parliament—aye, to all the people of Canada—there may be offered at this moment as an inspiration to that form of public service which alone can unify the discordant elements in our population, the example of the venerable leader of the Opposition, who takes up his new burdens in the spirit that breathed through the words of Gladstone's last Midlothian address: "While Nature cries aloud for rest, I am buckling on the armour."

Motion of Mr. Herbert M. Mowat (Parkdale), for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Wednesday, March 20, 1918.

The House met at Two o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) it was ordered that the Address to His Excellency the Governor General, adopted by the House on the 19th instant, be engrossed and presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of Women's War Conference.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Annual Report, Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year 1916-17.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Statement of Governor General's Warrants.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Statement of unforeseen expenditure.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Report of the National Battlefields Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Statement of receipts and expenditures of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended April 30, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Statement showing distribution of $25,000,000 advanced by the Dominion Government to the Canadian Northern Railway and its constituent companies as provided for in chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Statement of superannuation and retiring allowances in the Civil Service during the year ended December 31, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Interim report of R. A. Pringle, K.C., commissioner to inquire into the manufacture, sale, price and supply of newsprint in Canada.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Finance) it was ordered that this House do on Friday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean it was ordered that this House do on Friday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

RE-ARRANGEMENTS AND TRANSFERS OF DUTIES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to authorize re-arrangments and transfers of duties in the Public Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Kindly explain.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This Bill authorizes the Governor in Council to change any department or any branch of a department from the direction of one minister to the direction of another. It has become evident that some re-arrangement of certain departments is necessary. It is a short Bill; I will read it for the information of the House:

1.—(1) The Governor in Council shall have power,—

(a) to transfer any powers, duties or functions or the control or supervision of any part of the public service from one minister of the Crown to any other minister of the Crown, or from one department or portion of the public service to any other department or portion of the public service; or

(b) to amalgamate and combine any two or more departments under one minister of the Crown and under one Deputy Minister.

(2) All orders made by the Governor in Council under the provisions of this Act shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fifteen days after they are made if Parliament is then sitting, and if not, then within fifteen days from the commencement of the next ensuing session of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women, was introduced and read the first time.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the solar mean time during the summer months.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is this the same Bill as last year?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is similar to last year's Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

On the Order for Questions being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At this stage may I ask the Government, by your leave Mr. Speaker, if it is expected that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will be in his seat this session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will make an announcement with regard to that to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

DUTIES ON FARM IMPLEMENTS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Government received any petition praying for the removal of duties on farm implements?

2. What action, if any, does the Government intend to take with a view to meeting the demands of the western farmers on this question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. There have been communications on the subject alluded to.

2. Any necessary announcement will be made in due course.

LORD BEAVERBROOK.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Has the Government of Canada paid any money directly or indirectly to Lord Beaverbrook?

2. If so, how much, and for what purpose was the money paid?

3. What was the nature of the services rendered by Lord Beaverbrook to Canada?

4. What was the nature of the campaign of propaganda, if any, and the details of such campaign?

5. What were the concrete results?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 and 2. Lord Beaverbrook's services to the Canadian Government as Canadian Record Officer and as Officer in Charge of the Canadian War Records Office have been given entirely without remuneration. The expenses of the Canadian War Records Office have been paid partly out of the war vote and partly out of the profits derived from the sale of the publications, photographs and moving picture films produced under the auspices of the office. The total grant for this purpose has been $25,000, of which only a portion has been expended.

3, 4 and 5. Lord Beaverbrook's first position was that of Canadian Record Officer. His duties were, by means of daily cables, to give to the public of Canada an account of the performances of the Canadian troops. In this capacity also he wrote 'Canada in Flanders.' He was appointed Canadian Record Officer in January, 1915.

In January, 1916, the Canadian War Records Office was founded and Lord Beaverbrook was placed in charge. One of his principal tasks in this capacity was to oversee the collection, filing, copying, collation and safe keeping of the enormous quantity of official records, maps, diaries, précis and private accounts relating to the operations and activities of the Canadian troops. These will form invaluable material for the historian, and it is recognized that in this respect Canada is probably now in a better position than any other part of the Empire as a result of the work of the Canadian War Records Office.

Among other duties of the Canadian War Records Office are the preparation of a weekly communique for the Canadian and British press describing the work of the Canadian corps; the publication of the Canadian Daily Record, a news bulletin containing information from Canada and circulated among the troops and at the training camps; the taking and publication and exhibition of photographs depicting the operations of the Canadian corps, and also the taking and producing of moving pictures for the same purpose. The Canadian War Records Office has also founded a periodical publication, The Canadian War Pictorial, in which are published photographs of various scenes taken by the official photographer. The office has also published 'Canada in Khaki,' a war book of a popular character, consisting of pictures, stories and poems dealing with the Canadian Army, and largely contributed to by officers and men at the front.

Within such lines have Lord Beaverbrook's duties been confined so far as his position under the Canadian Government is concerned. His task was to discover and make known primarily to the people of Canada, and incidentally to other people, the story of the doings of the Canadian soldiers. The means at his command included the press, the printed volume, photographs and moving pictures. These have all been used for the purpose indicated. It is in such a sense and in such a sense alone that the Canadian War Records Office has done propaganda work for the Canadian Government, and in this sense of course every belligerent Government engaged in this war has conducted active propaganda.

A report of the work of the Canadian War Records Office, dated the 11th January, 1917, was made by Lord Beaverbrook (then Sir Max Aitken) to the Prime Minister, and a copy was laid on the table of the House on the 31st January, 1917. (See Sessional Paper No. 61).

PENSION COMMISSIONERS FOR CANADA.

*MR. DEVLIN:

1. Who are the Pension Commissioners for Canada?
2. What are their salaries?
3. Do they, or any of them, draw a pension or pensions from the Government?
4. If so, who, and how much?
5. If any such Pension Commissioner is in receipt of a pension, or drew a pension, how long did he serve overseas?
6. What length of time did he serve in France?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Commander J. K. L. Ross, chairman; Colonel R. H. Labatt, member, and Major J. L. Todd, member.

2. $5,000 per annum.

3. Yes. One of them.

4. Colonel R. H. Labatt draws a full disability pension.

5 and 6. Colonel R. H. Labatt enlisted in August, 1914, and proceeded overseas with the First Contingent in September, 1914. During training in England he was operated on for duodenal ulcer in February, 1915. Upon recovery he proceeded to France to command the 4th Battalion on May 13, 1915. Owing to disease diagnosed by the R.A.M.C. at Osborne House as valvular disease of the heart, he was returned from France on June 15, 1915, and recommended for six months' rest and then for light duty. He returned to Canada about the end of July, 1915. Upon arrival in Canada he went upon the staff of the 2nd Military District to lecture and subsequently on the 1st of July, 1916, was put in command of Niagara Camp, which he relinquished upon taking over his duties as a member of the Board of Pension Commissioners on September 11, 1916. He was boarded for discharge and recommended to be sent to the hospital for three months, but was subsequently allowed to pass under his own control on the understanding that he was to lay up for three months, which he hopes on the return of the other Commissioners to be able to do.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

1. When and upon whose recommendation was the office of Food Controller in Canada authorized and established?

2. To which Ministerial Department does the Food Controller report, and what member of the Cabinet, if any, is responsible for the administration of the office of Food Controller?

3. What has been the total amount incurred as salaries for Food Controller and his assistants and staff at Ottawa and throughout Canada from the establishment of the office up to and including end of February, 1918?

4. What has been the total expense of Food Controller's Office at Ottawa and throughout Canada, including rents, furnishing, equipment, heat, light, salaries, travelling expenses, stationery, printing, advertising, telegrams, telephones, postage, and all other expenses of Food Controller's Office at Ottawa and branch offices throughout Canada, since the establishment of the office, up to and including February, 1918?

5. What was the total cost of administration of Food Controller's Office at Ottawa and throughout Canada, including rents, furnishings, equipments, heat, light, salaries, travelling expenses, stationery, printing, advertising, telegrams, telephones, postage, etc., including all and every expense of Food Controller's Office at Ottawa and branch offices throughout Canada for each of following months, viz.: December, 1917, and February, 1918?

6. Are there any claims for salary or expenses from the Food Controller's Office outstanding or in dispute; if so, what is the amount involved?

7. How many employees are there on the Food Controller's staff at Ottawa and throughout Canada?

8. How many of the employees are returned soldiers who have been on Active Service since 1914?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. What was the rate of commission paid in connection with the Victory Loan?

2. How much was paid in such commission, and to whom?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the number of paymasters or others of the various regiments recruited since August, 1914, who are short in their funds, giving the names and addresses and amount of shortage of each one, showing the action the Government has taken in the matter.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the names of the Staff of the Hospital Commission, the number of persons employed, their names, duties, salaries, former occupation and amounts paid to each for travelling expenses.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the names of all persons employed in Ottawa in the Military Service Council, their salaries and former occupations.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a copy of the Order in Council recently passed making provisions for the staff, the number of persons to be employed and their salaries, in the Food Controller's Office. Also a list of the names of those at present employed, showing their respective salaries and duties, former occupations, where formerly employed and salary received in former occupation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a statement in detail showing the expenditure in connection with the National Service Board for salaries, newspaper advertisements, travelling expenses, and all other expenses, respectively.

MILITARY SERVICE.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of any treaty between Great Britain and the United States, permitting the conscription of British subjects in the United States for military service and of American citizens residing in British Dominions.

He said: The subject which is involved in this motion is certainly one of very great importance. The matter was yesterday referred to casually in the observations of the Prime Minister, and in answer to a question of my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), my right hon. friend did not seem to give precise information as to the nature of the convention which had been made between Great Britain and the United States; but I understand, at all events—and it has been so understood by the press—that a convention has been adopted by Great Britain and the United States permitting the Canadian authorities to recruit British subjects residing in the United States and permitting the American authorities also to recruit in Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is, their own subjects?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Of course, their own subjects. I look upon this convention as a step in advance of anything that we have known amongst civilized nations up to the present time. It is certainly a very great advance in our ideas, and I cannot but congratulate the Government upon the step they have taken in that matter. Great Britain and France to-day are as united as two nations in Europe can be or ever have been, but I am sure it would not be thought possible in Great Britain that a recruiting sergeant should go from London to Paris to recruit a British subject, or that a French officer should go from Paris to London to recruit a French subject.

I have seen by the papers—how correct is the report I do not know—that some arrangement has been made, but I have always doubted it. But if it is so, I rejoice all the more. That would, indeed, be a very wide departure from the policy upon which this Government came into office in 1911, when they would have "no truck or trade with the Yankees." I do not know that they are very enthusiastic even now about trucking or trading with the Yankees, but the force of circumstances is such that they have been compelled to have a great deal more truck and trade with the Yankees than we thought it possible this country ever would have under their administration. To-day, we go much further than trucking with the Yankees; we allow the Yankees to come into our own country and exercise what is practically the right of sovereignty in recruiting their own people, and the Yankees allow us the same privilege in their country. That is quite an advance in the policy of my right hon. friend, and I rejoice at it and congratulate him upon it. When the announcement was made, I could not but believe that this arrangement was one of the good effects of the entrance into the Cabinet of some Liberals, who had convinced their colleagues that they should give up their old opinions about "no truck or trade with the Yankees" and realize that the closer our relations with our neighbours to the south the better for the advancement of civilization at large. A great deal of the trouble in this world arises from distrust—distrust between nations, distrust between creeds, and distrust between races. Human nature, after all, is very much the same the world over, and I think all will agree that it would be better for the world in general, and for this country in particular, if this distrust could be allayed. So I said to myself: Well, it may be that I was in the wrong after all, and that my friends who went into the Cabinet were in the right, for it looks as if they were in process of making Liberals of their Conservative colleagues; and if that is really so, I do not know that I shall be very sorry for their entrance into the Cabinet. If they could bring their colleagues to sound Liberal doctrines I would forgive them a good deal.

But I was too previous in my congratulations. My joy was of short duration, because, if I am to believe a paper which is very close to the Government, it is precisely the reverse that is taking place; instead of Liberals converting the Tories to sound Liberal principles, the Liberals are going over to Toryism. Here is an item which appeared in The Toronto News of the 14th instant. I will not say that the Toronto News is an organ of the Government, but it is very close to the Government, and I think, as a rule, reflects the Government's opinion. It says:

> Western telegraph despatches represent Hon. Charles A. Dunning, Director of Food Production, as advocating the removal of all duties on agricultural implements. He is said to have advised the Alberta Legislature to ask the Union Government for this concession, and the Legislature adopted a resolution in accordance with the representation. If Mr. Dunning has made the statements attributed to him he has gone farther than he should have done. The Unionist government was formed on the absolute understanding agreed to by all the western ministers that the tariff should remain in abeyance until after the war.

Is it or is it not a fact, that when hon. gentlemen from the Western Provinces entered the Cabinet there was an absolute understanding by all the western ministers that the tariff should remain in abeyance until after the war? If that be so, I am surprised, because in another paper called the Farmers' Magazine, published in Toronto, I find an account of a conversation between the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) and Mr. Dunning, the Director of Food Production, which goes to show that the Minister of Agriculture had advised Mr. Dunning to go and buy tractors across the line because the duty was going to be remitted. The article is entitled, "How Crerar got his Tractors—Henry Ford begins output of his 1,000 Tractor order for Canada April the first," and begins with Mr. Crerar saying:

> "Dunning, go to Detroit and get Henry Ford to sell us 1,000 tractors at a rock-bottom price to help our farmers to win out on this food production drive."

Mr. Dunning replies:

> "Yes, I know, Crerar, but how in the name of common sense can we do anything with this prohibitive duty on tractors? The farmers say it is too large an expense."

And my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture replies:

> "Easy! The Cabinet has consented to do the sensible thing and forego the duty for one year. Your course is clear sailing. Try it out at once. The farmers want all the machines they can get."

So here we have the statement of a paper close to the Government that there were to be no tariff changes at all during the war, and on the other hand, the statement from another paper that the Minister of Agriculture had told Mr. Dunning that there would be a change in the tariff so far as tractors are concerned. So the matter is in

doubt, but at all events it is a fact that tractors up to a certain price have been put on the free list. But there is something more important than that. Was there such an agreement as is mentioned by the Toronto News which, after stating that there was this agreement to have no tariff changes during the war, says:

No room for doubt was left upon this issue.—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the right hon. gentleman will not proceed too far with his argument on the tariff unless he does it by way of analogy, because he is now quite far afield from the subject of his motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will not go very far afield. I will just conclude this quotation and then I am done. I am asking for information on a subject connected with what I am reading; that is all. The Toronto News says:

No room for doubt was left upon this issue. Independent agricultural candidates in prairie constituencies signed an undertaking to this effect before they obtained the government endorsation.

Is it or is it not a fact, that some of my old friends whom I see on the other side of the House signed such an agreement as is mentioned here? Did they agree, before they got their endorsation, that there should be no tariff changes during the war? If so, Mr. Dunning ought to be advised, because he evidently wants to have not only tractors but all agricultural implements put on the free list. He wants to have cheap production; we all want that; and it will strike everybody that if we are to have cheaper production one of the best things we can do is to have cheaper implements. Now, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was hardly worth while to interrupt my right hon. friend, because it was perfectly evident that in the course of his discussion of Motion No. 13 he had unfortunately picked up his notes on No. 16, and so he went on to discuss farm tractors on a motion concerning a military convention with the United States. His observations with regard to farm tractors do not seem to be very closely relevant to the question of the Military Convention, and I shall merely say a few words about the convention itself. My right hon. friend's time-worn joke about having "no trade or truck with the Yankees" has done service on a great many occasions. It must be tired by this time, and my right hon. friend might give it a rest for a while. As far as the military convention is concerned, it has been entered into, but I do not think it can be laid on the Table until it is ratified. It is very much along the line which is to be adopted in the convention between Great Britain and the United States, if I understand it aright. In fact, the convention between the United States and Canada was the first one agreed to, and it will probably form the basis of the conventions which will be entered into between the United States and Great Britain, and between the United States and other European nations. There is no objection to the motion, but I do not think the document can be brought down until it has been ratified.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By the Senate?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, and by the British Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It will have to be ratified by both Governments.

Motion agreed to.

WAR MISSION AT WASHINGTON.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved:

For a copy of the Orders in Council creating the War Mission at Washington, appointments to the same, with instructions as to the extent of its powers and scope of its work.

He said: May I ask my right hon. friend if he can tell me from memory the names of the members of the war mission?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Lloyd Harris, Mr. Ross McMaster, Mr. A. H. Scott, Montreal, and Mr. Frank Rolph, Toronto. Mr. Lloyd Harris is the Chairman, and the Orders in Council have already been brought down.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR RETURN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a copy of all Orders in Council creating the War Trade Board, appointments to the same, instructions, and reports from the Board to this date.

ADMISSION FREE OF DUTY OF FARM TRACTORS AND OTHER IMPLEMENTS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all Orders in Council, reports and correspondence with respect to the admission free of duty of farm tractors and other agricultural implements.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps my right hon. friend may wish to say something about the Military Convention on this motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am satisfied with what I have said.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERY TREATY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States concerning fisheries between Canada and the United States.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is impossible to bring down a copy of the treaty. It has not yet been made. Negotiations are still pending.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Dropped.

AMENDMENT OF PENITENTIARY ACT.

The Order of the day being called,

The Minister of Justice—In Committee of the Whole—The following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Penitentiary Act, Chapter 147 of the Revised Statutes, and to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint a Superintendent of Penitentiaries, who shall be an officer of the Department of Justice, and superintend the administration and business of the penitentiaries, and who shall be paid a salary of four thousand dollars per annum; and three Inspectors of Penitentiaries who shall be classified as officers of the Department of Justice, in subdivision B of the First Division of the Civil Service, and shall each receive a minimum salary of twenty-five hundred dollars per annum.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to be allowed to drop this notice, as an error has crept in it as it is drawn, and, subject to renewing it in the correct form, it will be dropped.

Motion dropped.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5 to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Bill is to make a variety of amendments to the Dominion Lands Act. Some of the main amendments were before the House in a similar Bill which was introduced, but which did not secure the assent of Parliament, at the last session. When I make that statement I know that most of the hon. members present will understand the main purpose of the Bill. It provides facilities for pre-emption holders to obtain loans upon their pre-emptions prior to the issue of the patents. It provides in various ways for facilitating the working of the Act, but there is no clause in the Bill providing for anything in the way of a fundamental, important or radical change. But, by way of explanation, I think it well to refer to a matter of some importance particularly to hon. members representing western constituencies. Mainly with a view to meeting the evident requirements of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, in connection with soldiers' settlement, it has been decided to withdraw entirely the privilege of the pre-emption of purchased homesteads. The clause of the Act which provides for the purchase of pre-emption homesteads will cease to have effect from and after to-morrow. From that time the privilege of free homesteading, or the privilege of taking land, will be confined to the ordinary homesteading right. It might also be added that this right is being substantially curtailed as well by a provision for the exclusion from its exercise of very considerable areas of western land within proximity to railways. This is being done at the request of the Soldiers' Settlement Board and under the provisions of the Act of last session establishing that Board.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 2.55 p.m.

Thursday, March 21, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Canadian Indemnity Company.—Mr. Allen.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Spinney.

Bill No. 9, respecting Fraser Lumber Company, Limited, and Fraser Companies, Limited.—Mr. Elkin.

Bill No. 10, to enable the Western Power Company of Canada, Limited, to own and operate the Railway of the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Stacey.

HON. SIR THOMAS WHITE.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO HIS ABSENCE BECAUSE OF ILL-HEALTH.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to the question addressed to me yesterday by the leader of the Opposition, it is my duty, but with great regret, to inform the

House that the health of Sir Thomas White has been seriously impaired by the enormous responsibilities and the severe and unremitting labours which have been imposed upon him in the performance of his duties since the outbreak of war. No burdens of anything like the same magnitude have ever been imposed upon a Minister of Finance in Canada for a like period. Sir Thomas White's keen realization of duty impelled him to throw into the task his utmost strength and energy. His wide business experience and his great ability enabled him to render to Canada a service for which the whole country should be grateful. After my return to Ottawa about the middle of January I became convinced that he required immediate and prolonged rest, and I strongly urged him to put aside his work for such a period as would bring about a thorough restoration of his health. He finally agreed to do so; and upon consulting an eminent physician he was informed of the imperative necessity that he should desist from all active work for a period of six months at least. There is not the slightest doubt that Sir Thomas White would greatly desire to be relieved from his present responsibilities, but on the other hand he finds himself confronted with the duty of remaining at his post, if at all possible, until the conclusion of the war. His colleagues would gladly undertake to carry on the work of his department during the present session, in order that he may have the necessary rest; and the duties of Minister of Finance have been, during his absence, entrusted to the very capable hands of Mr. Maclean. I am not confident, however, that Sir Thomas White will find it consistent with his ideal of duty to remain absent during the session while still continuing as Minister of Finance. On the other hand, his colleagues naturally shrink from asking him to resume, at the risk of a permanent breakdown of his health, the crushing burdens which he has been sustaining during nearly four years of war. I am in correspondence with him and any further announcement will be delayed until after the Easter holidays.

ARGYLL HOUSE EMPLOYEES.
STATEMENT BY SIR ROBERT BORDEN.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The attention of Sir Edward Kemp, Minister of the Overseas Military Forces, has been directed to certain animadversions which, from time to time, have appeared in the press with regard to the officers and men who are employed at headquarters at Argyll House in London. Argyll House is the headquarters for some hundreds of thousands of men who are now engaged in France or in Great Britain in the military service of this Dominion. In a telegram received recently from Sir Edward Kemp he has asked me to make public the following statement, and I accordingly do so:

Of seventy-six officers and two hundred and nine other ranks employed at Argyll House fifty-five officers and one hundred and twenty-eight other ranks have seen service in the Field, the great majority of whom were evacuated owing to wounds. Sixty-four of the other ranks without overseas service are at present unfit for general service. On becoming fit they will immediately be replaced by returned casualties. May I direct attention to the fact that the officers in charge of this responsible work at Argyll House are men of high reputation. They are Canadian citizens whose names for the most part are household words in Canada. Generally they have abandoned occupations at great sacrifice to perform a service for their country. Heads of branches have seen service at the Front and they are continually pressing claims to be freed from onerous, difficult and exacting tasks with which they have to deal at headquarters in order that they may return to the Front.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest that it would be advisable to have the names of those men?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will get them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I notice that the name "Argyll House" is employed. Does that include all the service in and around the headquarters in London?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not know. I will ascertain?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think it will be found that it does not.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 11, respecting the Department of Immigration and Colonization, was introduced and read the first time.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No 12, respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, was introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

LEAVE-OF-ABSENCE BOARD APPEALS.

Mr. GLASS:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the urgent need of more speedy

action on the part of Leave-of-Absence Boards in disposing of appeals of men who have had farm experience, and whose services will be required immediately for spring work, on the farms and for seeding?

2. Has the Government taken into consideration the probable need of the appointment of additional Leave-of-Absence Boards with a view to the more expeditious disposal of appeals by men required for farm work?

General MEWBURN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INFORMATION FOR CANADA.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is there a Director of Public Information for Canada?

2. If so, what is his name?

3. What salary is he paid?

4. What was his former occupation?

5. What Department of the Government has control of this office?

6. How many persons are employed in the office by the Director of Public Information?

7. What are the names of each?

8. What salary is each one receiving?

9. What was the former occupation of each and their respective salaries?

10. What is the nature of the work being done?

11. What is the estimated cost of maintaining the office per month?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2. M. E. Nichols.

3. $5,000 per year.

4. Newspaper editor.

5. President of the Privy Council.

6. Ten.

7, 8, and 9. Frank Yeigh, $300 per month, formerly lecturer and organizer $350 per month.

W. S. LeSueur, $150 per month, formerly advertising manager, $200 per month.

Miss B. A. Macleod, $75 per month, formerly stenographer Imperial Munitions Board, $80 per month.

Miss W. Wilson, $100 per month, formerly journalist $100 per month.

Miss M. Currie, $65 per month, formerly stenographer Federal Press, $65 per month.

Miss M. J. Roe, $60 per month, recommended by Civil Service Commission.

Miss R. G. MacLeod, $60 per month, formerly stenographer Militia Department, $56 per month.

Charles Brooks, $25 per month, office boy, $20 per month.

Captain William Wallace, M.C., and Lieut. I. D. Johnson are also employed in the office of the Director of Public Information as editors of the Canadian Daily Record, but they are paid by the Militia Department, receiving the pay of their respective ranks. Neither Captain Wallace nor Lieut. Johnson has yet been discharged from the C.E.F., in which they were serving.

10. The work carried on by the Director of Public Information is directed along the lines of giving the public the fullest possible information concerning the war and war problems, at home and abroad.

The Director of Public Information keeps in close touch with Government activities and with the work of the boards and commissions specially constituted to meet problems arising from the war. The facilities of his office are at the disposal of these various departments of government, boards, and commissions, to prepare, direct, or advise in publicity campaigns and are being utilized for that purpose.

The director will also keep in touch with the Department of Propaganda in Great Britain and with the Committee of Public Information in the United States, so as to provide the Canadian people with fuller information relating to the war and activities of the Allied Nations.

A special work undertaken by the Director of Public Information is the preparation of summaries of news and opinion of the British Empire and foreign countries, with special reference to problems arising from the war. This information will be presented in the form of a weekly review.

The Director of Public Information has also taken over the general supervision of the Canadian Daily Record, published for the use of the Canadian soldiers overseas.

Of the various activities of the Director of Public Information, particular mention may be made of the War Lecture Bureau organized early last December through which a large number of voluntary workers have been enlisted in the work of delivering patriotic speeches. The bureau is active in nearly every province in Canada and addresses have been delivered to approximately 400,000 people. It has co-operated in local campaigns for the Patriotic and Red Cross Funds and is being utilized in the campaigns for Farm Labour and Greater Production.

11. Approximately $4,000 per month, of which nearly one-half is expended on the Canadian Daily Record published for the Canadian soldiers overseas.

EXPORTATION OF NEWSPRINT AND MECHANICAL WOOD PULP.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1 Has an Order in Council been passed providing that newsprint paper and mechanical

wood pulp are among the goods of which export is prohibited except under license issued by the Minister of Customs at the request of the War Trade Board?

2. If so, what is the object of said Order in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: 1. Yes.

2. The object in passing the Order in Council was to assist in the control and supply of newsprint for domestic purposes.

IMPERIAL MUNITIONS BOARD.

*Mr. DEVLIN:

*1. During the months of October, November or December, 1917, did the staff of the Imperial Munitions Board do any work for the Government in connection with the copying of lists showing the names of soldiers' wives and soldiers' dependents?

2. If so, who paid the various members of the staff of the Imperial Munitions Board for doing this work?

3. For what purpose were these lists used?

4. Did any member of the staff of the Militia Department arrange to have the work done?

5. If so, what is his name?

6. On whose instructions were the lists copied?

General MEWBURN:

1. There is no record of any such work having been done for the Government.

2. and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4, 5 and 6. There is no record in the Militia Department of any such instructions, nor was there any payment made on account of such expenditure.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a copy of all Orders in Council appointing members of the National Service Board, and all reports made individually or collectively by the members of the Board.

QUESTION PASSED AS MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Who were the officers of the Engineer Training Depot stationed at the St. Johns, Quebec, barracks during the months of October and December, 1917? Who were the officers of the Engineers Training Depot stationed at St. Johns, Quebec, barracks on the 17th of December, 1917? Where did these officers enlist and where did these officers reside before their enlistment? Where were these officers residing at the time of their enlistment?

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS' CONTRACTS.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (W. Peterborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, Parliament should provide that the Postmaster General shall have power to revise rural mail carriers' contracts not yet fully executed in order that the service may not suffer from conditions bearing unfairly on the said carriers arising from sudden rise in prices due to unusual circumstances and unfairly affecting the rate of remuneration contracted for.

He said: My object in bringing this motion before the House is that mail carriers, after they have entered into certain obligations, sometimes find themselves, owing to circumstances over which they have no control and which they could not reasonably be expected to have taken into consideration, placed in such a position that they have a moral right to appeal for a revision of their contract, but the Postmaster General has no power to revise the contract in any way. When he is apprised of these unusual circumstances, he replies that he has no power to revise the contract, and the consequence is that there is no reconsideration. I, myself, know of cases where mail couriers are going behind daily, as a plain statement of their expenditures shows, and the result is that the country is really taking advantage of these men by holding them strictly to their contract. A great injustice is done these couriers solely because the Postmaster General has not the power that other ministers of the Crown have, under different circumstances, of revising a contract or improving its conditions. The Postmaster General simply has to shut out all consideration of the matter, and this works a very great hardship. The Government should not take undue advantage of any man, especially of men so necessary to the business of the country as mail couriers, and since the desire of the House can only be that all the people shall be treated fairly, I fancy the House, if it will but think of the matter for a moment, will be only too glad to empower the Postmaster General to revise these contracts so as to enable him to do justice in every case where a grievance is clearly shown.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Acting Postmaster General): The motion which the hon. gentleman makes looks to the creating of a power in the Postmaster General to "revise," by which I understand he intends to convey the idea of altering the conditions of the contracts that have been entered into for the carriage of rural mail. Those contracts were entered into after calling for tenders, and as a rule there was some competition and some difference of prices. It is not impossible—it is, in fact, highly probable—that there are cases (quite a few have been brought to the attention of the department where it is contended, and in many of them it may be true, that conditions have so changed by reason of circumstances quite unforeseen

as to make the prices of the original tenders and the prices of the contracts made upon them inadequate. But it hardly seems to me that the proper remedy in those cases is to empower the Postmaster General to revise the contracts and enter into new contracts with the individuals at present holding them. It would seem to me that the proper method of dealing with these cases, if the conditions of the contracts to-day are, by reason of unforeseen circumstances, inequitable, would be to cancel the existing contracts and call for new tenders, which tenders would be made in view of and under the existing conditions of to-day. I may say that where it has been made clear to the department that there was serious loss resulting from entirely unforeseen circumstances, in not a few instances the contracts have been cancelled and new tenders called for, and I think I may say we are inclined to continue that policy. It does seem to me that it would be an unjustifiable procedure simply to modify the conditions of existing contracts in the direction of increasing the prices; that, in effect, would be making a new contract, and where there is a question of making a new contract the proper thing in the public interest, in order that the best price obtainable under existing conditions should be had, and the fairest course to those who may seek to do this work would appear to be to proceed as I have suggested. The department is quite prepared to aid in that way whenever a case is made showing that there is serious loss on the part of the contractor. In view of that declaration—and I think my hon. friend will recognize that this is the more equitable course both from the point of view of the public interest and the point of view of all those who may be in a position to carry out this work—I would suggest to the hon. member that, perhaps, he might feel justified in withdrawing his motion.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: The rural mail delivery system is certainly a great boon, particularly to the farmers, and I am glad it has spread rapidly in the far West as well as in the eastern provinces. But, useful and progressive a system as it is, the danger lies in the fact that the expenditure may be increased unduly if some safeguards are not provided. I quite agree with what the Acting Postmaster General (Hon. C. J. Doherty) says. My own experience in the Post Office Department leads me to believe that when tenders are called quite a number will always be submitted. It is not within my recollection that the department on any occasion received no tenders when tenders were called for. I agree with the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that the high cost of living and the circumstances of the war have changed and modified considerably the old state of things. Still, it is to be remembered that in every contract with the Post Office Department there is a proviso that the Postmaster General may cancel the contract at any time for good cause; therefore, if a mail carrier find that he is aggrieved by conditions arising out of the high cost of living or that he does not receive enough for the performance of his duties, he can at any time state his case to the minister, who, if he is fair, will cancel the contract and call for new tenders. We have to check carefully the expenditure of every department, and we cannot provide too many safeguards in the operation of a system which entails such a large expenditure as does the rural mail delivery. Some years ago the Minister of Public Works could spend practically any amount of money without calling for tenders if the expenditure in question could be considered as unforeseen. The Government of the day put a check on that laxity, and now there is a provision that the department cannot spend a sum exceeding $5,000 without calling for tenders. That was a proper safeguard to take. With all due regard to the member for West Peterborough, I submit that the Postmaster General should guard against any laxity in the expenditure of money, even for such a worthy object as rural mail delivery. When tenders are called any man is free to send in a tender, and in justice to every one I think that the minister should not have the privilege of selecting, without regard to the amount of the tender, the person who should get the contract. The department is doing well in calling for tenders and accepting the lowest tender, as has been done in the past. I admit, with the hon. member for West Peterborough, that the delay in calling for tenders should be done away with. The Acting Postmaster General should, however, limit the zone of advertisements calling for tenders for mail services; it is nothing short of a scandal to see advertisements in papers published in Vancouver, Alberta, and Manitoba, in connection with mail contracts in Nova Scotia or the province of Quebec.

Mr. DOHERTY: May I ask when that began?

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott): I support the resolution of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). When the rural mail delivery system was established

a few years ago, there was a fixed price according to locality. In certain localities the prices were too low; the department would not exceed a maximum price of $30 a mile. Since the increase in the cost of living and in the cost of feed for horses and gasolene for motor vehicles, a large number of mail carriers have been carrying the mail at a loss, or at any rate, at a very small wage. As the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said, the system has been a great boon to the farmers, and that in itself is a reason why we should not expect the mail carriers to work at such low wages, or to carry out their contracts at a loss. The Government would be justified in granting an increase on a sliding scale until the contracts have expired, and without asking for renewals. The present contractors have done the work in the past at low prices and it would be unfair to them to throw the service open to competition before the expiration of the contracts. I would certainly support the Government should they give these carriers an increase to cover the remaining periods of their contracts.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): For several years past I have brought this matter to the attention of the various gentlemen who have occupied the position of Postmaster General. Especially after the inauguration of parcel post delivery I interviewed the Postmaster General and pointed out to him how unfair the system was working in respect of those engaged in rural mail delivery. I commend the hon. member for Peterborough for bringing this matter to the attention of the acting Postmaster General and of the House. He should be congratulated because of the unanimity of view, so far as we can judge from those who have already spoken, and on the fact that those who have spoken have admitted that there is such a thing as the high cost of living for people who live in the country. One would judge from reading the press at times that what is called the high cost of living applies only to cities and towns and that in country districts it does not cost any more to live than it did in former days. This is a reason why the subject of the hon. gentleman's motion should be seriously considered by the Department. If we are to treat these servants of the public as others have been treated; if we are to treat these contractors for the carrying of mail in the country districts as other contractors have been treated, the Postmaster General should have power to revise the contracts. Contracts have been entered into in times past for one year for the supplying of various articles to departments of the Government. On the holders of the contracts representing to the Government that the articles they were supplying were costing more than the contractors were paid for them, the period of the contract has in some cases been cut down from one year to six months. I believe that contracts to supply goods have been made for a period of six months rather than for a period of one year as was formerly the case. Most if not all of our rural mail delivery contracts are for a period of four years, and hundreds of people throughout the country who in good faith entered into these contracts have been put to increased expenditure by reason of the inauguration of the parcel post system and their being obliged to provide an extra horse or a larger rig in order to convey the mail; and have also been deprived of the small revenue they formerly obtained by carrying these parcels now carried as mail. They have put up with it and hundreds of the men have been operating at a loss. But with that characteristic stick-to-itiveness of men who live in the country districts, they have stuck to their contracts notwithstanding the fact that they have lost money. Not so those who have had contracts and who live in cities and towns. When the pinch came they began to squeal and they came to Ottawa and squealed loudly enough to get their contracts changed and their remuneration increased. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux)—he represents two or three constituencies, but we will say Rouville—he was very fortunate in being elected to all of them—says that there is a saving clause in the contracts and that the Postmaster General has power to annul any contract by giving two or three month's notice. That is all right for the Government on the one side, but where does the other fellow get off? What chance has the fellow who has taken a contract? The hon. member for Rouville says: Let him take his plea to the acting-Postmaster General either by way of petition or through a delegation. He says that no doubt the acting-Postmaster General is a fair-minded man and that he will annul the contract and enter into a new one. That is not a fair way of looking at it. People in the country districts are entitled to every dollar of money that is being spent on rural mail delivery. Let me emphasize that fact, Mr. Speaker. There are thousands, and tens of thousands, of people living in the country districts who cannot importune

the various Cabinet ministers for public works, harbour improvements, post offices and one thing and another. About the only thing the Government can do is to give an effective and efficient mail service.

I repeat what I have said on former occasions that this is not a question of whether there is a surplus or a deficit in the Post Office Department. If there is any department of the Government where there is a justification for having a deficit it is the Post Office Department because every cent of revenue comes out of the pockets of the people and it should go back to them in the form of an efficient service. The people of the country will find no fault with this or any other Government if there is a deficit in the Post Office Department so long as the Government gives the people in country districts an efficient and effective service. I hope this matter will not be simply passed over as something of little importance but that it will receive the attention that it merits. I hope that not only will rural mail carriers get more pay but that country postmasters and postmistresses will also be more fairly remunerated.

They are entitled to more pay than they get at the present time. The hon. member for Rouville says that the Government is safeguarded by competition, that if these routes are put up to tender there will always be lots of persons to tender for them. Of course, my hon. friend is speaking for that part of the country with which he is best acquainted—his own part of the country. That may be true in his part of the country but I want to assure him and you, Mr. Speaker, that while his statement may have applied, not only to his own part of the country but to the Dominion in general four or five years ago, it does not apply to-day to many parts of the province of Ontario as it did a few years ago. If, four or five years ago, rural mail routes were put up to tender, many people would have tendered for those routes. It is not the case to-day. Rural Ontario has been depleted and there are not enough men to attend to the wants of the country or to work on the farms. There are not many people in rural Ontario to-day vieing with each other to get mail contracts. They have other work to do. I merely ask that this resolution of the hon. member for Peterborough receive serious consideration and that action be taken with the view of doing justice to the rural mail carriers, because I maintain in all sincerity that they have not received just treatment in times past.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything to what has been said by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) but I wish to refer to what has been said, particularly by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), with respect to the necessity of giving due consideration to the questions involved in this resolution. It is quite true that it is a dangerous thing to interfere with or disturb contracts once they are entered into. It might well be urged that one who undertook a contract would not care to lessen his price if the prices of oats, carriages and other things went down instead of up. That argument could well be used and he would say: That is one of the fortunes of war; and if the prices had gone up I would have had to put up with it. But we have extraordinary conditions in Canada to-day. We have war conditions and we have a springing up in the prices of horses, the feed of horses, vehicles and all that is necessary to outfit mail carriers. Therefore, I submit here, Sir, that the ordinary rules of conduct in dealing with contracts ought to be departed from to some extent and that justice ought to be done to the people who are immediately concerned. The hon. the acting-Postmaster General (Mr. Doherty) says that he is willing to seriously consider the question of cancelling contracts. Well, the situation is very much like that of a man who is in a government or other office and who says: I took this position when there were only my wife and myself; we got $500 a year and we got along nicely on that. Now I have a family of ten or twelve, the prices of the necessities of life have gone up and what I used to get is not sufficient to keep body and soul together and to enable us to get along in the way in which we ought to. The minister would say: You can resign your office and go out; that is the only remedy I have to offer you. That is poor consolation to the man who has put his time and energy into the office with which he has been connected for a score of years and who is now not fit to do any other kind of work. It is poor consolation for the mail contractor, who has, perhaps, bought three or four horses for $1,000, who has bought a number of carriages and who has acquired the means of operating the mail route for four years or more, to be told: You can forfeit your four horses and your carriages and resign. If you have lost money that is your luck, but

you can tender again, and that is the only remedy I have for you. That is, perhaps, safeguarding the public, but it is poor consolation for the man who has undertaken the contract and who has entered into obligations and involved others in obligations in order to see that he carries out his contract. I think, Sir, the people of Canada are quite willing that proper methods should be used by the Post Office Department to see that no man shall lose money by reason of the fact that prices have gone up to the extent they have, and that contracts were made at a time when these high prices did not exist. The people generally are unwilling that any one man or one class of men should suffer all the loss. Proper inquiry should be made into these things, and such advances made on the contracts during the period they have still to run as would enable the contractor to make a fair profit upon his investment. The hon. member for Frontenac has particularly pointed out the case of men carrying the parcel post. I know of scores of such cases in my part of the country where men who were doing the work with one horse conveniently and well have had to use two horses; instead of one man handling the mails, two men were required just at the same small price that was being paid when one man and one horse did the work. Though representations have not been coming in to the present acting minister so much as to the ministers who preceded him, there has been continuous knocking at the door of the Post Office Department for some fair consideration. I submit to the minister, who is an ex-judge and a lawyer, and therefore capable of judging this thing, that all contracts should be taken up in the light of present conditions compared with the conditions existing at the time the contract was made and the tenders called for. In thousands of cases, tenders were called for and contracts entered into when the parcel post was not in existence, and by reason of the parcel post a new duty and burden has been cast upon the contractor that was not in contemplation by either party at the time the contract was made. That certainly is a subject for consideration and for readjustment. It has been the law and the custom that if you add a few miles to the route of a mail carrier there is a readjustment and he gets a pro rata advance. If it is well known that for twenty years a certain quantity of mail was carried along a certain route by one horse, and if it turned out that, by a change in the law, articles not hitherto carried in the mail are added, by which the weight is raised from 100 pounds to 300 pounds, I submit that that is a tangible increase in the responsibility cast upon the mail carrier, and that the department should give cognizance to that and compensate the carrier accordingly. The resolution moved by the hon. member for Peterborough is a very timely one, and it is proper that this question should in the fullest and most open way be brought to the notice of the House. If the minister should come to the conclusion that the only thing he can do is to cancel the contracts and call for tenders, I submit to his consideration the question of men who have bought horses and carriages and what equipment was necessary for the carrying of the mail, and which they now have on their hands, and suggest that the taking over of this plant should receive his serious consideration.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens: Though this may seem to be only a minor matter, it is really a matter of the utmost importance throughout our country, and I am glad that the hon. member for Peterborough has drawn the attention of the House to it. I sympathize very heartily with the object he has in view, but my only difficulty is whether or not the remedy he is proposing is a safe one. It is a fact that this class of service is performed for the people of Canada generally at a very low rate. I do not know why it is that the fascination of a Government dollar is so strong, but the fact is there seems to be so much competition for it that in very many instances under the best conditions the man who gets the mail carrying contract loses money on it. I have known many men who in taking these contracts have ruined themselves because they made their tender too low. But I think the suggestion that the Postmaster General should have the power to revise these contracts in individual cases is a rather dangerous one. I am not surprised that the hon. Minister of Justice shrinks from it. If he has the duty of saying whether a certain contractor should receive an advance and another not, he will have a disagreeable duty, and I am sure that all the members of the House would be unwilling that any postmaster general should have such discretion as to make a distinction between a contractor whose price he would increase and one whose price he would not increase. It would be a very uncomfortable thing for the Postmaster General; it would be a very embarrassing situation indeed.

I would suggest for the consideration of the Postmaster General if the remedy which he himself has suggested is not to be deemed the best one, namely, that he consider the advisability of offering a general percentage of increase based upon the changed conditions. In that respect there would be, at all events, an appearance of equality, and the Postmaster General would be saved a great deal of trouble. The suggestion that the contracts be cancelled is perhaps for the moment the best thing that can be done, but if it is to be dealt with in the manner of a revision, I would suggest for his consideration whether it would not be better to offer a fixed percentage of increase, applying to contracts that have been taken within a given date, such percentage of increase to correspond in a measurable degree with the increased cost of material and supplies.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree that there are great objections to the course proposed that such matters should be left within the discretion of the Postmaster General, or within the discretion of the Government. I appreciate the suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). At the same time the Government naturally must take into consideration the position in which it would be placed by even that suggestion, because probably it might be called upon not to stop there but to apply some percentage of increase to every contract that has been entered into by the Government. Perhaps, now that the discussion has taken place, the hon. member who made the motion will be content to withdraw it in order that the subject may be considered by the Government. The discussion could be renewed in some other way at a later date if thought desirable. I should like to add, of course, that all of us have the greatest possible sympathy with those who have undertaken these contracts at a cost which involves loss to them. None of us would desire that. But on the other hand there are considerations touching the public interest which, as hon. members on both sides would agree, the Government ought to take strictly into account before any definite action is embarked upon.

Mr. BURNHAM: In view of what the Prime Minister has promised, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

SEPARATION ALLOWANCES FOR SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it should not be necessary for soldiers' dependents to show total disability in order to obtain aid or other forms of support from the Separation Allowance Branch, but that such aid should be apportioned according to support possible.

He said: The point at issue is simply this: Where the dependent of a soldier applies for separation allowance, that dependent must show that this soldier was her sole means of support, or, if there is a male relative at home, such as a husband or brother, that he is totally incapacitated and absolutely unable to furnish any portion of the means of support of the person applying for the grant or allowance. If such person was only affected to the extent of 5 per cent, then the soldier would not be the only or sole means of support. The consequence is that the support is in many cases of such a meagre character that it is an imposition and unfairness to the soldier and his family, and not really intended—cannot be intended—by the people of this country or the members of this House as a justification for refusing some degree of assistance, if not the full measure of allowance. I will read you a certificate by Dr. Carmichael, of Peterborough, a very well-known physician, with reference to the case of Mrs. Hamlin. It illustrates the point we are discussing so extremely well that I may be pardoned for bringing it to the attention of the House:

In reference to the case of Mrs. Marilla Hamlin, 254 Munroe Ave., Peterborough, Ont., who is receiving Separation Allowance on account of her son, 204157 Pte. W. Hamlin, 3rd Division Ammunition Company, and is now cut off because her husband is not totally incapacitated, she has three sons at front, and three more children at home, not able to earn for themselves, going to school. She always depended on her sons to help keep home and children, as the father was not able to work steady It will take all he can earn to board and clothe himself, let alone keep his wife and family at home, and it will likely have them suffering before another winter is over when everything is going up in price. The husband has a chronic bronchitis, some might say T. B. from his appearance and cough if he gets any cold. And her three boys doing their bit for country she should not be in want or suffering when her boys, if home, would keep her comfortable.

Yours truly,

D. M. Carmichael, M.D.

Now it is to be presumed in some cases, at any rate, if not in this, that the sons have since become married, and that their mother and younger brothers and sisters at home have positively no means of support except a portion of the assigned pay. The dependents have no separation allowance, and they are naturally stranded and in great

distress simply because the Disability Board of the Militia Department has no power to grant to them a portion of the separation allowance, but must grant all the separation allowance or none. That is to say if the person who was the means of support cannot be described as totally ineffective, the partial disability cannot be considered at all in giving these people the privilege of separation allowance. That is clearly a very serious matter. It is absolutely an evil, and it certainly has brought about, in many cases to my own knowledge, the greatest possible hardship. I do not think the Government itself will admit that there is any excuse whatever for such a state of affairs. It is doubtless a case which has been overlooked, and the sooner the injustice to these people is remedied, the better it will be not only for them but for ourselves.

Major-General MEWBURN: My hon. friend from Peterborough has raised a very large question that will require a great deal of careful and mature consideration. The separation allowance that is given to dependents of the soldiers enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force is granted under clear and definite terms. It is given to the wives of officers, non-commissioned officers and men belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and some time ago was extended to widowed mothers whose sons were their sole and only support. Doubtless there are many cases of hardship existing throughout the country of mothers, and in many cases I might say, sisters who were not dependent on the men when they went to the front, but in regard to whom circumstances have since arisen which cause these unfortunate women to think they should receive the separation allowance to which they are not legally entitled under the provisions of the Act. If you open up and go into the question of apportioning the separation allowance according to the need or suffering of the particular individual, it means raising a problem requiring an enormous staff to deal with and throwing an immense additional responsibility on the department in the investigation of every similar case. The instance to which my hon. friend has referred no doubt has been met, or if not it should be met, by the magnificent efforts and work of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The officers of that fund are working in the very closest co-operation with the Separation Allowance Branch, by whom all cases are investigated. Where no provision exists for the payment of separation allowance to the dependent of a soldier overseas, and when circumstances warrant, the Patriotic Fund intervenes and takes care of the needy and distressed. If it is the pleasure of the House that the Separation Allowance should be extended to such dependents, such action, as I have already said, will demand very careful and mature consideration. Not only will it necessitate an enormously increased staff but it will mean practically duplicating the work of the Patriotic Fund. The Disability Board investigates, checks, and reports on all these cases; and I think if my hon. friend will withdraw his motion until such time as it shall have received more careful consideration by the department and the Government, the need will be met much more quickly than by having a prolonged discussion in the House.

Mr. NICKLE: It does not seem to me that this matter can be set aside as easily, or that it is as simple as the minister thinks. Prior to the inauguration of the Military Service Act, when only those were bound to serve who were willing to do so, it was easy for the man who felt that it was incumbent upon him to maintain his parents to remain at home and look after the charge that he had so many years performed. The hon. member for Peterborough in proposing this Resolution did not perhaps go as fully into the facts as he might have done, and therefore it may not be amiss that I should take a minute or two in explaining the principles upon which the separation allowance was granted.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: The separation allowance falls into two classes: It is the amount that is granted to those who are legally dependent upon the man; and it is also granted to those who, although not legally dependent have moral claim upon the man who has gone, or who is to go, to the front. In the case of the wife who is legally dependent upon the man no question arises as to her financial status or position in society. She may have an income of $20,000, or may be in receipt of only $5 a week, but separation allowance goes to her as a right. If a wife has a legal claim she gets, according to the rank of the man, such money as the Government has seen fit to apportion to the various ranks. For instance, the wife of a private gets $25 a month, whereas the colonel's wife draws $60 a month. That will give you some idea of the spread, or the scope, that exists between the private and the colonel.

Take, however, the case of a man who has gone or who has to go, who does not go

voluntarily. He may have occupied a position in society from which he may have drawn a revenue of $1,000, $2,000 or $3,000 a year. Suddenly he is told that all this counts for nothing. He is told: Your service to the State is measured by your ability to be a soldier and the work to which you have hitherto given your attention must be laid aside, the income which has been adequate for the maintenance of your family must be foregone and you must go overseas. At once this situation confronts the dependent mother or sister. Five minutes before this man became a soldier he had an income of say $1,500 a year. Five minutes after he becomes a soldier, his income is $1.10 a day plus such an amount as the Patriotic Fund cares to give. The allowances from the Patriotic Fund are given on well-defined lines: The amount to be given is settled according to the number in the family. Therefore, the amount cannot be increased unless the Patriotic Fund regulations are varied. Three cases in my own riding have recently come to my attention. One was the case of a sister who, before her brother went overseas, had a reasonable living allowance of $1,200 to $1,500 a year. Suddenly she finds her income reduced to the income that a private's wife would have, with the exception that there is no separation allowance. In other words, her brother may make a grant to her of not exceeding $20 a month to maintain a home that has hitherto been kept in the style of about $1,000 a year. Another is the case of a man connected with a large educational institution who had two brothers. One went to the front and I think was killed. The second I think went voluntarily. The third is in this educational institution. He is an unmarried man earning only a small salary, and although the mother has made application for separation allowance, a ruling has been given that as the boy who has been taken, is not the sole support of the mother and as there might be a possibility if the man in the educational institution directed his energies along another line, he might earn more—he is going to the university and following his studies while at the same time he earns money as an instructor—no separation allowance can be made. The third case is that of a widow. One son is going—and this is the case of a man going voluntarily—as a surgeon, and he is earning a good income. The other brother, a young man, is only starting as a medical practitioner. He wrote me a short time ago he was not able to earn enough to support himself, much less to assist in the maintenance of his mother, and it has been ruled that, because the boy who remains at home may be of assistance to the mother, no separation allowance should be granted. As a representative of a constituency that has sent many men to the front, and that under the Military Service Act will send many more, I desire to advocate the rights as I see them of those who remain behind when the State demands the services of those on whom they have been dependent. I do not intend to branch out into a discussion in regard to the conscription of wealth, but when the State enlists the service of a man compulsorily it is the duty of the State to supplement, at least to the extent of the separation allowance, according to the rank the man holds, the income of those whose income has been depleted by the State saying to the man: "Your services are now required; no matter whether you wish it or not, you must go." I believe the general feeling throughout this country is that the dependents of those who have been, or are to be, conscripted are entitled to the most generous consideration of this House and of the country. This is not a question of an Act; it is a question of a regulation. It was a regulation passed by the Militia Department last year, and it established the principle that no separation allowance shall be granted when the boy taken is not the sole support. If I may read between the lines of the remarks made by the minister, I think he would be willing, if the consensus of opinion of this House was in that direction, that the regulation should have the careful consideration of his officers, and I trust his sympathetic consideration as well.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister taken into consideration, or does he understand the regulations in force in the United States in regard to the support given to the relatives of those who have gone to the front?

Major-General MEWBURN: In the United States the authorities go into the question of insuring the man.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And they also provide him with a revenue equal to what he had before going to the war.

Mr. T. M. TWEEDIE: This question of separation allowance is one in which every person is interested. I concur very heartily in the expression of opinion which has been given in regard to this particular class of cases which is the subject matter of the re-

solution before the House. I have always been of the opinion that the separation allowance has not been established on the basis of justice and equity. In the early days of the war we found that in Canada there enlisted a great many men who left large families behind them, and there also enlisted many men who left behind them no children at all. The result of the regulation in regard to separation allowance was that if a man went to the front and left behind him a wife with no children, that the wife received $20 a month—the amount has since been increased to $25—the same separation allowance as was received by the wife of a man who left behind him five or six children. I have known of cases where a man has left behind him nine or ten children, and where his wife has had to support that family on the same separation allowance as is given to a soldier's wife with no children at all. I trust before the close of this session of Parliament, some steps will be taken to readjust this matter; that we shall follow to a large extent the system in force in England, and that there will be a sufficient sum granted to the dependent wife and an additional allowance made for each child while the man is at the front. It is only reasonable to ask this of the House of Commons and of the country. It is only doing justice to those wives and children who have been left behind, because I cannot, by any process of reasoning, understand how a family of six can be supported on the same sum of money as a family of two, with only the wife at home.

The Minister of Militia and Defence raised some question in regard to the large amount of work involved if we undertook to adjust this fund so as to render assistance in cases where there was only partial disability. This does not necessarily involve any excess of work. The country in all these cases can afford to be generous, and when we find there is a family left behind and that there is perhaps an aged father, or an infirm brother, or an infirm sister, or an infirm child, the moment we find that physical disability, if it can be established to the satisfaction of the department that the man who enlisted, and through whom the support was claimed, had contributed an amount of at least $20 or $25 per month to the support of that family, then this country should give a corresponding amount to the support of the woman and children who are left at home. I trust that this matter will be taken up and thoroughly discussed, and that this House will see its way clear to readjust the system on which the separation allowance is paid so that there will be a scale graduating from the wife alone to the wife with five or six children.

Mr. BURNHAM: In deference to the request of the minister, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MONTREAL-GASPE STEAMER SERVICE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers concerning the steamer service between Montreal, Quebec and the various harbours of Gaspé.

He said: I shall not delay the House at any length, but as this matter is of urgency I wish at once to direct the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the serious situation which confronts the peninsula of Gaspé and the group of islands in the gulf of the St. Lawrence known as the Magdalen islands. The county of Gaspé is divided into two well-known parts—the mainland, on the Baie des Chaleurs, and the Magdalen islands, in the gulf of the St. Lawrence. Up till last fall the steamship service between the various harbours on the coast of Gaspé and the large centres of population such as Montreal and Quebec was performed by two steamers, the Lady of Gaspé and the Percesien. The Lady of Gaspé has been sold by her owners, at a very fair price I am told, and the Percesien, I am sorry to say, foundered in a storm not very long ago on her way to Liverpool. The large population along the coast of Gaspé, as well as the population of the Magdalen islands, depend for a livelihood chiefly on two industries, agriculture and fisheries. There are several harbours between Matane, which is the nearest railway centre, and Gaspé basin. The other section of the peninsula from Gaspé basin to Matapedia is connected with the Dominion by a railway system. I am speaking now chiefly of that section of the peninsula which is on the river St. Lawrence and also of the Magdalen islands. The people there have no communication except by steamer, and I am sorry to say that so far they have been unable to secure a steamer service for next summer. The disappearance of the steamer service between Quebec, Montreal, and the various harbours on the coast of Gaspé has created this situation; the fish, instead of being

shipped inland to Quebec, Montreal, and the Canadian West, is now being gathered up by Americans. I have specific information on this subject, and hear on reliable authority that some Gloucester firms in the State of Maine have sent agents this winter to the coast of Gaspé to gather up the fish which could not be shipped last summer through lack of shipping facilities. So much for the mainland.

Motion agreed to.

PICTOU-MAGDALEN ISLANDS STEAMER SERVICE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions and all other correspondence and documents, concerning the service of the steamer Amelia between Pictou and Magdalen islands.

He said: This other motion deals with the steamer service between Magdalen islands and the mainland. The situation in that section of the country as regards shipping facilities is just about the same as it was some years ago when I was in the Government, representing the county of Gaspé. I then induced one of the large ship-builders of Nova Scotia to build a steamer adapted to the peculiar service between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands. The Lady Sybil was built, but when war was declared she was sold by the owner to the Admiralty, at a very high figure, if I mistake not. The department then gave the contract to the Magdalen Islands Steamship Company which owned the steamer Amelia. I need not weary the House with the many complaints which have come to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself with regard to the very poor service given by the Amelia. I quite understand that it is very difficult under present circumstances to get ships, but it does seem to me that the people of the Magdalen islands, isolated as they are for several months of the year, should be given special attention. While I am on this subject, let me tender my hearty thanks to the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) for what he did last fall, when navigation was closed between the Magdalen islands and the mainland. The steamer Amelia, as I have said, was very inferior, was unable to carry the freight that offered and was unfit to carry passengers. I appealed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to send the Government ice-breaker, the Stanley, to the Magdalen islands, and the hon. gentleman was kind enough to consent to send the Stanley, not only once but twice, much to the relief of the very thrifty population which has found its abode there. There are on these islands nearly six thousand people, earning their living chiefly by fishing, and also by agriculture. Perhaps I might give to the House an account which appeared in the Toronto Globe of February 6th of the arrival of the steamer Stanley, and the feeling of satisfaction the people of the Magdalen islands had on seeing her breaking her way through the ice and bringing them the necessaries of life for the winter season. The despatch reads:

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Feb. 6.—H. H. Acorn of Souris, agent there for the Magdalen Islands Steamship Company, has arrived here on return from the islands. He went down there in the Dominion Government steamer Stanley, sent by the Government with a cargo of foodstuffs from Pictou and Souris. She reached there on Saturday last, after battling two days and nights with solid, heavy field ice from one to three feet thick, for a distance of forty miles. The ice was encountered after leaving East Point, and extended in an unbroken field, without a lead or a crack as far as the eye could see. It was so heavy in places that the steamer could not go more than half her length without bucking, while twice she stuck so hard that the crew were obliged to use slice bars for more than an hour to release her, and on Friday afternoon she covered only six miles in three hours.

Fully five hundred people gathered at the breakwater at Amherst Island to greet the Stanley with rousing cheers and see for the first time an ice-breaker in action.

The cargo was discharged on Saturday night during a snowstorm, with the temperature eighteen below zero, and on Sunday morning the steamer sailed for North Sydney, arriving there Monday morning.

Kerosene and Gasoline Lacking.

Mr. Acorn reports that the islands are now well supplied with food and fuel, but there is a great shortage of kerosene oil. Many families are now without lights in their homes, except for cases of sickness, whilst none will be able to use more than one light during the winter.

There is practically no gasoline on the islands, and the fishermen will be greatly hampered in their spring work; in fact, no fishing can be attempted to any extent until a stock of gasoline arrives. There are now 100 drums of gasoline at Pictou and 64 at Souris awaiting shipment, but these could not be carried on the Stanley without spoiling the flour, meat, etc., which made up most of her cargo. The people are also in need of a large quantity of stock for repairing their boats and fishing gear. This stock is till held over at Souris.

The people are warm in their praise of the Marine Department and Captain Rowe in coming to their relief, and hope to secure the Stanley for a trip in early spring.

This morning I received the following message, which I believe was also sent to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Amherst via Pictou, N. S., March 20th.

The County Council of the Magdalen islands authorizes me to transmit to you and to the Department Marine and Fisheries the following resolutions passed yesterday, and to humbly solicit that you use your utmost endeavours to have the enclosed request acted upon as soon as possible, viz., that the Council at its regular meeting assembled hereby expresses to the department its appreciations and thanks for the services rendered by the steamer Stanley during the month of January in bringing to these islands provisions and other goods which were absolutely necessary in order to enable the inhabitants of these islands to survive the severe winter without excessive hardships. That this Council humbly beg to draw the attention of the department to the following facts: the inhabitants of the islands are almost entirely dependent on the fishing industry for their livelihood. This industry is entirely dependent on gasoline and kerosene for motive power and the amount of fuel which had been purchased for early spring fishing was not brought by the Stanley, but remained in Pictou and Souris. Should this fuel not be on hand here before the opening of navigation for commercial vessels it would entail a loss of thousands of dollars to the fishermen of these islands as the early spring is the most productive fishing season. This loss would not only occasion a material loss at the time but also a loss of earning power which would certainly cause a famine during the coming winter. Therefore, that this Council humbly beg that the steamer Stanley be sent to these islands with gasoline, kerosene and other needed fishing supplies as early during the month of April as it will be possible for her to come here. May add that since above resolution is passed the public is informed that the Amelia has been sold and that no other steamer is offering for the Magdalen Islands service next season, which makes it even more urgent that the Stanley be sent as requested. Kindly keep us informed promptly as what steps are being taken.

A. J. PAINCHAUD,

Secretary Treasurer of the County Council Magdalen Islands.

This telegram, and the report which I have read from the Toronto Globe of 6th February, speak for themselves. I suggest that the Ministers of Trade and Commerce and Marine and Fisheries consider the situation which confronts the mainland on the northern coast of Gaspé and the Magdalen islands. In view of the high cost of bacon, pork and other kinds of meat, fish is becoming more and more valuable and is entering more largely into the diet of the consumers. Why should we let the Americans gather all the fish from the Magdalen islands and from the northern coast and thus prevent our own city people from getting it? As no steamers can be found—I quite understand the reasons why—I suggest that the two departments arrange that the steamer Princess, for instance, be made available for the people on the river St. Lawrence and that the steamer Stanley be put on the route between Magdalen islands, Prince Edward island and Pictou during next season. This request is a reasonable one, because the people of the Magdalen islands are absolutely isolated during several months of the year. I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be as generous in this case as he was at the beginning of last winter, when he agreed to the request which I made on that occasion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, three services under the Department of Trade and Commerce which have been for many years subsidized, are of nearly equal importance, and all very necessary. These three have, within my experience, received as large a share of attention and have been as troublesome and difficult as any three in the whole range of our local services. In order of importance, I think the Magdalen islands service comes first, because the Magdalen islands have no rail communication with the outside world. The next one, I would say; is the north shore. The north shore is sparsely inhabited, but the people of that district are our citizens, and by virtue of the very sparseness of habitation and the extent to which the population is scattered along the coast, have special claims for being looked after by the Dominion Government in the way of steamship communication. The other is the Gaspé shore, from Gaspé along the coast, about which my hon. friend has been speaking. That, however, has railway communication on two ends. At Gaspé there is rail connection with the Government railways; at Matane there is rail communication with the rest of Canada. The important stretch there which has no available service except by water is that portion of the coast between Gaspé and Matane. With reference to the Magdalen Islands service, my hon. friend sees as well as I do the extreme difficulty of getting any vessels at all, let alone thoroughly suitable vessels for that service. The same holds good with reference to the north shore, and the stretch of country between Gaspé and Matane, or the old service between Gaspé and the cities of Montreal and Quebec. The two vessels which last year carried on the Gaspé service have gone out of the service, and in spite of every effort put forth by the department to obtain one, no suitable vessel is in sight. It is possible that a vessel may be obtained; everything possible is being done to obtain one. What I do think should be provided for in some way is the stretch

[Mr. Lemieux.]

of the coast between Gaspé and Matane. That at least would be a relief, if it is impossible to get service on the old route between Gaspé and Quebec.

With reference to the Magdalen Islands service, the only really useful vessel that has ever been on that service went away early in the war. I think it was: The only vessel which would be got last year for that service was the Amelia. The Amelia was a serviceable vessel, up to her powers and capabilities, but she did not suit the Magdalen Islands people. She was not the best vessel for that trade, but she was absolutely the only one which was available. She was put on and kept on, and performed that service as well as she possibly could, with a great deal of dissatisfaction, some of which was well founded and perhaps, as is usual, some of which, upon investigation, was found not to be so well founded.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are these vessels fitted with cold storage?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. Then, in reference to the north shore service; that service has had a checkered career ever since I have known anything about it. Probably the best service we had was the year before last and part of last year when the Canada Steamship Company performed the service at a very largely increased subsidy. I think they performed the service to the satisfaction of the people along that coast. But the Canada Steamship Company has gone out of the service. They have no vessels which they can give us, and at the present time the department is making the best search it can in order to provide a vessel for the north shore service. That briefly describes the situation in reference to these three. My hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) has kept well up to the traditions of his department. The Department of Trade and Commerce, which subsidized the summer service, always collaborated with the Department of Marine and Fisheries for two or three trips early in the autumn or winter and early in the spring when the ordinary subsidized vessel found it impossible, on account of ice and weather conditions, to make the trip. That is not a new thing. We have always collaborated, and I am quite sure that we will collaborate during the present year. Whether or not my hon. friend will take the Stanley and put her permanently on that service or whether the Princess can be spared from the service of the Deparment of Marine and Fisheries, suitable or unsuitable as she may be, I do not know. That is a matter that is being discussed by the two departments in order to reach a conclusion as to what can be done. But I cannot say anything more to my hon. friend than I have already said, that everything possible will be done to provide some sort of a service. With reference to the north shore service, the people will not be allowed to starve or to suffer for actual necessities. We will preserve them from that without any doubt, and if we can give them a reasonably good service for their products, as well as for necessities in the matter of living, we shall do it. The same applies to the Magdalen service and in a modified degree to the Gaspé service. We shall not even be kept from using the extraordinary powers which the Government has at this time if we can find suitable vessels to get possession of and with which to perform this service. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can come forward with some of his vessels and help out now or in the early spring, and if his department collaborates with us along the north shore, it will lead to a happier result than would be achieved without that co-operation.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): What does the Government intend to do with the Northumberland?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot say that. That vessel does not belong to my department, nor, I think, does it belong to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I am not sure whether it belongs to the Government or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. READ: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important questions that can come before the Parliament of Canada. Of course everybody knows the great difficulty there is in securing tonnage but at the same time if we are going to increase food production it is essential that proper transportation facilities should be obtained. I asked the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) what they were going to do with the Northumberland. The Northumberland is a steamer that has been plying between Summerside and Point du Chene in connection with the Intercolonial railway service. That service, as my hon. friend knows, will probably be suspended this coming season because the new car ferry system has been inaugurated between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and the long deferred implementation of the promise of union between the prov-

ince of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member inasmuch as he is making his first speech in the House, but I must direct his attention to the fact that the motion before the House is for papers in connection with the steamship service between Montreal, Quebec, and the various harbours of Gaspé.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to say that he was discussing both resolutions, No. 14 and No. 16, at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The discussion could not properly include the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the Dominion in any case.

Mr. READ: I have no intention of discussing the question of Confederation. I was simply leading up to the question of the transportation difficulties as between the port of Montreal and the Maritime Provinces, and I was going to point out to the minister that some boat probably could be secured that might be used between Montreal, the Magdalen islands and possibly the north shore. I simply wanted to know what was going to be done with the steamer Northumberland. And it occurred to me that if they were going to take her off the Prince Edward Island route between Charlottetown and Pictou, or Summerside and Point du Chene, she might be available.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged, indeed, and I appreciate to the fullest extent the kind words of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the action of my department in sending the steamer Stanley to the Magdalen islands. I wish to assure my hon. friend that we were only doing our duty and nothing more. I am grateful to him for bringing so important a matter so promptly to my attention as he did at the time. I have not as yet received the telegram that my hon. friend read to the House a moment ago, but no doubt it is at my office. I cannot at the moment state whether or not it will be possible to send the Stanley to the Magdalen islands for another trip, but I wish to assure my hon. friend that I shall take the matter up the first thing tomorrow morning, and if it is at all possible to send the Stanley to the Magdalen islands again that will be done with the very greatest of pleasure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Read]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to let my hon. friend know as early as possible to-morrow what I can do in that regard. My colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has fully gone into the matter, that comes more under his department than mine, with regard to the other services.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thank the hon. minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: I call to the attention of the House, that if the mover of the resolution exercises his right to close the debate, it will not be competent for any other hon. member to speak.

Mr. HENRY E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and also the Minister of Marine, state that everything would be done to provide for a freight steamer service for the south and north shores of the St. Lawrence. Some weeks ago resolutions were passed by the Quebec Board of Trade and the City Council of Quebec requesting the Government to provide for a service for the north shore and for Seven islands. It is of my personal knowledge that no service at all has been given on the north shore to Seven islands although there are large industries there which have had to close down, and some interested people from Seven islands are now on their way to Quebec to organize a delegation of the Quebec Board of Trade and City Council to wait upon the Government to ask if a reasonable service can be given. Thousands of pounds of fish which were all ready to ship to Montreal and Quebec last fall were left over as there was no transportation. I am pleased to know that the matter will have the serious consideration of the Government in order that these deserving people may have proper facilities to carry on their industry.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF MRS. WINEAS ZWINGLE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between Mr. Henry Tucker, K.C., and the Right Hon. Sir Robert L. Borden, K.C.M.G., P.C., the Department of Militia, the officers of the Patriotic Fund, concerning the claim of Mrs. Wineas Zwingle.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) in his seat, because although the name of the Prime Minister is mentioned in the motion

I wish specially to appeal to the Minister of Militia and Defence. I do not intend to be critical as to the administration of the separation allowances, but I wish to get from my hon. friend some explanation which might serve not only in this but in similar cases. My object in bringing this matter before the House is because I believe the case has been exhausted through correspondence between the hard-headed Scotch Presbyterian lawyer who acted for this unfortunate woman and the various departments of the Government. It is at the request of Mr. Henry Tucker, K.C., of Montreal, a lawyer of very high standing at the Bar, that I bring this matter up. The name of the soldier whose wife, according to Mr. Tucker, has not been fairly treated by the Patriotic Fund is Wineas Zwingle. He joined, in the early stage of the war, the 150th Battalion, and he is on the firing line at the present time. He left behind him a wife and four children, but previous to leaving, according to my information, he made provision for his wife and family: the assigned pay $20, next, the separation allowance, $20, and $24 per month was allotted by the Patriotic Fund, making a total payment of $64 per month for the wife and four little children. This soldier also left his wife in possession of a small candy store in Montreal. During the month of February, 1917 the assigned pay of Zwingle and the separation allowance were sent, I do not know under what regulation, to the Patriotic Fund by the Department of Militia. The Minister of Militia stated a moment ago, that both the department and the Patriotic Fund were working in close co-operation. From March 1 to the middle of August, 1917, Mrs. Zwingle received $242.75, but from the latter month until December 8, 1917, she did not receive a red cent. Remember that this woman is absolutely penniless, with the exception of the candy store, and has dependent upon her four children, the eldest of whom is only 12 years old. In October, 1917, Mrs. Zwingle saw her lawyer, Mr. Tucker, K.C., and at that time, as alleged by Mr. Tucker, she was positively starving. He inquired from the Patriotic Fund, first why they cut the allowance from $24 to $10 per month, and second why the assigned pay and the separation allowance had been handed over to that organization for administration. The answer Mr. Tucker received from the Patriotic Fund, and I am simply quoting from the voluminous dossier which has been handed to me by that gentleman—was to the following effect: "This woman is keeping what is known in common parlance as a 'blind pig' and you had better see Recorder Semple of Montreal." Mr. Tucker, who is a very warm-hearted Scotchman, saw the woman was starving and freezing—and it is not necessary to remind any hon. gentleman of the severity of the weather during the winter which has just closed—and he went to interview Recorder Semple whose statements were most favourable to Mrs. Zwingle. The recorder said he had received the complaint referred to about Mrs. Zwingle, but had investigated it and found it to be baseless. Later on, acting on the advice of her lawyer and at the suggestion of the Patriotic Fund, Mrs. Zwingle sold her candy store for a certain sum. Remember, Mr. Speaker, I am not passing judgment on the Patriotic Fund organization. I am myself one of the incorporators of the fund, and one of its members, and I do not wish to pass judgment upon those who compose the organization. I know what devotion is being displayed, and what excellent work is being performed by the members of the Patriotic Fund all over the country; but sometimes, owing to misinformation or otherwise, persecution may result which is absolutely unwarranted. In November, 1917, according to Mr. Tucker, the Department of Militia and Defence having been stirred up by the many letters written by him, sent Mrs. Zwingle a blank declaration to fill in and swear to, which declaration had to be countersigned by some officer of the Patriotic Fund. The declaration was for the purpose of determining how Mrs. Zwingle received her separation allowance and assigned pay. For one reason or another the Patriotic Fund—and I repeat that I am not criticising the organization because I am not personally aware of these facts, I am merely repeating what I was told by a very reliable counsel—refused, or rather, one of its officers refused, to countersign the blank declaration, and hence Mrs. Zwingle was once more deprived of both her separation allowance and assigned pay. In November, 1917, Mr. Tucker again complained to the department and obtained an order that the checks be paid direct to Mrs. Zwingle, but in the meantime she had been absolutely starving and freezing. On the 12th December, 1917, relief came in the form of cheques for two months from the department at Ottawa. On the 24th December, 1917, there was made against this unfortunate woman, who was evidently born under an evil star, another very serious charge, which I need not repeat, but which, according to the documents I have before me, is absolutely

unfounded. Following this, the Militia Department order that her cheques for the assigned pay and separation allowance be paid direct to her was cancelled, and it was determined once more that the payments should be made through the Patriotic Fund at Montreal. What I wish to represent to the Minister of Militia—and this unquestionably is the high court of the land where all grievances can be ventilated—is that Mrs. Zwingle's husband is at the front, and she complains that she has been ill-treated, persecuted and slandered.

She claims that her husband's assigned pay and her separation allowance are her absolute property, and that the department has no control over them. As regards the Patriotic Fund allowance, I quite agree that according to the Act passed in 1914, the Patriotic Fund has a discretion in the matter, although the discretion should be used wisely and fairly. But as regards the assigned pay and the separation allowance, I would like to have a statement from the Minister of Militia if the department can direct the payment to be made through the Patriotic Fund or through any other organization, or if she is not, as a matter of right, entitled to have those moneys paid to her direct. I have brought the matter before the House after a long correspondence exchanged between Mr. Tucker, K. C., the Patriotic Fund, the Department of Militia and Defence, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. It is a grievance, made perhaps more serious by the fact that this woman states positively that she has been persecuted, that she has been slandered, even after the allegations made against her were declared to be without foundation. I hope my hon. friend will look into this matter in the department and see that Mrs. Zwingle receives her assigned pay and her separation allowance without any further delay.

Major-General MEWBURN: This matter has not come before me personally in the Separation Allowance Branch, and I have no desire to shield or to make excuses for any mistakes that may have occurred. Since I have had the honour of taking charge of the Department of Militia and Defence, the Separation Allowance Branch has caused us more trouble and anxiety than probably any other branch in the department. This branch deals with some 300,000 accounts, and mistakes have been made. Since I took charge of the department, I have endeavoured to re-organize that branch and have tried to get it down to a proper business basis. I think I can say I am succeeding in that. I may go further and say that it will still be some months before it is running smoothly.

I will investigate this particular case thoroughly and find out why this woman has been treated in the way my hon. friend states, which statement I have no doubt is correct. I cannot understand why the money was paid over to the Patriotic Fund. There have been cases where money has been paid over to the Patriotic Fund on account of some arrangement between the Patriotic Fund and the beneficiary. The Patriotic Fund has a committee which has made many investigations throughout the various cities of Canada. There have been cases where people have been drawing separation allowances to which they were neither legally nor morally entitled, and we have had to call upon the Patriotic Fund to make investigations. The declaration of which my hon. friend has spoken is the legal declaration which every person claiming separation allowance has to swear before a commissioner or a notary public. It is simply to get the evidence in the department so that we can have the account straightened out. If any injustice or wrong has been done to any person by an official of my department, he will cease to be employed in my department. I will make it my duty to investigate the matter fully and, if any wrong has been done, to rectify it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am perfectly satisfied with the answer given by the minister. I am willing to let him have the dossier in my possession. It would then perhaps not be necessary for him to go through all the departments of the Government because many letters have been addressed to different departments.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall be glad to have the papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am satisfied that there has been no ill-will on the part of the department, and the declaration made by the minister that the assigned pay and separation allowance should go direct to the dependents is quite satisfactory. If that is done, there will be no more grievance.

Major-General MEWBURN: If she is the lawful wife of the soldier.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly she is. There is an error in the name on the Order Paper. It is not Mrs. Antoina Zwingle, it is Mrs. Wineas Zwingle.

Motion agreed to.

TREATMENT OF RETURNED SOLDIERS ON TRANSPORTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHARLES G. POWER (Quebec South): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to an article which appeared in the Ottawa Evening Journal, and to ask for some information from the Minister of Militia.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this not a matter about which the hon. member could procure information in the ordinary course by placing a question on the Order Paper?

Mr. POWER: I rather doubt it. It is a matter of considerable urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say to the House at this early stage in the session, that the asking of questions on the Orders of the Day being called must be used most sparingly and only in cases of peculiar urgency. Hon. gentlemen have the privilege of having questions answered by placing them upon the Order Paper.

Mr. POWER: In this case, it is a question of peculiar urgency, because it refers to the return of soldiers from the front, and I understand that within the next month or so some 15,000 or 20,000 soldiers will return from England to Canada. In the Ottawa Evening Journal there is a despatch from Montreal, dated March 19, which gives the statement of a certain sergeant who returned on a boat which recently arrived on this side:

> On our boat they had 103 third cabin berths empty, absolutely empty, while wounded men and furlough men of the first contingent were confined below. They might at least have given these vacant berths to the cripples in the party. There was plenty of room on the boat, but the sleeping accommodation was disgraceful. For men who have seen active service for three and a half years to be kept under deck like that by officers who have never seen the front is a trifle hard to put up with, said the sergeant. You will hear more of it.

I simply desire to ask the Government if it is their intention to take immediate steps to remedy this evil if it exists.

Major-General MEWBURN: This is the first intimation I have had of the article which my hon. friend has read. As regards returned soldiers coming home on transports, the berthing and other arrangements are made entirely overseas, and we, on this side, cannot claim responsibility for such arrangements. Some three or four weeks ago an officer was sent overseas from Canada to take up with the overseas authorities proper berthing accommodation for the troops coming back. The article referred to is evidently an anonymous one. It does not mention the sergeant's name. If there are any complaints to be made so far as my department is concerned, those complaints should be made in the regular way, and my hon. friend can rest assured they will be thoroughly investigated.

If in the administration of the department I had to stop and pay attention to anomymous letters and anomymous correspondence in the newspapers, no work would ever be accomplished. There is already going on an investigation regarding transports, and a very minute investigation of another subject. As far as this particular article is concerned, I shall be very glad if my hon. friend would have the sergeant he refers to send in his complaint in writing to be investigated.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER.

ELECTION OF MR. GEO. H. BOIVIN, M.P., FOR SHEFFORD.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The thirteenth rule of the House provides that a Chairman of Committees of the House shall be elected at the commencement of every Parliament as soon as an Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's speech, and the second paragraph of that rule provides that the member elected to serve as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees shall be required to possess a full and practical knowledge of the language which is not that of the Speaker for the the time being. Now your language, Mr. Speaker, is English, although occasionally you make successful excursions into the French language. Unfortunately, we are not blessed on this side of the House with a very large number of gentlemen who fulfil the qualifications required by the second paragraph of the rule which I have just quoted. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) does undoubtedly possess those qualifications, but he finds himself unable to undertake the duties. Possibly, there are one or two other members on this side of the House who might be considered as possessing the knowledge alluded to. However, it has always been the custom in this House that when the Chair is filled by a Speaker of British descent, the Deputy Speaker shall be one who traces his origin to the other great pioneer race in this country. It seems to me inadvisable that we should depart from that practice at the present time. I have spoken to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition on

the subject, as I would not care to make a motion of this kind with regard to an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House without conferring with him. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) has had an experience in this House of some six or seven years. He is eminently qualified by ability and by temperament to undertake the duties which would devolve upon the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. Moreover, he has shown a careful study and an intimate knowledge of the rules, as has been demonstrated on more than one occasion when questions of order were discussed in the late Parliament. I have, therefore, great pleasure in moving, seconded by Sir George Foster:

That George Henry Boivin, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Shefford, be appointed Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend has stated the rules of the House correctly, and I hope the spirit in which he makes his motion, of recognizing the different elements which compose our population, will prevail at all times. The rule with regard to the election of a Deputy Speaker has worked satisfactorily in the past, and I am sure I hope it will continue to work so in the future. My right hon. friend has stated that, unfortunately for the Government, it is not blessed with many supporters speaking the language which ought to be spoken by the Chairman of Committees. I regret that as much as he does, but it is his own fault and not the fault of the people to whom he alluded, and when he mends his ways he may be sure of having better support.

For the moment I have to say to my right hon. friend that it is not in accordance with the practice in Great Britain that the presiding officer of the House should necessarily be a follower of the Government; my right hon. friend knows that as well as I do. In Great Britain it has happened over and over again that the leader of the House has recommended the appointment, not of one of his own followers, but of a member of the opposite party, for the Speakership. I think my right hon. friend has stated in the House that it would be preferable if we followed the practice that has prevailed in Great Britain, that the presiding officer should not be appointed on account of his politics, but quite independently of his politics, and I am of the same opinion also. That practice, however, has never been followed in this country, and I do not know that it will ever be possible to come to it, but at all events its merits are undoubted. The presiding officer of the House is really a judge between all sides. He is there in the Chair to mete out justice to all and in proper manner, and in this respect the duties of the Deputy Speaker are the same. Mr. Boivin, the gentleman whom my right hon. friend has selected, as I think everybody who has sat in the late Parliament will agree, is well qualified for the office. He is fair and impartial in character, and I believe that when in that Chair he will, as will be his duty, forget that he belongs to a party, and will be there simply to do justice to both sides. It is not a political office; it is essentially a judicial office. When my hon. friend the member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) first saw his name mentioned in the newspapers as the possible choice of the House, with a very great sense of delicacy, with which I think I ought to acquaint the House, he was not quite sure whether he could accept. He consulted me about it, and I told him, without any hesitation, that if the choice fell upon him he should unhesitatingly accept the appointment, because it could not be considered a political gift. It is not the gift of the Government, but the gift of the House of Commons and of the people of Canada; or rather, it is a recognition by the House of Commons of the qualities which fit him for the position which he is now entrusted with, and for which I, for my part, am very happy to rejoice.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman that it would be most desirable if we could adopt in this country the practice which has prevailed in Great Britain. That practice has sometimes in Great Britain been obliged to withstand pretty severe shocks. In 1895, I recollect, there was a very grave question as to whether a Speaker of one party who had been elected about a year before should be continued as Speaker by the other party; but fortunately, the wise counsel prevailed and he was re-elected, and he served with great acceptance and great distinction. Possibly, the course which is being taken to-day may prove to be a step towards the consummation of the ideal, as to the wisdom of which I certainly agree with the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman wish to discuss the motion?

Mr. CURRIE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister exercised his right of reply in closing the debate; perhaps I was remiss in not so advising the House.

Mr. CURRIE: According to the rules of the House, I understand that every member is supposed to be heard, even though the person who made the motion has been heard the second time. Unfortunately, I did not catch your eye, Mr. Speaker.

I have no desire to make any lengthy remarks on this subject, but I wish to state my objection to the motion, if no one else will oppose it except myself. It is true that it has been the custom to appoint a member from Quebec to the position either of Speaker or of Deputy Speaker, but there are other members in the House outside the province of Quebec who have a knowledge of the French language, and I think that some steps should have been taken to appoint one of those members. Moreover, if the province of Quebec is desirous of being represented in the person of the Deputy Speaker, the constitutional practice should have been followed, one of the members of the Opposition should have resigned and allowed a supporter of this Government to take his seat and the Deputy Speakership. That is customary and the constitutional usage; the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of the House are chosen by the majority in the House. They represent the views of the majority of the House and have done so from the time of Onslow. The constitutional practice followed in England whereby occasionally a Speaker is chosen without regard to politics has not been followed in this Parliament. I sat in the House during the last session and I have not forgotten the opposition of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) to the Military Service Act and to the attempts on the part of members on this side of the House to send aid to the soldiers in the trenches. After listening to the addresses of the leader of the Opposition so far this session, I cannot help thinking that, like the Bourbons, he never forgets and he never forgives. He had to bring in a lot of talk about reciprocity and that sort of thing. He has forgotten that when he was the leader of the Government this country was known to the outside world as a few acres of snow. To-day Canada has a place in the sun, and that place in the sun has been given to us by those men who have so nobly fought for Canada and the Empire in the trenches. What will the whole world say if this House appoints this man as Deputy Speaker—which no doubt, has been arranged to be done?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. gentleman in referring to another member to refer to him as an "hon. member."

Mr. CURRIE: All right, I will refer to the hon. member for Shefford. If this House elects him Deputy Speaker, we shall be electing a man who represents all that a majority of the people of this country voted against during the last election. I feel deeply on this question. I would almost say that it was a slap in the face for the soldiers in the trenches and of the electors who voted for this Government to appoint a member of this House to the position of Deputy Speaker who has opposed everything that the soldiers voted for and that this Government represents—that is all.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that a message had been received from the Senate acquainting this House that the Hon. Messieurs Bostock, Boyer, Dennis, Douglas, Godbout, Gordon. Laird, Landry, McHugh, McLennan, Poirier, Power, P.C., Richardson, Taylor (New Westminster), and Webster, have been appointed a committee to assist his Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the Senate are concerned, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the said Library.

Also a message acquainting this House that the Hon. Messieurs Crosby, Dennis, Dessaulles, DeVeber, Domville, Donnelly, Farrell, Forget, Legris, McCall, McLean, Pope, Prince, Ratz, Robertson, P. C., Sharpe, Talbot, Taylor (Leeds) Thibaudeau, Todd and White, have been appointed a committee to superintend the printing of the Senate during the present session, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of Parliament.

And also a message acquainting this House that the Hon. Messieurs Landry, Taylor (Leeds), Thompson and Watson, have been appointed a committee to assist his Honour the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant of Parliament, so far as the interests of the Senate are concerned, and to act on behalf of the Senate as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the said restaurant.

RE-ARRANGEMENT OF DEPARTMENTS.

NEW DEPARTMENTS CREATED.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of a Secretary of State for External Affairs, a Minister of Immigration and Colonization, and a Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, and that the salary of each of the said ministers shall be $7,000 per annum; and also to provide for the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment and that the salary of such Parliamentary Secretary shall be five thousand dollars per annum; and to provide that the several salaries of the persons holding the said offices shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada for the periods during which they have respectively held the offices; and further, to provide that during the present war and for one year thereafter one or more other ministers, not exceeding three, members of the King's Privy Council for Canada, who may be named by the Governor in Council, may be paid such salaries or other remuneration as Parliament may provide, and shall not, by reason thereof, be ineligible as Members of the House of Commons or disqualified to sit or vote therein.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The necessity for making provision for a salary for the Secretary of State arises in this way—the Prime Minister has ceased to be President of the Privy Council, which position has filled for a number of years,—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I regret exceedingly to have to take the lead in asking the right hon. leader of the Government to speak a little louder. Gentlemen behind cannot hear, and I cannot hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as the provision of a salary for the Secretary of State for External Affairs is concerned, the necessity arises owing to the Prime Minister having ceased to be President of the Privy Council. By statute it is provided that the Prime Minister shall be Secretary of State for External Affairs, but as he has received in the past a salary as President of the Council, no salary has ever been provided for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. When the present Government was formed in October last the Prime Minister relinquished the post of President of the Council and it was therefore necessary to make some provision for salary for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A new ministry, that of Immigration and colonisation, has also been established, and a ministry of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, as well as a parliamentary secretaryship to the latter department. This resolution makes the usual provision for these salaries. It is not intended to fill at present the parliamentary secretaryship of the Department of Militia and Defence which has been rendered vacant by the resignation of Mr. McCurdy, who has become Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. So far as the remainder of the resolution is concerned, it makes provision during the present war for a salary to one or more ministers, not exceeding three, who are members of the King's Privy Council for Canada, and who may be named by the Governor in Council. It it provided that they shall be paid such salaries or remuneration as Parliament may provide and that they shall not by reason thereof be ineligible as members of the House of Commons or disqualified to sit or vote therein. This is intended to provide for a case like that of Mr. Maclean, who is Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Reconstruction and Development, but who does not otherwise preside over any department of the Government. It also provides for the case of Senator Robertson, who is a member of the committee and the chairman of a very important sub-committee with respect to labour conditions. I may say that insofar as both these gentlemen are concerned, they have, during the period since they assumed these duties, been as actively engaged in the work of the administration as any other members of the Government. In addition to the duties which I have mentioned as devolving upon Mr. Maclean, he has, during the absence of Sir Thomas White, carried on the work and assumed the responsibilities of the Department of Finance. However, it is in respect to his work as vice-chairman of the committee on reconstruction and development in the past year, in which he has been very actively engaged, that this proposed salary is intended to be provided.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are these gentlemen named as members of the Privy Council?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Maclean and Senator Robertson are both members of the King's Privy Council for Canada. They were sworn in as such when they became members of the Government in October last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend has not mentioned who is to be the third minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. There is no intention at present to appoint any third minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is only by way of precaution?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By way of adequate precaution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have no intention on this side to discuss the measure to-day, but I would like to have more information than my right hon. friend has given me. Perhaps he cannot give it to-day. We would like to know what the number of the members of the administration will be, including the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the parliamentary secretaries, the Solicitor General and so on. I will not ask my right hon. friend to give that information to-day. I know that he is blessed with a good memory, but there are limits to his memory, and perhaps, in view of the numerous personnel of the Administration, his memory is not equal to the undertaking of giving me the particulars. In the meantime, instead of relying on his memory, he may perhaps look the matter up and, after consulting with his officers, he may be able to get a list of those who are now members of the Administration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am confident that I can rely on my memory, but I can tell my right hon. friend that I shall certainly bring a list.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It might stand as an order for a return.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I ask my right hon friend the Prime Minister if he could, for the information of the House, give the functions of the Committee on Development and Reconstruction, presided over by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Maclean)?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I laid the Order in Council on the table of the House on Monday last and I shall furnish my hon. friend with a printed copy of it before the commencement of the session to-morrow.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are these ministers to accept office without consulting the people or to go back for re-election in the constituencies which they represent?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Under the Order in Council which is to be confirmed by legislation founded upon this resolution, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was appointed to the position which he holds and was in the enjoyment of a salary before he was elected. I do not understand that it would be necessary for him to seek re-election.

Mr. CANNON: May I ask the right hon., the leader of the Government if it is true that the Inland Revenue Department is to be merged with the Department of Customs?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall make a statement with regard to that when the Bill comes up again.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time and concurred in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 13 to amend the Salaries' Act and the provisions for preserving the independence of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, (Mr. Boivin in the Chair):

That it is expedient to provide that vegetables may be sold by the pound and that a dozen of eggs shall mean a dozen eggs weighing not less than a pound and a half; and also that packages containing human food or other commodities should be marked with the name and address of the fillers, and the weight, measure or quantity of their contents, but not including packages for export or imported into Canada, goods sold in bulk or broken packages, or fresh fruit and vegetables, and allowing for discrepancies in weight or measure due exclusively to difference in atmospheric conditions and other causes; and also to provide that firewood shall be sold by the cord, and every cord shall contain one hundred and twenty-eight cubic feet; and also to provide that every bag of Portland cement shall contain ninety-four pounds net weight, and four such bags shall constitute a barrel, and the bag shall be made of good strong fibrous material and have marked thereon the brand and name of the manufacturer and the net weight; but these provisions should not apply to articles held in stock; and also for the imposition of penalties for the violation of the law.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a resolution that is to form the basis of a Bill to be introduced. Most of the Bill to be introduced is similar to the one introduced last year and which was discussed in the House and distributed throughout the country. One or two additions are made to that. Probably any discussion which takes place upon it had better take place upon the Bill rather than upon the resolution.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that eggs have been added?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, eggs and cord wood have been added.

Resolution reported.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF HAY.

On motion of Sir George Foster the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to provide for the inspection and grading of hay, the licensing of pressers of hay for sale or exportation, the charging of a fee of one dollar for such licenses, the labelling of pressed hay for sale, exportation or importation, the grading of straw, and the imposition of penalties for violation of the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the minister kindly explain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a new Bill, providing for consolidation of, and some amendments and additions to, the present Inspection and Sale Act. As regards the inspection and sale of hay and the grades of the same, in the East that has been law for some time. No grades have been established for hay in the western part of Canada, and this resolution provides for grades in that section of the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The same grades in the East and the West?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no, different grades. The grades established in the East, in the Bill to be introduced, are practically the same as they are at present. There will be new grades established for the West. Then there is provision for the inspection, which comes, of course, as a corollary from having grades fixed, and it is also proposed, for statistical purposes chiefly, to authorize the issuing of licenses for the pressing of hay to those who press hay for public sale and for export.

Mr. NESBITT: Do you mean to the man who presses hay, or to the farmer who gets it pressed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To the men who are pressers of hay, and that is the reason particularly for this resolution, in order to make provision for that change.

Mr. ELKIN: Mr. Chairman, in the East, at least, there is not any practical use for the law that now exists in connection with the inspection of hay. Hay is sold in the East both loose and pressed without any inspection. I would like to have further explanation as to the practical use of this resolution.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Inspection has previously been carried out in Quebec and in Ontario, and, I think, in other provinces; at least, there has been a provision for inspection which could be brought into force.

[Sir George Foster.]

I think that is true with reference to the East.

Mr. ELKIN: Not in the Maritime Provinces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I think so. However, I will have fuller information upon the introduction of the Bill. This is simply the resolution on which to base the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I presume this new legislation must be necessitated by representations which have been made to my hon. friend to the effect that the present law was not sufficient. I have never heard that there was any complaint from the province of Quebec regarding the existing law. As I understand it this resolution is intended to extend the present law. The export of hay is of great importance in the province of Quebec as well as in other parts of Canada. If my hon. friend has any correspondence on this subject, any suggestions made to him by public bodies or others, I think he should bring it down. The matter is new to a great many of us, and the resolution provides for a very wide extension of the system of licensing. More information should be given.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All the information in our hands will be brought down.

Mr. READ: The minister states that the inspection of hay applies in the East already. I think that is a mistake. At least, it does not apply to Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. I think it only pertains to the province of Quebec.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. READ: Not in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. PROULX: Will the pressers have to guarantee the quality of the hay?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are grades of hay established. The inspectors fix the grades, and then those who press it have their duties to perform, which include pressing it properly, keeping out foreign substances, and putting their tags upon it to show the quality of the hay.

Mr. EDWARDS: I see no pressing need for this legislation in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned. I have no doubt, however, that there is probably some necessity for it in the Maritime Provinces, and no doubt the suggestion for this legislation emanated from the East, as I understand

there is now in the cabinet a gentleman who is an expert on hay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PROULX: A Bill was presented last year providing different grades of hay. In conversation with an extensive buyer of hay, I was told that the grading was impracticable. I hope that the Bill to be presented this year will provide a simpler classification. In the Bill introduced last year five or six grades were provided. My informant was of the opinion that it could not be successfully operated.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill has been circulated very widely. More or less correspondence and actual conferences have taken place on the Bill as it will be brought down and so far as I can understand from the report of my Department, it has the practical consent of those who are engaged in the hay business. The House will have full opportunity of discussing the Bill and deciding as to whether it is one which ought to be put into operation or not.

Mr. BUREAU: Will hay which is not to be exported require to be pressed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, hay that is sold in this market.

Mr. BUREAU: For all hay sold in the home market?

Mr. MICHAUD: What will be the practice in connection with the selling of either loose or pressed hay?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This will apply to all hay that is pressed for sale under the grades which are established under the Bill. It will not prevent a man from selling a bundle of hay if he wants to sell it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is to apply when a sale takes place on the market?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that the Bill has been printed and circulated to some extent? It has not been sent to any of the dealers this year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has been circulated all through the country.

Mr. COPP: The proposed Bill?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. COPP: We did not see it down in our part of the country. I would like to ask the minister if, after the Bill is introduced, time will be given for representations to be received from dealers in the Maritime Provinces if necessary?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly.

Resolution reported, and read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the resolution be read a second time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock, I now leave the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully enter my protest at the low tone in which the speaking is carried on across the floor of the House. It is impossible for members to hear what is being said.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am suggesting to my hon. friend that we go through the Order Paper and not come back this evening.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have Bills to consider to-night.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

VAN BUREN BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in Committee on the following proposed Resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to ratify and confirm an agreement dated the 8th day of March, 1918, between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company for a lease of certain lands situate in the parish of St. Leonards, in the County of Madawaska and Province of New Brunswick and lying between the International Railway and the National Transcontinental Railway, at the annual rental of twelve hundred dollars from the 1st day of May, 1918, until the 31st day of August, 1934, payable in half-yearly payments of six hundred dollars each on the first day of March and thirty-first day of August in each year; the first payment to be made on the 31st day of August, 1918, for the portion of the semi-annual term then expired, and the last payment to be made on the 30th day of August, 1934.

Hon. Mr. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): The object, as the resolution itself states, is to confirm an agreement made between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company on the 8th March, 1918. This is a portion of the

Bangor and Aroostook railway which runs from the State of Maine into Canadian territory and connects with the Canadian Government railways at St. Leonards. After entering Canadian territory the line crosses the Transcontinental railway and likewise the International railway also owned by the Canadian Government railways. The portion of the railway leased is a stretch about two miles in length between the International and the Transcontinental railways, and our object in leasing is to permit us to discontinue the maintenance and upkeep of two stations at St. Leonards. As it is now, trains operating on the International line run to a station that was built for that railway, whilst Transcontinental trains proceed to the station of that railway. By leasing this small portion of the line, trains on the International railway will run over the two miles into the station of the Transcontinental railway. In this way we discontinue the keeping up of the International Railway station. We have taken a lease until the year 1934. The reason for leasing instead of purchasing the two miles is because of the fact that this portion of the line is bonded and the bonds fall due when the lease expires.

Mr. MICHAUD: The International is operated by the Government?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MICHAUD: And the International trains used to go to the Canadian Pacific Railway station instead of running to their own? I am very glad indeed that the minister is providing a Union Station for both the Transcontinental and International railways. I believe that $1,200 will pay the Bangor and Aroostook railway well for the privilege of running over the section leased; it is only a matter of operating a couple of trains a day that we are called upon to pay for.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the minister to say in his explanation that the expiry of the lease would coincide with the falling due of the bonds.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Did the hon. gentleman intimate that it was then intended to purchase the line which is now being leased?

Mr. REID: That will depend upon the man who will then be occupying the position of Minister of Railways. The date is too far ahead for me to venture to make a prediction upon. Whoever is Minister of Railways at that time will be free to either purchase the line or make a new lease. In this instance I might say we are paying a rental which practically amounts to the interest on the cost of building the stretch of two miles.

Mr. MICHAUD: I should explain that International railway freight trains run over the line in question several times a day.

Mr. REID: This will be a portion of our line. The hon. gentleman stated there were only a couple of trains a day, but we will run all our freight over this portion of the system. In the past for any International line freight that went over this piece of railway we had to pay the Bangor and Aroostook railway. Now we control the two miles in question the same as though we had purchased it.

Mr. MICHAUD: The minister should understand that several through freight lines run over this line.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 14 to confirm an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR ADVANCES ACT, 1914.

On motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution. Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend Paragraph (a) of Section 2 of The Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914, Chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1914, so as to provide that of the sum of nine million dollars which the Governor in Council was authorized by the said Act to advance and pay to the Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, such sums may be advanced as are required to pay off and retire debentures of the Corporation of the par value of three hundred thousand dollars maturing in the year one thousand, nine hundred and eighteen.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister kindly explain?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Montreal Harbour Advances Act of 1914 to enable the Commissioners to retire, out of moneys to be advanced by the Government, debentures issued to the public and maturing during the year 1918, to the amount of $300,000. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve will

understand that this is the usual way of handling the matter. When this money was advanced under the Act of 1914, the Harbour Commissioners thought they would have fully expended the money by the end of 1917, but that not being so, it was necessary to amend the Act as I have just stated.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. BALLANTYNE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 15, to amend the Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the Minister be in a position to state, at the next sitting of the House when this Bill is brought up, the programme of work on the Montreal Harbour?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Do I understand the hon. member to mean the programme of work we contemplate carrying on at Montreal during the coming year?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad to give that information at the next sitting.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

PROPOSED TEMPORARY CONTROL OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution. Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, until the expiration of a period of three years after the termination of the present war, make regulations prohibiting the importation or exportation of goods of any class, description or origin, or produced or manufactured in whole or in part in any country or place specified in the regulation, either generally or from or to any country or place named in the regulation, subject to such exceptions (if any) as may be specified in the regulation, and to any licenses the grant of which may be authorized by the regulation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am moving this resolution in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who cannot be here this evening. It is merely for the purpose of founding thereon a Bill which is in precisely the same terms. If the hon. gentlemen will be good enough to permit the resolution to be passed pro forma, I shall not attempt any explanation of it in the absence of the minister who will give a full explanation of it upon the second reading.

An hon. MEMBER: Is the Bill printed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have a printed copy in my hand. Bills are not printed and distributed until they are introduced. This Bill has not been introduced. If the resolution passes, I shall introduce it immediately, and then it will be printed and distributed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It seems to me to be a very large order for the Government to ask Parliament to give them this power until three years after the termination of the war. There may, of course, be some good reason for it. I can quite understand that during the war it may be necessary for the Government to have this power as to imports and exports, but why we should go so far as to give control of our import and export trade into the hands of the Government independently of Parliament for a period of three years after the war is over, it is difficult to understand. I trust some good reason will be forthcoming with regard to this proposal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely agree that there should be a full explanation of the grounds upon which the Bill is founded, and my hon. friend may rest assured that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will give his reasons very fully when he moves the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it in virtue of this principle that the War Trade Board has been created?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it has no connection whatever with the constitution of the War Trade Board.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What makes me suggest that there should be a full explanation of the proposed resolution and the creation of the War Trade Board is that I find that an Order in Council was passed about eight or ten days ago prohibiting the export of enumerated articles. I am interested in one—mechanical pulp, sulphite pulp. I went before the War Trade Board the other day in order to obtain a license for a company. On reading this resolution, I thought it was the same principle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It may be the same principle in one sense, but the Bill has no connection with the establishment of the War Trade Board.

Mr. ELKIN: Might I ask the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, by what means he proposes to carry out the provisions em-

bodied in this resolution? It is rather a broad resolution, and from many standpoints it might be dangerous for its powers to be carried out by what might be considered a War Trade Board. If the work is to be carried out by officials of the Government, the matter might have an entirely different standing from what it would have if they were carried out by the War Trade Board as at present constituted. It is very important from many points of view that we should know something further about the resolution. The members of the War Trade Board, as I understand, give their services voluntarily and without remuneration, but the board is not without influence. As we are at the present time importing many articles that are rather dangerous, this control should be exercised by officials of the Department of Trade and Commerce. As the resolution is a broad one and confers a great deal of power, it should be carefully considered by this House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There will be the most ample opportunity for discussion of the Bill upon its second reading, and afterwards in Committee of the Whole, where the greatest possible scope is afforded for any discussion of that kind. I am merely asking that the resolution may be passed pro forma in order that the Bill founded upon it may be introduced. The resolution itself provides that the regulations are to be made by the Governor in Council.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 16 to amend the Customs Act and to provide for the temporary control of exports and imports.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, Chapter ten of the Statutes of 1911, and to provide that where, for topographical or other reasons, it is not expedient to use for public road purposes the existing road allowances, the title to which is vested in the Crown in the right of the Province, the Provincial Government may be permitted to lay out such roads as may be necessary for the convenience of the public, and may be granted title thereto in consideration of the surrender of such portions of the said road allowances as are not required for public roads; and notwithstanding anything in the said Act, a grant may be made to the Province of British Columbia of the minerals, within the meaning of the Mineral Act of the said province, located in any lands sought to be acquired for mining purposes in the Dominion Forest Reserves in British Columbia, under the provisions of the agreement between the Dominion and the said province as confirmed by Order in Council dated the eleventh day of February, one thousand eight hundred and ninety.

[Mr. Elkin.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This resolution, I think, is self-explanatory. I should be glad if the Committee would pass it, in order that the Bill which is founded upon it may be introduced.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What are the minerals which it is proposed to transfer to the province of British Columbia.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All minerals, I suppose, on those lands.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In many parts of the Northwest and British Columbia where railways are located, it is an easy matter to locate a wagon road alongside, to the great advantage of the settlers. At the crossing of rivers, streams and valleys, the same bridge would answer as a public highway. I take the liberty of suggesting that when the Bill is in Committee consideration might be given to this suggestion. The roads alongside the railway would be much shorter than the rectangular roads, and would be of great service to the settlers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall bring my hon. friend's suggestions to the attention of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: This resolution would seem to indicate that negotiations had taken place with the province in respect to its subject matter. If there is any correspondence, I suppose that it will be brought down upon the second reading by whoever has charge of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will draw my hon. friend's request to the attention of the Minister of the Interior, and he no doubt will see that it is complied with.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RE-ARRANGEMENTS AND TRANSFERS OF DUTIES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) Bill No. 2, to authorize re-arrangements and transfers of duties in the Public Service, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—transfers from one minister to another and from one department to another—amalgamate departments—orders hereunder to be laid before Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: Does not the existing law with reference to the creation and organization of each department give the authority conferred by paragraph (a) of subsection 1?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there is such a provision with respect to the Department of External Affairs and possibly two or three other departments, but there is no general provision of this kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the right hon. gentleman specify the cases in which this Act might apply? Am I to understand that presently certain departments are to be transferred to the jurisdiction of one minister only?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I gave one illustration the other day which I think is quite appropriate. Patents, copyrights and trade marks have been attached for a good many years to the Department of Agriculture. We have under consideration the advisability of transferring these matters to another department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Like the Archives, which, I think, was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. There are some other illustrations to which I need not allude at the moment. It may be possible to combine some of the departments. This is a general power; it does not permit an increase of the number of departments, but it does permit the transfer of a department or of a branch thereof from one minister to another. It permits also an amalgamation of two departments under one minister.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Sir Robert Borden moved the second reading of Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I ask the right hon. gentleman to postpone this Bill until to-morrow?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would hon. gentlemen like it to stand?

Mr. MURPHY: Until the right hon. leader of the Opposition is here.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Could the Bill be distributed in the meantime?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Bill is printed in English and French and distributed. As my hon. friends have been very good in expediting business, I certainly shall not press the second reading of this Bill this evening, particularly as the leader of the Opposition is not present. There does not seem to be anything else to do except to adjourn, and I move, therefore, that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 8.38 p.m.

Friday, March 22, 1918.

The House met at three o'clock.

ESTIMATES FOR 1918-1919.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1919, was read by Mr. Speaker to the House and referred to the Committee of Supply.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask if it is the Government's intention to have the usual Easter recess next week, which is Holy week, from Wednesday to the following Tuesday?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is the intention to have the usual recess from six o'clock next Wednesday afternoon to three o'clock on the Tuesday following.

THE GERMAN OFFENSIVE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: In view of the reports concerning a very severe engagement on the western front I desire to ask if the Prime Minister has received any word as to the progress being made by our troops?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Nothing has come in since the offensive commenced, except the report in the press. I have asked the Minister of the Overseas Forces to keep

us informed from time to time, so far as may be possible, especially with regard to the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should like further to suggest that before any figures are given out as to the casualties, they should first be verified. There should be no solemn faces amongst the people of the Dominion; we are prepared to face the worst.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know of any announcement having been given out this year without it first being verified.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps not this year, but certainly last year.

QUEBEC SISTERS OF CHARITY ORPHANAGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask for information from the Government with regard to a report I have seen from the city of Quebec that the military authorities have terminated the lease of a certain property in Quebec which has been under lease for at least forty years to the ladies called the Sisters of Charity, which has been occupied by them as an orphanage, and in which there are now not less than two hundred orphans. Has the lease been terminated? Personally, I think the Citadel property would be better adapted to the Government's military requirements.

MAJOR-GENERAL MEWBURN: The property has been occupied as my right hon. friend states, but it was considered valuable for military purposes, and an officer has been sent to Quebec to investigate the matter. The lease has not yet been cancelled, and nothing has been done in the way of removing the occupants from the building. I hope an amicable arrangement will be come to before action is taken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter came up last autumn. Certain representations were made, in view of which it was arranged that those in occupation of the premises should not be disturbed during the inclement season, but I think it was pointed out then that the property might be required for military purposes this spring.

Mr. H. E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): I have just received a letter from the Sisters of Charity in Quebec saying that they have received notice from the military authorities there. There are two hundred orphans in the building, which has been occupied for over fifty years and on which considerable sums of money have been spent. There is no way at all for the Sisters of Charity—

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order for the hon. member to enter into any discussion of this matter on the Orders of the Day. It having been brought to the attention of the Government, nothing further can be done at this stage.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not hear a word of what my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said. Hon. members sitting in this part of the House do not know what the building is to which he refers. I think we must insist on the words being spoken loud enough for the members to hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry my hon. friend spoke too late. I should have been glad to speak louder if he had directed my attention to it earlier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it would assist very materially if the hon. members themselves would indulge in less conversation.

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) some days ago called my attention to the fact that the Supplies voted by the House last session will expire on the 31st of this month, and he asked me to agree to voting the usual two months' supply in advance of the usual Supply Bill. I have no objection at all, but this vote is being taken on very short notice. I suppose it is all right, but I am not overburdened with confidence in my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MACLEAN: I can assure my hon. friend that it is all right. I move:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $26,282,144.31 being one-sixth of the amount of each item set forth in the main estimates for the year ending 31st March 1919, laid on the table of the House this day, be granted to His Majesty for the year ending 31st March 1919.

Mr. MURPHY: I have no objection to the adoption of the resolution, provided it be understood that consent to its adoption to-day will not preclude the moving at a later period to strike out any particular item to which any hon. gentleman may take exception.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is always understood.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Mr. A. K. Maclean, Acting Minister of Finance, the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1919, the sum of $26,282,144.31 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL—INTERIM VOTE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 18, granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public services for the financial year ending March 31, 1919.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, and read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 17, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee of the Whole thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—To authorize granting road sites to provinces upon surrender of certain road allowances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that this clause be amended by inserting after the word "may," in line eleven, the words "by order of the Governor in Council."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would the hon. minister explain the reason of the legislation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are several sections of an entirely different character all relating to different portions of the Act. This first clause is to amend section 9 of the Forest Reserves Act. That section provides that the Dominion may lay out roads in forest reserves. The previous section had provided that any roads that were already laid out were the property of the province and should remain the property of the province although embraced within a forest reserve. Now it transpires that certain of the roads which were the property of the province are unsuitable and that the provincial authorities desire permission to make new roads. But there is no provision in the Act whereby any new road within a forest reserve can be given to a province, and this provides that if the province surrenders the old road the Governor in Council may grant title to the new road that is given in lieu thereof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I imagine that this legislation has been suggested by some case which has arisen in some of the western provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In British Columbia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At the present time the reserve which will be immediately affected by this provision will be in British Columbia? Is it in contemplation that it will be applied immediately in any other province than British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act applies equally to all forest reserves but, from memory, the case that is now under review is in British Columbia. It is clear that the Act must be general in terms and in all likelihood it will be availed of in any province wherever a road is to be altered. There is no way of altering it now under the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not ask the question in any captious spirit. I believe that conditions may change in these reserves and that such legislation as this may be commendable. I am only asking for information if it is intended to apply this provision anywhere else than in British Columbia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not even certain that British Columbia is the province where the immediate case arises but, from memory, I think it is, and I do not know of any more than one case.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The section reads:

Provided, however, that where, for topographical or other reasons, it is not expedient to use for public road purposes the existing road allowances.

Why not put it the other way and say:

Where it is more expedient to use new routes.

This would make provision for using the old road allowances as well as new routes. There are many places in the Northwest where it is of great advantage to the travelling public to have wagon roads laid out immediately adjacent to the railroads. If

this were changed about as I suggested, it would not be restricted to any routes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read the hon. gentleman's remarks yesterday, and what he said is quite correct; the Act at present provides for that. The Dominion may lay out a road anywhere without closing any other road.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is all right.

On section 2—to authorize grant of minerals in forest reserves to Province of British Columbia, under agreement of February, 1890:

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be remembered that the Privy Council has held that the title to the precious metals in the railway belt is in the province, and that the title to the baser metals and to the surface is in the Dominion. In the administration of the Act in the past, constant difficulties arose, which difficulties were got over by the agreement that is referred to here whereby it was provided that if an applicant worked mineral rights in the province, and lived up to the provisions of the Mineral Act of the province, he could acquire patent on payment of a fixed amount, or he could acquire title to the surface rights and to the baser metals. That arrangement has been working ever since 1890, and in consequence we do not administer any of the baser metals in the Railway Belt except coal, and there is very little coal. But when the Dominion Forest Reserves Act was passed in 1911, there was a clause of that Act by which the Minister was refused permission to convey title to any lands at all within the limits of a forest reserve. These lands were locked up and no one was empowered by authority of Parliament to issue a patent for any purpose whatsoever. The result was that wherever there were mineral claims in relation to these lands it was impossible to carry out the terms of the agreement of 1890. By this amendment we propose to make it possible to carry out the terms of the agreement in respect to forest reserve lands just as in respect to other lands in the railway belt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did not exactly follow what was said by my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen). By a decision of the Privy Council one class of metal was held to be the property of the province and another class of metal was held to be the property of the Dominion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The baser metals were held to be the property of the province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, of the Dominion; the precious metals were held to be the property of the province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Under the law as it is to-day the baser metals belong to the Dominion, and the object is to transfer these baser metals to the province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not quite. The object is not to transfer the baser metals in toto to the province by any means. The object is to enable us to carry out the arrangement as to the transfer of the baser metals to the patentee of the province in individual cases, which arrangement we made in 1890 but which, by reason of the Forest Reserves Act of 1911, cannot now be applied in the case of forest reserves. Under the arrangement of 1890, it was provided that wherever a man was, under the law of the province entitled to a patent, having lived up to the regulations and to the Mineral Act of the province, he could get a patent from the province to the precious metals, and that he thereby became entitled to a patent from the Dominion to the baser metals and surface rights upon payment of a fixed amount. But, by the Forest Reserves Act, it was provided that no patent could be given under any conditions to any lands in the forest reserves. Consequently a patent could not be given to a patentee of mineral rights in the province. This amendment provides that we may carry out the arrangement of 1890 as respects forest reserve lands just as we could previously carry it out, and as we now carry it out, as respects other lands in the railway belt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It means that the metals which belong to the Dominion may be transferred to the province and by the province granted to somebody for the purpose of exploitation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: May be transferred direct to the patentee of the province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly. Is not this possibly interfering with the policy which guided Parliament when it passed the Act of 1911, that is to say, to preserve the forest reserves certain restrictions are necessary as far as possible to keep the forests in a state of nature and prevent exploitation by human hands. The great tendency to-day is toward the exploitation of minerals in forests, and, in consequence, valuable quantities of timber land are destroyed every year. Now, as I understand,

the object of my hon. friend is to permit exploitation of minerals. In many cases, in order to get at one good mine, it may be necessary to open ten, and all the dangers which I have mentioned may, therefore, arise in the forest. Do I understand that the policy of my hon. friend is that if a man goes into a Dominion reserve and locates a mine he would get title from my hon. friend, who is the administrator of the reserve, or would he go to the Government of British Columbia, and would the hon. minister give the land to the Government of British Columbia? Is that the object of the legislation? I am afraid that it will have to be very carefully guarded if the purpose of the Act of 1911, to preserve the forests, is to be maintained.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: What the right hon. gentleman says is correct that in so far as this operates it does give encouragement to the exploiters of minerals, even in forest reserves. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that by no Act of Parliament can we take away from a province what is now the property of the province even in forest reserves. By the Act of 1911 we closed the forest reserves in so far as we had control of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is the property of the province?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The provinces still own their own metals in these reserves.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In all the provinces?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, in the railway belt. This clause has no application at all except to forest reserves in the railway belt of British Columbia, because in the forest reserves of the other provinces different conditions apply. It would be a serious responsibility for Parliament to take such action, or to refuse to take such action as would result in virtually denying to the province of British Columbia access to its own vested rights in the forest reserves. So some way has to be found. I do not think this a very serious matter, because I do not think there is much exploitation in the railway lands. All that I recommend to Parliament is that we comply with the agreement of 1890—and do not fall away from that agreement in the matter of our forest reserve lands. I know of no other way by which we may maintain our rights intact, and at the same time not deny to the province the strict benefit of all their possessions in these reserves.

Sec. 2 agreed to.

On Sec. 3—To take a piece of land out of forest reserve and park.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of that clause?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Clause 3 defines the area of the Rocky mountain forest reserve.

An hon. MEMBER: That is not included?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The Rocky mountain forest reserve is defined in the Forest Reserve Act of 1911, and the description appears in the schedule to the Act. This excepts from that schedule a quarter-section of land. The explanation is that, in 1908, previous to the passing of the Act, there had been lands withheld from entry in contemplation of being finally included in forest reserves. Among the lands surveyed and held for inclusion was this quarter-section, and a map was sent to the agent of Dominion lands for the district concerned, namely, Calgary, on which the limit of the forest reserve was clearly shown, and the following words were included in the memo sent the agent at the time the map was forwarded:

> Please note that no homestead entries have been granted for lands lying west of the line indicated.

These words should have been:

> Please note that no entries are to be granted for lands lying west of the line indicated.

Had he looked at the map very carefully the agent would have seen that the intention was to exclude from entry the land west of that line. However, the agent gave entry to a Mr. Andrew Nelson on this quarter-section and another quarter-section. Before the mistake was noticed, Mr. Nelson had virtually earned patent for that quarter-section, and Mr. Nelson was not at fault. He had made his home there; he had made improvements; and it was not until, I think, very recently that the controller of the land patent branch discovered, that the land was in the forest reserve. It was felt the only equitable thing to do was to take this land out of the reserve inasmuch as it is just on the border in any event, and give Mr. Nelson title to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask what Mr. Nelson has done upon that quarter-section? Has he put up a building or cleared the land?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, he has complied with all the requirements of the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The remedy should then be to expropriate the land and to compensate the patentee. If you permit this man to start a farm or settlement in the reserve, you may thereby very materially affect the value of the reserve. These forest reserves are of the greatest importance and should be carefully preserved. Many thousands of acres of the most valuable timber land have been set aside in this reserve and you are permitting somebody to settle upon a quarter-section in it, and there is all the risk of fire which will arise and which might destroy that property altogether. If a mistake has been made, unless this man has a very valuable settlement, it would be far better to compensate him generously rather than to have him on the reserve. I think everybody will agree to that.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: My right hon. friend's argument would have considerable force if this were a quarter-section within the reserve and not on the boundary of the reserve. But this is a quarter-section right on the end of it, and his own farm is right across the road. The two quarter-sections are the N.E. ¼ of 13-13-3 W. 5-M and the S.E. ¼ of 24-13-3 W. 5-M. My right hon. friend's remarks would have more force if the danger of fire were at all increased by his ownership of this land, but the fact is he has land right across the way, so there is virtually no change in this regard. I do not think it would be wisdom to expropriate. We have the power to do so under the Forest Reserve Act. If the land were enclosed far in the reserve it would be advisable to expropriate, but the recommendation of the head of the branch, who has all the facts, is that we should simply leave him undisturbed. In this same connection, many lands have been reserved for inclusion in forest reserves. and that the minister has power himself to remove those lands from such inclusion if it is found that it is not in the public interest that they be continued. He has not the power here, for the reason that these were lands that were not held for inclusion or were actually included in the first place. I am afraid we will pay pretty dearly for it. I think the officer who examined the ground probably knows that no serious detriment to the reserve is probable by the removal of this quarter-section.

Mr. MURPHY: Has he reported to that effect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will not dispute the facts because my hon. friend is familiar with them and I am not. I must say, however, that the principle seems to be a very vicious one. It would be far better under the circumstances to adhere to the policy of expropriation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand there is no other case of entry within the forest reserve.

Bill reported.

INSPECTION AND SALES ACT AMENDMENT.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES.

Resolution in respect to the weights and measures of certain human food and other commodities read a second time and concurred in.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19, to Amend the Inspection and Sale Act, (vegetables, eggs, food containers, firewood and cement).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF HAY.

Resolution in respect to the Inspection and Grading of Hay, read a second time and concurred in.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 20, entitled An Act to Amend the Inspection and Sale Act, (Hay and Straw Inspection).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RE-ARRANGEMENTS AND TRANSFERS OF DUTIES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden Bill No. 2, to authorize re-arrangement and transfer of duties in the public service was read a third time and passed.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

BILL TO CONFER ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ON WOMEN.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved the second reading of Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women.

He said: Before the Bill is read a second time, it is proper that I should give some explanation to the House. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in five provinces of the Dominion at the present time women have

the right to vote in provincial elections. I am informed that a Bill conferring the franchise upon women has been introduced in the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia at its present session. If that Bill should pass, the position would then be that in six provinces of the Dominion women have the right to vote in provincial elections, and in the three other provinces they have not that right. Then the situation, so far as this Parliament is concerned, would resolve itself into three alternatives: either that we should leave the situation as it is at present, or that we should extend the franchise for Dominion purposes in each province to those women who enjoy it for provincial elections in such province, or third, that we should enact a measure in this Parliament which would enfranchise women generally, under proper safeguards as to naturalization, to which question I shall refer in a few moments. It has seemed to the Government advisable that the third alternative should be adopted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Which?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To enfranchise women generally throughout the Dominion. I do not depend for this upon the considerations which I have placed before the House as to the condition of provincial legislation on the subject. I do not even base it on the wonderful and conspicuous service and sacrifice which women have rendered to the national cause in the war. Apart from all these, I conceive that women are entitled to the franchise on their merits, and it is upon that basis that this Bill is presented to Parliament for its consideration. It is our belief that the influence of women exercised in this way will be a good influence in public life. We believe that beneficial results have ensued wherever the franchise has been granted to them; indeed the principle of granting the franchise to women generally was practically affirmed in the last Parliament.

There are, however, some considerations with regard to naturalization to which I must direct the attention of the House; those hon. gentlemen who were members of the last Parliament will recollect that they were then referred to. In 1914 the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed an Act known as the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914. That Act was passed also in Canada, and I think in some of the other dominions, in pursuance of a resolution which was adopted at the Imperial Conference of 1911, and which sought to bring about such an arrangement between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions as would place naturalization on a more satisfactory basis than it had previously occupied. There was a good deal of correspondence and discussion between this Government and the Government of the United Kingdom with regard to certain provisions of that Act, but eventually, in 1914, we passed in this Parliament a measure which in every respect, I believe, corresponds with the second part of the Imperial Act to which I have alluded. By section 10 of that Act it is provided that the wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject and the wife of an alien shall be deemed to

4 p.m.

be an alien. In 1914, after our Act had been passed, an amendment was made in the British Act, and we made a corresponding amendment in our Act at the war session in 1914. Section 10, to which I have just referred, was amended by adding thereto these words:

> Provided that where a man ceases during the continuance of his marriage to be a British subject, it shall be lawful for his wife to make a declaration that she desires to retain British nationality, and thereupon she shall be deemed to remain a British subject.

Apart from that, the qualifications necessary to any person who might desire to become a naturalized British subject in Canada under the Naturalization Act of 1914 were set out in section 2 of the Act, as follows:

> (a) that he has either resided in His Majesty's dominions for a period of not less than five years in the manner required by this section, or been in the service of the Crown for not less than five years within the last eight years before the application; and,
>
> (b) that he is of good character and has an adequate knowledge of either the English or French languages; and,
>
> (c) that he intends if his application is granted either to reside in His Majesty's dominions or to enter or continue in the service of the Crown.

The second subsection provides as follows:

> The residence required by this section is residence in Canada for not less than one year immediately preceding the application, and previous residence, either in Canada or in some other part of His Majesty's dominions, for a period of four years within the last eight years before the application.

One very important change that was made by this statute was the change in the length of residence required. Under previous Acts —which, however, granted only a local naturalization operative in Canada—the period of only three years' residence was required. In discussing at the last session the question of extending the franchise to

women, I pointed out certain anomalies which would result unless some amendment were made in the Naturalization Act, or some other provision enacted to meet the possibilities to which I am about to refer.

Under the present law of Canada it is necessary that a man shall be either a natural-born or a naturalized citizen of His Majesty in order that he may exercise the franchise. But inasmuch as a woman merely by her marriage to a natural-born or naturalized British subject becomes a British subject herself, it might be that without some such precautionary enactment as I have referred to, a woman residing only a few weeks or a few months in Canada would be entitled to exercise the franchise. On the other hand, there is the converse difficulty: that a woman who was a natural-born British subject and who married an alien would, merely by the fact of her marriage, lose the right to vote. These questions seemed to present very considerable difficulty, and I had much doubt at one time whether they could be met and solved without an amendment of the Naturalization Act itself. I think there is a good deal to be said for some amendment which would give to a woman the right to determine her own nationality, notwithstanding her marriage, because if a woman, notwithstanding her marriage, is to have the right to exercise the franchise in this country, the natural conclusion therefrom would be that she ought to have the right to determine her own nationality. However, if we waited for any such amendment of the Naturalization Act, it is possible that we would have to wait a long time; therefore, we have endeavoured so to provide in this Bill that such difficulties as those to which I have alluded cannot possibly arise.

The measure is a very short one, and I hope hon. gentlemen will understand that its length does not at all correspond to the amount of time that was bestowed upon it before this solution was found. It is proper that I should give an explanation of the Bill, which is within very short compass.

Section 1 provides, in the first subsection, as follows:

1.—(1) Every female person shall be entitled to vote at a Dominion election who,—

(a) is a British subject;

(b) is of the full age of twenty-one years and upwards;

(c) has resided in the constituency in which she seeks to vote for a period of at least three months immediately preceding the date of the issue of the writ for an election in such constituency; and,

(d) is not disqualified on account of race, blood or original nationality to vote at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly of the province in which the constituency is situate in which such female person seeks to vote.

Hon. gentlemen will observe that a period of three months immediately preceding the election is required in the particular constituency in which the woman shall be entitled to vote. It follows from certain dispositions to which I shall refer later that the woman, unless she is a natural-born or a naturalized British subject, must have lived in this country for a much longer period. Paragraph (d) provides that we shall follow the enactments of provincial legislatures with regard to disqualification on account of race, blood or original nationality.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is meant by "blood"?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that this is the form of expression which has been used in some of the provincial enactments alluded to.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is not shown as a quotation; that is why I asked.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, but the same language is used in order that we may follow precisely the law of the provinces in that respect.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there any intention of enfranchising the Indians? They are fighting at the front like heroes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have not taken that into consideration in this Bill. Subsection (2) provides that

For the purposes of this Act a female person shall be deemed to be a British subject,—

(a) if she was born a British subject and is unmarried or is married to a British subject, and has not become a subject of any foreign power; or,

(b) if she has herself been personally naturalized as a British subject and has not since become the subject of a foreign power; or,

(c) if, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and obtain and presents to the official in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists of the said constituency a certificate, under the signature of a judge or any court of record or of any superior court, under the seal of the said court, certifying that such female person is of the full age of twenty-one years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time, and is possessed of all requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty; or,

(d) if, nothwithstanding she is married to an alien, she was at the time of such marriage a British subject by birth and has not herself sworn allegiance to any foreign power: Provided, however, that this paragraph shall not apply to the wife of an alien enemy.

The meaning of that is practically this: to be entitled to vote, a woman who has become a British subject by marriage, or through the naturalization, while she was a minor, of her father. who was previously an alien, must have lived in this country the necessary length of time and must in every way fulfil the qualifications which would be necessary in case she were applying as an unmarried woman for naturalization.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The House is very thin at the moment, and I do not purpose to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage, as I understand several members wish to speak on it. I suggest that we give the Bill its second reading and go into Committee upon it, when the information I desire can better be given than across the floor of the House.

Mr. THOMAS HAY (Selkirk): Is an educational test to be provided in connection with this Bill?. If not, would it be necessary for the women to comply with the educational test of the province before being allowed to vote at a Dominion election?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend perhaps did not observe that I pointed out the provisions of the Naturalization Act. Subsection (b) of section (2) of that Act provides that any person seeking naturalization must be of good character and must have an adequate knowledge of either the English or the French language; that is the only educational test. Inasmuch as this Bill provides that any woman who has not been naturalized in her own right must fulfil the same requirements as if she were seeking naturalization, the condition which I have just read would apply to her, and she must fulfil it before being granted the vote.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Women to be entitled to vote:

Mr. STEVENS. There is one point I am not quite clear about. Paragraph (c) provides that the woman shall have resided in the constituency in which she seeks to vote for a period of at least three months. Do I understand that a woman from a foreign, but not an alien enemy country, who comes to Canada and is married to a British subject four months, we will say, prior to an election, thereby securing British citizenship, is able to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: She must fulfil the qualifications required by paragraph (c) of subsection (2). Subsection (2) makes it necessary that she shall have resided in Canada a sufficient length of time and be possessed of all the requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject. She must reside in Canada for at least a year, and must reside within the Empire for at least five years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: She must become naturalized, and in addition to that must have lived three months in the constituency.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If she becomes naturalized by reason of marriage or by reason of being a minor at the time when her father, being an alien, was naturalized, she must show before a judge of a Superior Court that she has fulfilled all the requirements that would be necessary if, being an unmarried woman, she were making an application for naturalization on her own behalf. The three months' residence in the constituency is an additional qualification.

Mr. DEVLIN: Those three months may be counted as part of the time?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest that instead of saying "three months," we say "ninety days." Some three months would be more than ninety days, and others would be less.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is pretty much the same.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no objection that I can see to paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), but I may call attention to paragraph (d) which seems to me most objectionable. It provides that every female person shall be entitled to vote at a Dominion election who,

(d) is not disqualified on account of race, blood or original nationality to vote at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly of the province in which the constituency is situate in which such female person seeks to vote.

Take the law of the province in that respect. If there is to be in any province any legislative enactment which prohibits a woman from voting, our law respects that part of the provincial legislation. If in

British Columbia, for instance, an alien is disqualified on account of race, blood, or original nationality from voting in the province, she cannot vote in a Dominion election. If, on the other hand, in the neighbouring province there is no such prohibition, then she is allowed to vote in the Dominion election. I think that is the proper interpretation of the law. This provision was put in the negative. That is to say, we adopt the provincial legislation in the negative.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In order to make the matter perfectly clear, permit me to say that we are merely carrying out in this respect, the same principles with regard to women which now prevail in regard to men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not intend to discuss the principle of the Bill on the present occasion, but will reserve any remarks I may have to make on that subject. But the policy the Liberals have always advocated since the time of Mr. Blake, when we had the Franchise Bill, which was discussed at great length, was that we should adopt provincial legislation in the matter of the franchise. It has, I think, been contended by authors who have written on the subject that the franchise is largely a matter of education and tradition, and therefore, wherever there is a revision of legislative power, it has always been suggested that the proper body to legislate upon the franchise should not be the central Government, or the central power, but the local legislature. It is a specific provision of the constitution of the United States that the power to legislate upon the franchise is vested in the State. Congress has no power to legislate upon the franchise, and in every federal election, whether it be for the presidency or for Congress, is taken upon the franchise of the state. Today in the American Union there are states in which women vote for the presidency and states in which they do not. The reason for this legislation is that the franchise, as I said a moment ago, is largely a matter of education and tradition. There are communities which are more educated and more advanced, you may say, in the line of franchises than other communities. Take, for instance, the two nations which are today at the head of civilization in Europe. The franchise has just been granted in England to women, after a period of long education. I am satisfied that although France is supposed to be a democracy far more advanced than England, the reason why the franchise has not been given to the women in the country, is that in France education and tradition have not favoured that course. In my humble judgment, the Act would have been more useful if we had followed the policy of leaving the question of the franchise to be determined by the provinces. At present there are five provinces which have given the franchise to women. Those provinces are the five provinces west of the Ottawa river. According to my interpretation of our own law, the women of Ontario, of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan, of Alberta and of British Columbia have the right to take part in Dominion elections. Our law upon this subject is contained in chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes, section 10, as follows:—

> The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

This language seems to me very clear and it seems to convey the right of the franchise in Dominion elections in all the provinces where it has been given to women. We had a discussion, as my right hon. friend will remember, last session upon this subject, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) took the ground that the law did not apply because of some distinction as to the word "person" which is derived from the interpretation given by British jurisprudence. My hon. friend, however, has taken the view that the franchise should be extended to women in all the provinces, regardless of the fact that some provinces are sufficiently advanced to give the franchise to women and others have not done so. Five provinces have done so. A sixth will do it this year, because Nova Scotia will have such a law. Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec have not yet reached that stage, but they will endeavour, I have no doubt, to fall in line at no distant date. My hon. friend, however, instead of taking the provincial franchises in the affirmative, and saying that the law of the province shall apply to every woman in every province when she has the franchise by the law of the province, has provided that when any women is denied in any province the franchise by the legislature of the province, she will not be able to vote at a Dominion election. However, they may be on a parity there, and if she is denied the franchise by a province, she will be denied the franchise under this measure also. Would it not be more in accordance

with the logic of things and with the best principles of legislation to take the provincial legislation not in the negative, but in the affirmative sense, and to say simply that the Dominion franchise shall be given to every woman who to-day has the right to vote in any province at provincial elections? It seems to me such legislation would be far more in accordance with the fitness of things than what is proposed by my hon. friend, in view especially of some other provisions to which I shall refer later on.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I entirely understand that the United States have a provision in their Constitution that the franchise adopted in the different states is to be used for elections to the federal Congress. We have no such a law in this country. I am not prepared to admit that it is not perfectly competent for this Parliament to create its own franchise law, apart altogether from the provinces. We need not discuss that at the moment. For the present we are proceeding along the lines of provincial legislation. We are guided by that in framing this law. There are certain restrictions in some of the provinces as to race and nationality in respect to men. We are simply providing in this Bill tnat there shall be precisely the same restrictions in respect to women. That is all. As we have followed the line of provincial legislation with regard to men, we think it proper also to follow the same line when we are giving the franchise to women. There is only one possible anomaly to which it is proper that I should draw the attention of the committee, and it has not been alluded to by my right hon. friend. I think this Bill gives to women a somewhat wider franchise in certain of the provinces than men enjoy at the present time. For example, there are certain difficult and intricate provisions relating to the franchise in my own province. The right is enjoyed by farmers' sons based upon a certain valuation of property. There is also a similar provision in regard to fishermen. These dispositions are not of a character to be made applicable to women, and inasmuch as women have waited a long time for the privilege of exercising their franchise, I do not think it will do any harm if they have a somewhat wider franchise than the men in the province to which I have alluded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, but it may create confusion. In my own province you give to the women universal manhood suffrage.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Womanhood suffrage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not the law in Quebec, although in most of the provinces they have universal manhood suffrage. Every man has a vote who is twenty-one years of age. In the province of Quebec the franchise is not given as a right, but it is made accessible to everybody. Every man in Quebec is a voter who is a land owner.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does it depend on a property qualification in Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think one qualification is that he must be the owner of land. The lessee of property of a value of $2 a month in cities is also a voter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does it not practically amount to manhood suffrage?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In practice it does, but it is not claimed as a right. No one has a right to go to the poll and say: "I am 21 years of age and demand a vote." He must show that he is the owner or lessee of land, or that he is a wage-earner getting $300 a year, or a professor, or a schoolmaster, or something of that kind. But under this provision every woman of 21 years of age will have the right to step into the poll and say that she is entitled to vote. No distinction is made by this Bill as to these qualifications applicable to men. All other considerations are put to one side.

Mr. READ: I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to paragraph (d) of section 1:

—is not disqualified on account of race, blood, etc.

In the province of Prince Edward Island there is a very large Micmac population, and there will be a technical difficulty in regard to giving the wives of Indians the right to vote. The paragraph reads:

(d) is not disqualified on account of race, blood or original nationality to vote at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly of the province in which the constituency is situate in which such female person seeks to vote.

The men have the right to vote in the province, but the women have not. As this paragraph reads, there will be difficulty in regard to the franchise of the wives of these Indians. I want to say in regard to the tribe of Micmacs that they have shown themselves to be the most loyal people in Canada. They have recruited over eleven per

cent of the whole population of the tribe for service at the front, and I take it that the law does not intend to disqualify their women from voting. It is simply a technical matter, and it will be apparent to the right hon. gentleman if he looks closely at the Elections Act. I hope he will make provision to give these women the vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall take the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Read) into consideration. I do not know that I could quite follow them, as he did not speak very loudly, but I will read his observations in Hansard and give them the best consideration possible.

Mr. NICKLE: I may misapprehend the law, but it appears to me that there is a rather anomalous condition being created by paragraph (c) of section 1. This paragraph gives the right to a woman to vote if she has been three months in the constituency immediately preceding the date of the election; whereas, section 32 of the War Times Election Act, subsection 2, adopted the provincial residential qualification which sets out that the male voter must have resided for one year in the province. Will not an anomalous condition be created if a woman who has resided in the electoral district for three months is entitled to vote, whereas the man will have to wait a year? Take the case of two immigrants coming from the old country, a man and a woman, and both British subjects; the man would not be entitled to vote unless he had been a resident of a province for a year, whereas the woman would be entitled to vote if she had lived in the constituency for three months.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If they were both British subjects?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes. There seems to be rather an anomaly in this way that the Act penalizes those who have for a protracted period been entitled to the franchise and makes a concession in favour of those who are just receiving it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I imagine that particular provision was not observed by the draftsman of the Act and I will direct his attention to it. We will see what should be done in that respect before the matter is finally disposed of.

Mr. NICKLE: Possibly I may misapprehend the provision of the Act.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does not the Dominion Franchise Act allow a man to vote if he resides thirty days in the constituency or in the province?

[Mr. Read.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was referring to the War-Times Election Act. I think the provision there may be different. I shall examine it further.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is another point that I wish to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister. A residence of three months qualifies a woman to vote under this Act. If it is intended that the provincial lists shall be adopted, and if the recording of the names of these women is to be done by the officials of the province in Nova Scotia, I would point out to the right hon. gentleman that provision is made in that province that the revision shall be completed on the 5th of April each year and that the revision lasts for twelve months. If an election took place nearly twelve months after the revision there would be a large number of women qualified under this Act who would not be on the list. I am not clear as to whether it is intended that the local lists shall be adopted but if so there would be that difficulty.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If women were on the provincial list in Nova Scotia the difficulty would not so occur. Assuming that the legislation which I mentioned a moment ago should not pass in the legislature of Nova Scotia, and with respect to any other province where women are not placed upon the provincial lists, there would have to be some machinery provided under the Dominion Elections Act. Machinery already exists under the War-Times Elections Act which is in force for the time being. Before the Dominion Elections Act is to be resorted to, my hon. friend is quite right in suggesting that some machinery must be provided.

Mr. DEVLIN: I had it in mind to ask the Prime Minister that particular question. I see by clause 2 of the Act that the Act is to be construed as one with the Dominion Elections Act and the War-Times Elections Act. That very particularly affects the province of Quebec where, under the system adopted, enumerators have to be appointed. This system was not necessary prior to the last election. Is that system to continue and will enumerators have to be appointed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As far as the War-Time Elections Act is concerned, it will continue because it is one of the provisions of the Act. I have already explained that in the application of the measure to the Dominion Elections Act I think it is very probable that some addi-

tional machinery will have to be provided for placing the names of women upon the electoral lists in the Dominion.

On subsection 2, section 1—a British subject for purposes of this Act.

Mr. MORPHY: I presume that under the rules of the House when a Bill is in Committee, one may refer to a former section. I would like to make a remark about subsection (3) of section 1, which reads:

> Every female person shall be entitled to vote at a Dominion election who. . . . (d) is not disqualified on account of race, blood or original nationality to vote at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly of the province in which the constituency is situate, etc.

These terms are so abstract that I think they should be defined in some way in the Act. One can hardly understand exactly what they do mean. I confess I do not. The next point I would like to make is that, in my opinion, a Franchise Act relating to the whole of Canada, so far as women are concerned, should contain within itself clearly and distinctly all the provisions which go to show in what the franchise consists and the requisite qualifications of the person who is to enjoy the franchise. I must confess that the War-time Elections Act was a very difficult one to understand. Lawyers, as well as men of business, disagreed about it; and when we consider that our election machinery must be handled throughout the length and breadth of Canada by men in rural districts, educated no doubt pretty well, but still farmers, who have to take care of the rural polls, I submit that it is the duty of this Parliament to make the Election Act as plain as possible and not as complicated as this Bill appears to be. The working out of this Bill, as I see it here now, is going to be very difficult. There are too many abstractions in it. I submit that the Act itself should contain all the factors that show in what the franchise consists. Where it depends upon the Naturalization Act, let us have the naturalization clauses put right in the Bill, so that we can get down to a complete, concrete Act that can be understood by the very commonest man in the country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a very useful form of legislation to enact by reference. I really cannot see that there should be any difficulty about working it out as this Bill prescribes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Could the hon. First Minister work out the last Elections Act in regard to enumerators and every thing else?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I never had occasion to attempt it. I am not talking about the War-Time Elections Act, I am talking about this Act. I really cannot agree with my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) that there is the lack of information in the Bill which impresses him. The first subsection seems to me to be tolerably clear, and I think I shall be able to show that the words which are used there have a distinct meaning within the law. However, I shall give consideration to what he has observed in that respect and shall speak further upon the matter when the Bill is next in Committee.

Mr. REDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the committee to paragraph (c), subsection 2, section 1, giving British nationality to any woman who marries a British subject, or to any woman who qualifies on account of her father having been naturalized while she was a minor. If that is the intention of the section, it seems to me that a grammatical interpretation will not convey that idea. The subsection reads:

> If, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor—

Now, it seems to me that the words beginning "if, being a married woman" grammatically govern the entire clause down to the word "minor," and if the first interpretation which I gave is the correct one, then the reading would be much more clearly conveyed by striking out the words "if being a married woman" and substituting the words "if, having been previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor." In the event of that not being the intention, then it would appear that any woman acquiring British nationality through the naturalization of her father while she was a minor, and who had married either a British subject or an alien, would not acquire British nationality which would enable her to exercise the franchise.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. I think there is some force in what my hon. friend has observed. It probably could be corrected by inserting the words "or, if she has become a British subject by the naturalization as a British subject of her father." I shall make a note of my hon. friend's suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a great deal of force in the observation of my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy), that this Bill should contain everything that is intended. Let me call at once to the attention of my hon. friend the difficulty which arises. Subsection (c) reads:

> If, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing, (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and obtains and presents to the official in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists of the said constituency a certificate under the signature of a judge or any court of record, etc.

If I understand this aright, it is intended that the provincial lists should be used and that no special lists should be made. At the present time the provincial lists are used: we make no Dominion list. We accept the lists of the provinces, and I think that is quite proper. If that be so, it seems to me the application for registration should be made at the time that the lists are prepared. The time at which the lists are prepared differs in almost every province. In Ontario, I think, they are prepared in the month of September or thereabouts, and in Quebec also they are prepared in September. I do not know the practice in the other provinces. But it seems to me that the Prime Minister should provide that the application for registration should be made at the time the lists are prepared. Otherwise, if there is no period stated in which applications are to be made, when must applications be made? Are they to be made at all times, even on the day of voting?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shal' consider what my right hon. friend has observed, but I should think it would follow as a matter of course, that the certificate must be produced before the woman can be put upon the list.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: She has to produce her certificate? In my own province the lists are prepared under the authority of the municipal council, in very much the same way as they are in Ontario. The secretary of the council prepares the lists and when ready they are submitted to the council and discussed by it. That system works very smoothly and creates no difficulty at all. Anybody who regards himself as qualified makes his application to the clerk who puts it upon the list and it is discussed by the council. I would suggest that something of the same kind should be provided for here: the woman goes to the clerk of the council with her certificate, which she has obtained from the judge, and then she can be registered. I want my right hon. friend to take into consideration the time when the lists are prepared in every province.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Should not the Bill contain some provision as to the preparation of the lists?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already explained my conception of the law. I think that under the War-time Elections Act there is machinery under which lists containing the names of women entitled to vote under this Act could be prepared. I have also mentioned in reply to my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysboro, (Mr. Sinclair) who, I think, raised this point, that so far as the Dominion Elections Act is concerned, when this legislation comes to be applied, there must be some machinery provided for this purpose.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If you are depending upon the War-time Elections Act it will require all the lawyers in the House to interpret it, and then no two of them will agree.

Mr. NESBITT: Do I understand that paragraph (c), subsection 2, will be amended, and that women will be under the same obligation as men to reside in the country for a year and in the constituency for three months?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said I would consider the point.

Mr. NESBITT: While on my feet, I would like to endorse what the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) said, that this legislation would be much more intelligible if there were not so many references in it. It is a very tedious and difficult matter to hunt up the information necessitated by the many references. I see no reason why the Bill should not be more simply drawn.

Mr. NICKLE: I would like the Prime Minister to make a note of this point: Paragraph (c) of the subsection 2, section 1, reads as follows, speaking of married women who have become British subjects:

> If, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage, or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject,—

--and so on. Now it seems to me that would not confer on the woman who had been an alien and had become a British subject by marriage the right of voting if her husband were not living, because she is no longer a married woman.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I see my hon. friend's point and I will make a note of it. We shall be very glad if any other hon. gentleman has any observations to make upon this Bill so that we may get the benefit of the wisdom of the Committee.

Mr. NICKLE: While upon this subject, take the last part of the section dealing with minors. As I understand it a minor becomes a British subject if, during the period of being a minor, the father being an alien becomes naturalized, and on attaining majority the minor does nothing to deprive himself or herself of the citizenship attained. The last part of paragraph (c) says that a woman can vote and can attain British citizenship by virtue of the naturalization of her father, but she must produce a certificate from the Court that she has lived sufficiently long in the country to entitle her, in her own right, to become a British subject. The child might have lived outside the country and have attained British citizenship by virtue of the naturalization of the father but she would not have the qualification required by the Naturalization Act entitling her to be naturalized if the father had never been naturalized. What is the object sought in this? Is the object fo the Bill to confer on a minor the right to vote by virtue of the father's naturalization, or must the naturalization of the minor be under such circumstances that she could have attained it if she applied on her own initiative?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course no woman can obtain the right to vote unless she is already a British subject. When she comes with her application to put her name on the electoral list she must show that she has the qualifications which would at that time have entitled her to become a British subject if she had not become technically such by the naturalization of her father.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Take the case of daughters of aliens over twenty-one years of age, though the father becomes naturalized, yet the daughter, being over twenty-one, must also become naturalized.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They can become naturalized and make the necessary application.

Mr. CURRIE: Is this Act intended to amend the War-times Elections Act?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Bill provides that it shall be construed as one with the Dominions Election Act and with the War-times Elections Act. According to the tenor of its provisions it is therefore in amendment of both.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The War-times Elections Act is to be repealed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This legislation will operate until it is repealed.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Against such legislation as this I would certainly have entered objection at a previous session, because I have some difficulty in making up my mind as to the desirability of granting the franchise to women in Canada. I am bound to admit there is a very strong public sentiment in favour of this legislation in various parts of the country, but no such demand exists in the province from which I come. The women of my province do not want to vote and are not asking for the right. I respect very much those women who believe they are entitled to have a voice in the settlement of great national questions in which they are vitally interested, and I understand such a claim when coming from women who are earning a living for themselves and families. They are a great deal more entitled to the franchise than the society women who are so insistent in their demands for it. Then there is the sentiment of those other women—I believe they constitute the majority of the women of Canada—who feel that their exalted position as queens of their homes cannot but suffer if they meddle in our political battles, who feel that the duties of motherhood require all their devotion and all their energies, and who are quite willing to leave to the men the troubles and responsibilities of political administration. But, by all means, if women are to vote in some parts of the country they should vote in all other parts of the country as well. It is true that the fact that the women of some provinces would vote, while the women of other provinces would not, would materially affect the representation in this House, but the total number of women's votes in any province on any big question, when numbers are computed, might have such an influence as to militate against any discrimination in the electoral law of the country.

The second reason I have for supporting the Bill is that it may prevent the recurrence of what took place at the last election,

when the Government, before appealing to the people, gave the franchise to a certain class of Canadian women—a class of women who were supposed to be easily carried away by the campaign the Government had in store for them—and refused it to others. I believe that such a thing must be prevented in the future. Any Government might otherwise be at liberty, under the pretense of settling great national or imperial questions, to select their own judges, to have their case decided by a sort of family jury. Certainly this must be prevented, and if this Act will be a means of preventing that I certainly shall waive all the objections which I should otherwise urge against it, and shall favour its passage in order that any future manipulation of the franchise may be done away with.

Mr. CAHILL: Why should there be any reference to the War-Time Elections Act in this Bill? As I understand the War-Time Elections Act, or that small part of it that is understood by any person, it disfranchised alien enemies at the last election and gave the franchise to women who were relatives of soldiers.

5 p.m. If this Act is to confer the franchise on women who are British subjects, what is the purpose of providing that the War-Time Elections Act shall apply? Is it with the view of disfranchising some of these women at a later date?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Without the enactment of this measure, under the War-Time Elections Act certain women only would have the right to vote. This Act is to be read with the War-Time Elections Act and if any by-election or general election should hereafter be held, under the War-Time Elections Act, all women as defined in this Bill would have the right to vote.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it not the intention of the Bill that all women shall have the right to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Then I do not understand how the War-Time Elections Act can in any way affect future elections held under this Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The War-Time Elections Act by its terms is operative only during a certain period. While it is operative or after it is operative all women as defined by this measure are to vote. Therefore, this Bill is to be read as one with the War-Time Elections Act and is also to be read as one with the Dominion Elections Act, so that under whichever Act an election takes place, women as defined in this Act shall have the right to vote.

Mr. EULER: Does not section 2, which states that the Act shall be considered as one with the War-Time Elections Act, particularly call into operation that part of the War-Time Elections Act which disfranchises citizens of alien enemy birth naturalized within the last fifteen years? If so, are not the wives of those disfranchised citizens thus also disfranchised? The point I should like to make—in this one should have the sympathy of every member of the House, notwithstanding what took place at the last election—is that under this Act, with the Conscription Bill in force, the mothers of men who are fighting at the front in the Canadian army may be disfranchised. Under the War-time Elections Act it was provided that even those who were of alien enemy birth should not be disfranchised if they had a son at the front. I think it was provided that the son should not be of age at the time of the election, but I am not sure about that. Under this Act, unless it is amended, it is quite possible that those who have been called to the colours under the provisions of the Military Service Act may find that their mothers, although good Canadian citizens, will be disfranchised because they happen to be of alien enemy birth.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not the intention of this measure to take the franchise from any one who would be entitled to it under the War-time Elections Act. My hon. friend asks further whether the provisions with respect to women who have sons serving at the front would apply also to women under this Bill. I shall make a note of that and inform my hon. friend at a later date.

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand this Bill aright, it is not the intention of the Government to give the women a wider franchise than the men have at present?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid that this Bill does go that length.

Mr. BUREAU: Of course, it is not because my right hon. friend threatened me the other day with the vengeance of the women's votes that I want to make this remark.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Oh, I did not threaten my hon. friend; I told him what might have been the result.

Mr. BUREAU: That is worse than a threat. I do not think the women ought to have a wider franchise than the men. Take the case, for instance, of an American coming across the line and marrying a Canadian girl. She goes to the poll and votes, while her husband who escorts her there is turned away and cannot vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Why should not that woman have the right to vote?

Mr. BUREAU: Perhaps we do not see things quite the same way; our mentality may not be the same. We certainly do not see everything from the same angle, as was shown in the last election, and that matter might be thrashed out in this House before we get through. Cases such as I have mentioned may bring disunion into the family.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: May lead to the divorce court.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, and divorces may be made easier after a while. I saw cases in the last election where a family became disunited over voting. Take another case. In the province of Quebec a man must earn a certain amount a year before he can vote, and I think that is a fair provision. When election day comes round that man who has worked hard all his life and has been a good citizen may find himself in an old man's home, while the old lady, living just across the street, will be brought out to vote. I say that is unfair to these old men. If we had universal suffrage it would be alright, but I certainly do not think a woman should have the right to vote when her husband has not that right. I think these three cases I have mentioned should be looked into. I do not want to be accused of being egotistical. I may say that even at my age I do not fear the woman's vote, but I do not want to see a woman vote when the master of the house has not that right. I think her title to vote should be subject to her husband having the right to vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I acknowledge at once that there is some force in the observations of my hon. friend. But on the other hand, I would point out to him that we had two alternatives; either to prepare and bring down to this House an exceedingly complicated set of provisions which would endeavour to adapt to the case of women all the remarkably varied provisions of the franchise Acts prevailing in the different provinces with regard to men, or simply to bring down, as we have done, a plain, direct enactment that all women, being British subjects according to the definition in the Act, shall have the right to vote if they are twenty-one years of age. I think on the whole that is the better course of the two, because, my hon. friend will remember, however intricate or complicated the provisions with regard to the franchise may be in any of the provinces, the practical result is that there is manhood suffrage, and if there is manhood suffrage in effect, then there ought to be woman suffrage in reality.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think the tenor of the discussion will lead the Prime Minister to see the necessity of adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for North Perth and having the Bill put in a concise form, eliminating all reference to other Acts. I am a fairly patient man, and I had a lot of good lawyers around me interpreting the last Dominion Elections Act, but I never met two lawyers yet who agreed on it. I hope that the suggestion of my hon. friend from North Perth will be followed. To my hon. friend from Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Mr. Bureau), I may say that I have yet to see in this Dominion very many men who go to the poorhouse on account of their wives.

Mr. BUREAU: I must protest against such a construction of my remarks. I think just the contrary; very often it is the wife who has kept her husband from the poorhouse.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then she should have the right to vote.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Thousands of women are supporting idle, drunken husbands, and these women are deprived of the franchise while the lords of creation strut about and control the elections. By all means give the women the vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We shall, of course, take into the very best consideration we can give to them the suggestions that have been made that this Act shall be comprehensive, but if those suggestions were carried out in their entirety we should have to embody in this Act the Dominion Elections Act, the War-time Elections Act, and all the provincial Acts that are alluded to; but I do not suppose the suggestion would go that far. It may be possible to include the provisions with regard to naturalization, if that is thought desirable, but it is utterly impossible to deal with the question of franchise under the present system upon the basis of inserting in any Act that is brought

before Parliament all the relevant provisions that must be taken into account when the lists are made up. That would involve, in the first place, every provincial Act in the Dominion from one end to the other that bears upon the franchise, and if the suggestion were carried out to the full, it would also involve embodying in this Act the Dominion Elections Act, and the War-time Elections Act. We shall, however, take into the best consideration possible the suggestions that have been made, and see whether we can work out something that will meet the views of hon. gentlemen who have raised these points.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister the provision in paragraph (c) of subsection (2) in reference to the obtaining of certificates from a court of record or from a judge. That provision is going to work a great deal of hardship and expense. The Prime Minister knows that women cannot, as a rule, go before a court of record; judges do not care to have their courts swarming with women looking for certificates, and somebody else will have to get these certificates for them. But there is a worse feature than tnat. I can only speak for the constituency from which I come, but in my county there is a large section which is about eighty or one hundred miles away from a courthouse, or from any place where there is a judge, and it would be practically a physical impossibility for these women to get their certificates as provided in the Act. I do not see why any woman who is making application to be put on the list should not have the opportunity of satisfying the board, or whatever it may be, that she is qualified in every way under the Act, without being put to the expense and inconvenience of going before a judge for this certificate. There is no machinery here by which she can satisfy the judge that she is entitled to the certificate, and she should be in a position to appear before the court and satisfy the judge in that regard. There must be some procedure by which the judge is to be satisfied that she is entitled to the certificate. The Act is silent on that point, and a judge would be at a loss to know how he was to proceed to grant a certificate. When the Prime Minister is talking about the War-time Elections Act, as I happened to escape from its machinations as by fire, I have no particular spite against it, but let me warn the Prime Minister that this War-times Election Act stands away beyond anything that ever visited Egypt in its darkest days, and that those frogs, and other plagues of Egypt sink into insignificance compared with the terrors and dreads of the War-times Election Act. I would like to tell the Prime Minister that in the dear old province of Nova Scotia we are the best and simplest people in the world, and have got along for seventy or eighty years with the well-understood Franchise Act, where everybody gets his name on the list, and there is no trouble about it, and I would like to warn him that he is going to leave a very dark blot upon his name in that fair province, where he stands high and well to-day, if he introduces a measure similar to the War-time Elections Act, to create strife, dissension and dissatisfaction.

Hon. A. L. SIFTON: I was rather surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) who has had some experience on the bench, should imagine that judges have any objections at all to women calling at their chambers, I have had some experience myself along that line, and I never heard of any objection being raised by any of the members of the bench in Canada until to-day.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was objecting to too many at the same time.

Mr. SIFTON: I agree thoroughly in regard to that, but if there is anything in this Act that would allow more than one lady to come to the chambers at one time, it certainly should be eliminated. But this paragraph was put in for the purpose of providing that, under no circumstances, will a female foreigner be able to vote without having the same qualifications as a male foreigner. There are hundreds and thousands of cases of women attaining the age, and becoming British subjects by the naturalization of their fathers, who have only been a few months in the country. It may seem an anomaly to those who have been in the habit of thinking that you had to remain three or five years in the country to become naturalized, but this clause was for the purpose of meeting the special case of people who had not spent any length of time in the country, but who were still naturalized British subjects. Thousands of foreigners have come to this country, leaving their families at home. They have spent the necessary three or five years in the country, and their families being minors, have arrived a short time before they became naturalized. Those families became British subjects two or three months after their arrival in the country. There are thousands of cases of that kind in Canada at the present time, people who became

British subjects without having spent the necessary time here, and although in some respects it is necessary, in framing an Act of this kind, to give women additional powers over their brothers or their husbands in regard to this, there is no reason why, if you are making a new Act and taking in a new class of people, you should go back to the anomalies that have bothered the different provinces and the Federal Government in regard to elections for many years. The franchise has grown, and it has grown gradually, and conditions have arisen and been met in various places, but if you are making a new Act for the purpose of enfranchising a new class of people, there is no reason why you should not exercise a little common sense, and try and make it as fairly equal as possible. One thing was mentioned as an additional advantage given to women over men by reason of the fact that they would be entitled to vote as British subjects if they had spent three months in the constituency. This gets over an absurdity. In all the elections that have taken place for years there has been this difficulty: that a man might move from Quebec to Manitoba, or from Ontario to Saskatchewan a few months before an election and lose his vote. Thousands of such cases have occurred in former elections where good British-born subjects of the Eastern provinces have been deprived of the franchise that they have had for years. It was the intention of this Act to cut out the anomaly, so far as women were concerned, and as soon as an amendment is made to the Dominion Franchise Act it will be cut out, I think, as far as the men are concerned, so that if they live three months in a Dominion constituency and are British subjects they would be entitled to cast their votes.

Mr. DEVLIN: The remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) confirm me in the opinion which I have held since this Bill was introduced. Why should not the Dominion Elections Act be so amended as to include under the word "elector" the word "female," and then extend the qualifications of an elector to the female as well as to the male?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is what this Act does.

Mr. DEVLIN: But it is a separate Act. We are beginning to have too many Acts dealing with the franchise. My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) has made some remarks respecting the War-time Elections Act. I cannot say that personally I suffered a great deal by the War-time Elections Act. We have in the county which I represent, honest men on both sides, Conservative as well as Liberal, and we never suffer from any dishonesty or disorganization in elections. Each time questions were asked respecting the franchise, it became necessary to take up the Dominion Elections Act, the Soldiers Vote Act, and the War-time Elections Act. In future elections we will have to take up the Dominion Elections Act, the War-time Elections Act—I hope not the Soldiers Vote Elections Act, because I trust the war will be over—and this new Act entitled "An Act to confer the electoral franchise on women"; whereas, the Dominion Elections Act could be amended in a very simple way to include these different provisions.

Mr. SIFTON: The only objection to that would be that it would not become law until the War-time Elections Act was repealed, and that would deprive the women of the possibility, in case of a by-election, of their votes. Another objection would be that there would be no provision for getting them on the list. The only provision there is for putting them on the list is in the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am in accord generally with the provisions of the Bill, and desire to congratulate the Prime Minister on redeeming his promise to bring down a Bill of this kind so early in the session. I think it will be met with favour throughout the Dominion of Canada, and the general principle has been accepted by a large number of the provinces, though our friends down by the sea are not moving quite as rapidly as Ontario and the West. There is one matter which I wish to speak about, which I do not see provided for here. Every male citizen who has the right to vote has the chance of becoming a candidate provided he will put up $200 and get the necessary nomination papers and so on. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Prime Minister that ladies hereafter will be eligible candidates for the Dominion Parliament or not. Whether that follows as a matter of course, or whether other special requirements will have to be complied with, I am not quite clear. Therefore, I would like the Prime Minister to say whether this is really enfranchising them and putting them on an equality with men in all respects, and if it is qualifying them to become candidates at the next election, or earlier, if there is any by-election; or whether they must be permitted through some other legislation to

become candidates for the Dominion Parliament. I know that some of the more advanced of the women's franchise clubs believe that women should be on a full equality with men, if not a little more so. I think the hon. member for Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Mr. Bureau) put it very well when he said that if we give them full equality we should not extend the right to vote farther than we extend it to men. I do not understand from these provisions that that is the intention of the measure, though it may in a few cases work out that way. But it is very important that we should know whether or not women shall be eligible as candidates for the Dominion Parliament. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Steele) asks me what I think. I do not intend to express myself just now on that point. If I were going to run I would rather run against two men than against one woman. This is a question that cannot be downed without an answer, and if the Prime Minister is prepared to give an answer to it I would be very glad to hear it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would require the amendment, I think, of another Act. This is merely a franchise Act. As far as the general principle is concerned, I shall imitate the prudent reserve of my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) who has just spoken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an exception, which has probably been made after consideration, and it is this:

> Provided, however, that this paragraph shall not apply to the wife of an alien enemy.

Has this been considered?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I understand it the Bill provides that a woman who marries an alien shall not thereby lose her right to vote, but that this paragraph shall not apply to the wife of an alien enemy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to this I would have to make the same objection as that which we made on this side of the House to certain provisions of the War-Time Elections Act. The term "alien enemy" may be made elastic. The alien enemies that we have at the present time are three in number—Germany, Austria and Turkey. If I remember aright I think the exclusion which was made of alien enemies——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid my right hon. friend misunderstands the Act. If he would allow me to correct him, I would say that an alien is not entitled to vote. A woman who was, at the time of her marriage, a British subject does not lose her right to vote by marrying an alien. But she does lose her right to vote if she marries an alien enemy, who is a person born in an enemy country and who has not yet been naturalized.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that. If she marries a Swede she marries an alien, but she does not lose her right to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If she marries an Austrian she loses her right to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If he has not been naturalized.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have encouraged immigration to this country. The Austrians that we have in this country are Slavs; they are not Germans. There are very few German immigrants in Canada. You are preventing a union between a Canadian woman and a Slav. The purpose that we should have in connection with immigration is the unification of races as far as possible, and nothing is better calculated to bring that about than intermarriage. Why should you prevent a woman, if she wants to marry a Slav or an Austrian, from marrying him?

Mr. CURRIE: She is not prevented from marrying him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, she is by this Act. She is not prevented from marrying him, but she is put in this dilemma, that if she marries she loses her vote, and if she wants to keep her vote she loses her husband. You should not put that temptation before her; give her the right any way. The objection I have to this is that it is not wise to prevent intermarriage; on the contrary, it should be encouraged as much as possible if we are going to bring people from any country to be citizens, although at the present time it would be rather awkward to authorize marriage with Germans, with whom we are at war, and whose mentality we know. But, as far as Austrians, or Armenians, or subjects of Turkey are concerned, I think this obstacle should not be placed in the way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend will observe that a considerable departure is made by the section to which he alludes, because a woman is given the right to vote by that provision although technically within the eye of the law she is an alien and not a British subject. We have thought it wise to go that far for the rea-

son that a woman who was a natural born subject in the first place might very reasonably be permitted to vote although she has technically lost her British nationality by marrying an alien. We thought it desirable to stop at that point and to prevent a woman voting who has married an alien enemy.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Supposing a woman marries an Austrian, or a man of alien birth who has become naturalized, her marriage does not disqualify her?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Progress reported.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 11, respecting the Department of Immigration and Colonization, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Deputy Minister.—Clerks, etc.,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has a deputy minister been appointed yet?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There has been no deputy appointed yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the department been organized as yet?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has been organized to this extent, that the minister is conducting the department and he has taken over those officials of the Interior Department whose duties were concerned with immigration and colonization. He has not found it necessary as yet to appoint a deputy minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Before you report the Bill, I should like to ask the hon. minister if, before taking up the third reading, he will bring down a list of the officers who have been taken over from the Interior Department into his department.

Mr. CALDER: I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. MURPHY: Would it be possible at the same time, to have a statement explaining what actions are confirmed as provided in section 5?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That merely relates to ordinary administrative actions so far as I understand.

Mr. MURPHY: A statement of those could be brought down.

Mr. CALDER: There is no statement of that kind. I might say that the Immigration Branch was a very distinct section of the Interior Department, and its whole personnel has been moved over. None of the officials attached to any other part of the Interior Department have been taken over with the Immigration Branch. The Immigration Branch was a body of itself within the Interior Department, and that branch has now simply become a department of the public service. I do not know of any particular information that I can bring down in connection with section 5. If the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) desires any particular information, and will let me know the nature of it, I shall only be too glad to bring it down to the House.

Mr. MURPHY: What I would like to know is what I am "confirming" by voting for that section?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. All that section means is this: the department has been created by Order in Council, and the minister has been discharging his duties, that is to say, he has taken over this branch from the Department of the Interior. Since its establishment he has engaged in the usual administrative acts in respect of immigration which would otherwise have devolved upon the Minister of the Interior. It is merely designed to sanction his acts in that respect.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill I wish to record my objection to the addition of any new machinery of Government which involves a great deal of unnecessary expenditure. I do not wish to be understood as finding any fault with the head of this new department; I presume he is in every way a capable and desirable minister, well able to administer that department. During the balmy days of immigration in this country, hundreds of thousands a month came into Canada and were taken care of by the old machinery of the Department of the Interior; and thousands and hundreds of thousands of homesteads and homestead entries were taken care of by the machinery of the old department as well. Now that we have no immigration or homestead entries to speak of, I cannot, as an outsider though a member of this House, understand why, at this stage and at this time, under war conditions, when every dollar should be saved and when everything should be avoided that

involves the expenditure of a dollar except for the purposes of war, we are establishing this new department with all that it involves. I remember well, when the present Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), as the financial critic on this side of the House, before he struck the trail for Damascus, was loud in his criticism as to the expenditure in connection with these departments, but now he is not satisfied evidently with all the money he can spend in the old departments, but must create new ones in order to have fresh fields for his new zeal as a convert to the faith of hon. gentlemen on the other side. I think it is only fair to the country, and fair to the Government, that it should be pointed out that we have had no explanation why this new department was created. It has not been explained to this House in any way whatsoever why the Department of the Interior was not able to look after this business. It would appear to me the trouble was this: the Prime Minister wanted a new government; he wanted to take in new blood, and he would not take it in without making places for it, and his heart was too tender, he was too much attached to his dear old friends of the dear old times to have them removed, and therefore he took his carving knife and began to cut and carve the departments in order to make room for his friends. That is the only necessity that I can see. I do not think that is any justification. In the old land, when like circumstances arose, Premier Asquith made room for new blood by getting some of his old ministers to go out. There is no record in Great Britain where any department was cut in two to provide new portfolios. But here, whenever anybody was put out, it was done in a way in which almost anybody would like to go out. The ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. Mr. Hazen, for instance, became chief justice of the province of New Brunswick at a salary of $7,000 a year, a very high position indeed. Almost anybody would be willing to go out under conditions of that kind. And going right down through the list, that is the sort of sacrifice that has been made by hon. gentlemen who left the Government. I strongly protest against this creation or splitting of departments when the business of the country does not require it, merely for the purpose of feathering a nest for foreign birds that wish to go into the Government.

Bill reported.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bill:

Bill No. 18,—An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1919.

SELECTING STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN presented the following report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present session:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs :

Armstrong (*York*),	Jacobs,
Blake,	Keefer,
Boys,	Lapointe (*Kamouraska*)
Buchanan,	Lemieux,
Bureau,	McCoig,
Cannon,	McIntosh,
Carvell,	McKenzie,
Copp,	McMaster,
Crothers,	Meighen,
Davidson,	Mowat,
Demers,	Nickle,
Devlin,	Porter,
Doherty,	Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Douglas (*Strathcona*),	Sifton,
Fripp,	Tweedie, and
Guthrie,	Vien.—32.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs :

Ames (Sir Herbert),	Lanctôt,
Anderson,	Lapointe
Andrews,	(*Kamouraska*),
Archambault,	Lapointe
Armstrong (*Lambton*),	(*St. James*),
Arthurs,	Lavigueur,
Ballantyne,	Leduc,
Blair,	Lemieux,
Bonnell,	Lesage,
Boyer,	Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Boys,	Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Bristol,	Maclean (*York*),
Buchanan,	MacNutt,
Bureau,	McCoig,

Cahill,
Calder,
Cannon,
Carvell,
Casgrain,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Copp,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davidson,
Davis,
Dechêne,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Fraser,
Fripp,
Gauvreau,
Guthrie,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Kay,
Keefer,
Lalor,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGregor,
McKenzie,
McLean (*Royal*),
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Marshall,
Martin,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Porter,
Power,
Richardson,
Savard,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Stevens,
Stewart,
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Trahan,
Tudhope,
Turriff,
Vien,
Wallace,
Wilson (*Wentworth*),
Wilson (*Saskatoon*), and Wright.—114.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Armstrong (*York*),
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brien,
Bureau,
Butts,
Casselman,
Charters,
Cronyn,
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fortier,
Foster (*York*),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Harrison,
Hocken,
Lafortune,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McLean (*Royal*),
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Martin,
Myers,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paul,
Peck,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Richardson,
Robb,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sharpe,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Sifton,
Steele,
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Tobin, and
Wigmore.—58.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Brien,
Burrell,
Butts,
Chabot,
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cruise,
Deslauriers,
Doherty,
Euler,
Gervais,
Griesbach,
Hartt,
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McGibbon (*Argenteuil*),
McIsaac,
McLeod,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Paul,
Seguin,
Steacy,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Wallace,
Wigmore, and
Wright.—30.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs :

Bowman,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Charters,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Crowe,
Currie,
Fontaine,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Prevost,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Richardson,
Shaw,
Verville,
White (*Victoria*), and
Wilson (*Wentworth*).—24.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Allan,
Andrews,
Archambault,
Ball,
Best,
Bonnell,
Boys,
Bureau,
Calder,
Cannon,
Carvell,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Crerar,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Davidson,
Devlin,
Edwards,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauvreau,
McCrea,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Maharg,
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Parent,
Proulx,
Redman,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Scott,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Spinney,
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),

Green,
Jacobs,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*),
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCoig,
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Verville,
Vien, and
Wigmore.—61.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Allan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Argue,
Baldwin,
Best,
Bristol,
Burnham,
Calder,
Cardin,
Carvell,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davis,
Dechêne,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
DuTremblay,
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (*York*),
Gauthier,
Gladu,
Glass,
Halladay,
Henders,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Kay,
Lang,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Loggie,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCurdy,
McLeod,
McMaster,
McQuarrie,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Porter,
Redman,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart,
Sutherland,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Tremain,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Whidden,
Wilson (*Saskatoon*),
—81.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Anderson,
Armstrong (*York*),
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Argue,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Brouillard,
Burrell,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Marshall,
Mayrand,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Myers,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,

Cahill,
Casselman,
Chisholm,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Crerar,
Cruise,
Davis,
Delisle,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Edwards,
Finley,
Fournier,
Fulton,
Gervais,
Glass,
Halladay,
Hay,
Henders,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Hunt,
Kay,
Knox,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lang,
Léger,
Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Maclean (*York*),
Maharg,
McLean (*Royal*),
McLeod,
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Paul,
Proulx,
Read (*Prince*),
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Robb,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Truax,
Wallace,
White (*Victoria*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*),
Wright.—93.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee to consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs :

Butts,
Campbell,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clements,
Fielding,
Gladu,
Hartt,
Hay,
Lang,
Lapointe (*St. James*),
Léger,
Loggie,
Manion,
Martin,
Munson,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McQuarrie,
Nicholson, (*Queens*),
Pelletier,
Read (*Prince*),
Rowell,
Sinclair (*Antignoish*),
Spinney,
Stevens,
Trahan,
Truax,
Tudhope,
Turgeon,
Wigmore.—32.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs :

Arthurs,
Blake,
Bonnell,
Burrell,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Dechene,
Denis,
Fortier,
Green,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
McMartin,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Pacaud,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Sexsmith,
Smith,
Tolmie, and
White (*Victoria*).—CJ.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs :

Argue,	Fraser,
Baldwin,	Halladay,
Bourassa,	Knox,
Bowman,	Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Boyce,	Manion,
Bureau,	Michaud,
Campbell,	Pacaud,
Carvell,	Parent,
Casselman,	Power,
Charlton,	Redman,
Cochrane,	Stewart,
Cooper,	Thompson (*Hastings*),
Ethier,	Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Fafard,	White (*Victoria, Alta*)
Finley,	Wilson
Foster (*York*),	(*Saskatoon*)—31.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs :

Ballantyne,	Lemieux,
Burnham,	Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Chabot,	Mowat,
Devlin,	Munson,
Elkin,	McKenzie,
Foster (Sir George),	Nickle,
Kay,	Richardson—14.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs :

Allan,	Lapointe
Andrews,	(*Kamouraska*),
Borden (Sir Robert),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Boyer,	Lemieux,
Chaplin,	Meighen,
Clark (*Red Deer*),	Myers,
Cooper,	Pardee,
Copp,	Rowell,
Cronyn,	Sheard,
Crothers,	Whidden—20.
Foster (Sir George),	

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Adjourn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There are a few Bills that have been printed, but nobody has had time to read them. I suggest to my right hon. friend that we have done a good day's work.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had hoped that we might make some progress this evening. However, it is true that it is not a very long time since the Bills were printed and if my right hon. friend greatly desires it I shall consent to an adjournment now. I therefore move that the House adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at six o'clock.

Monday, March 25, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS.

Agricultural Department, 1917, Report of Agricultural Instruction Act and report of the Experimental Farms.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Annual Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners and Report of Telephone Statistics for the year ended June 30th, 1917. —Hon. Mr. Reid.

THE WAR.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER AS TO THE GERMAN OFFENSIVE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I mentioned on Friday that I had sent a telegram to Sir Edward Kemp asking that we might be advised of the conditions which have developed in the German offensive, and I have a telegram from him this morning saying that the Canadians are not yet involved, and that he will keep us informed. The Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Mewburn) has placed in my hands the latest official report which has been received and which reads:

Monday Morning Service.

Bulletin:

London, Mar. 25.—Fresh attacks by the Germans have developed northward and southward of Bapaume, the War Office announces. The British repulsed powerful attacks yesterday afternoon northward of Bapaume.

Bulletin:

Paris, Mar. 25.—The French on Saturday went to the assistance of the British and took over a sector of the battlefront, the War Office announces.

In the region of Noyon on the right bank of the Oise heavy fighting with the Germans is in progress.

Bulletin:

Paris, Mar. 25.—(Official)—The statement follows:

"French troops began to intervene on March 23 in the battle now being fought on the British front. They relieved certain of the allied forces and took up fighting themselves on this sector of the front.

"At the present time they are engaged in heavy fighting in the region of Noyon and they are disputing the heights of the right banks of the Oise with important German forces.

"Northwest of Rheims there has been a violent artillery action in the region of Courcy and Loivre. In the Champagne two German surprise attacks east of Suippe resulted in failure. French patrols took some prisoners near Tahure.

"There was much artillery activity between Arracourt and the Vosges. At daybreak German forces attacked the French lines east of Bleneroy and east of Badonvillers. The Germans were repulsed with heavy losses."

London, Mar. 25.—(Official)—The statement follows:

"The battle continues with great violence on the whole front. Powerful attacks delivered by the enemy yesterday afternoon and evening north of Bapaume were heavily repulsed. Only at one point did the German infantry reach our trenches, whence they were immediately thrown out. Elsewhere the enemy's attacks were stopped by rifle, machine gun and artillery fire in front of our positions, and his troops were driven back with great losses.

"During the night and this morning fresh hostile attacks have again developed in this neighborhood and also to the south of Bapaume.

"South of Peronne, bodies of German troops who had crossed the river between Licourt and Brie were driven back to the east bank by our counter-attacks."

So far as one can judge. the Germans are undoubtedly throwing absolutely their full force into this attack. It seems to have been met with as great success as was anticipated from the first. It is beyond question that very much depends upon the issue; and I know the hearts of the people of the whole country will be lifted up in intercession that the right may prevail.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Intercession is very proper, but with the view, in a slight degree possibly of helping on the cause, I desire to ask the Prime Minister the following questions. Possibly he might be in a position to answer them to-day, but it will do no harm to ask them in connection with this matter. My questions are:

1. Inasmuch as Canadians are engaged in the titanic struggle now going on for the preservation of human liberty, is the Government taking necessary steps to maintain to the highest degree the pride, the courage, the resolution, the steadfastness and the confidence of the splendid and gallant soldiers of Canada, as well as of the Empire at large, in this struggle?

2. Have the Government taken precautions in the management of the forces, the appointment and the promotion of officers therein and the granting of honours, awards and decorations thereto, that favour from female, society, creed or other undue influences, shall not prevail; but that all shall be awarded on the one basis of merit and fitness alone?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman's preliminary remark would alone be ample evidence that these questions are not of sufficient urgency to permit them being asked on the Orders of the Day, and that they should be placed on the Order Paper in the ordinary course.

Sir SAM HUGHES: But my next two questions may be of sufficient importance.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as the replies cannot be obtained to-day, and it is desirable to adhere to the proper procedure, I would ask the hon. gentleman to adopt the ordinary course.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The other two questions are of great importance. They read:

3. Does the Government purpose doing anything to prevent panicky and sensational despatches, which merely cause nervous excitement among soldiers and population in Canada and overseas, from being issued by a few mentally epileptic newspaper reporters from overseas?

4. Has the Government any explanation of why the Allied forces, splendidly armed and equipped, and in chosen positions of their own, made up of the best men in the world, and numbering from seven to ten men per yard of front, recently gave way before an enemy not their equal in manhood nor superior in armament, even though they numbered thirty men to a yard of front in attack?

I think some action should at once be taken to prevent these panicky and sensational despatches.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think these questions might much more properly be asked in the ordinary way. Hon. members would assist much in the proper conduct of the proceedings if they would use sparingly the privilege of asking questions on the Orders of the Day.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to intrude in the slightest degree on your duties in this House, Mr. Speaker, but I think this is an occasion when nothing should intervene in the way of having the proper appreciation of these things placed before the country.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions marked with asterisks are answered orally.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT IN QUEBEC.

Mr. POWER.:

1. How many men have been employed up to March 15th in the registrar's office at Quebec under the Military Service Act?

2. How many public representatives have appeared before the Courts of Appeal in the district of Quebec?

3. How much money have they been paid?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 43.

2. 20.

3. No payments have yet been made to these representatives.

Mr. POWER:

1. How many men have been employed by the Dominion Police in the Military District No. 5 of Quebec, to investigate and round up delinquents under the Military Service Act?
2. How many of these employees are returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 46 men (including inspector).
2. Eight are returned soldiers.

ENLISTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What is the number of those who have voluntarily enlisted for service overseas from the start of the war to date?
2. What is the number of volunteers who have enlisted for service overseas from the first of January, 1917, to the first day of September, 1917?
3. What is the total number of recruits who have enlisted to date?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. 448,062.
2. 47,727.
3. 472,728.

NET FISHING IN MISSISQUOI BAY.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What reasons have been adduced for the enactment of the Order in Council dated the 18th February, 1918, prohibiting net fishing in the Bay of Missisquoi and in the Canadian part of Lake Champlain?
2. Has such prohibition been ordered on account of representations made by the American Authorities?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. That net fishing is not permitted in lake Champlain, and that the beneficial effects of such protection to the fisheries there was being seriously nullified by allowing seine fishing in Missisquoi bay, which is one of the most important spawning grounds of the lake.

2. The prohibition was adopted following representations by the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission appointed to consider the settlement of outstanding fishery questions between Canada and the United States.

MR. J. A. DUPUIS.

Mr. J. E. MARCILE:

1. Is Mr. J. A. Dupuis, barrister, still employed at Postal Station B, Montreal?
2. If so, is he attending regularly to work every day?
3. Was he granted leave of absence last fall?
4. If so, at what date did such leave begin and when did it take an end?
5. Is he still under leave of absence?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes, on account of illness.
4. November 30, 1917, to February 2, 1918. Absence from November 30, 1917, to January 2, 1918, was with pay. Absence from January 3 to January 23 was charged to annual leave, and absence from January 24 to February 2 was without pay.
5. No.

*Mr. J. E. MARCILE:

1. Is Mr. J. A. Dupuis, barrister, acting as representative of the Department of Militia in the Court at St. Hyacinthe?
2. Is he the same Mr. Dupuis, barrister, who is an employee of Postal Station B, at Montreal?
3. If so, does he get a salary, and how much per day, as representative of the Department of Militia?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

The answer given to me by the Department of Militia and Defence is:

1. No.
2. No information.
3. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY DIRECTORS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What are the names of the persons constituting the present Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway?
2. What changes have taken place in said board since the month of August, 1917?
3. What is the name or names and residence of the person or persons directing the operations of said railway?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Donald Mann, Mr. Z. A. Lash, K.C., LL.D., Mr. D. B. Hanna, Mr. R. J. Mackenzie, Mr. W. J. Christie, Mr. W. K. George, Mr. E. R. Wood, Mr. R. M. Horne-Payne, Major Graham A. Bell, C.M.G.

2. Hon. Frederick Nicholls and Hon. R. W. Richardson resigned since August, 1917, and Major Graham A. Bell, C.M.G., Ottawa, Ont., has been appointed a director since August, 19, 1917.

3. The general officers are as follows: Sir William Mackenzie, president, Toronto, Ont.; Sir Donald Mann, vice-president, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. D. B. Hanna, third vice-president, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. Z. A. Lash, K.C., LL.D., senior counsel, Toronto, Ont.; Hon. F. H. Phippen, K.C., general counsel, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. M. H. MacLeod, general manager, Western Lines, Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. S. J. Hungerford, general manager, Eastern Lines, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. W. H. Moore, secretary, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. Gerard Ruel, chief solicitor, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. Geo. H. Shaw, general traffic manager, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. L. W. Mitchell, treasurer, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. Lewis Lukes, asst. to president, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. A. J. Mitchell, asst. to vice-president, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. R.

C. Vaughan, asst. to third vice-president, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. A. J. Hills, asst. to executive, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. R. P. Ormsby, asst. to secretary, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. C. E. Friend, general auditor, Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. J. D. Morton, asst. comptroller, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. J. R. Cameron, asst. general manager, Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. D. R. Campbell, asst. general manager, Vancouver, B. C.; Mr. A. E. Warren, asst. to general manager, Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. A. E. Wilcox, general superintendent, Winnipeg, Man.; Mr. W. A. Browne, general superintendent, Edmonton, Alta.; Mr. W. A. Kingsland, general superintendent, Montreal, Que.; Mr. D. Crombie, general superintendent, Toronto, Ont.; Mr. J. Bain, general superintendent, Halifax, N.S.; Mr. E. F. Seixas, general electric lines, etc., St. Catharines, Ont.

London, England, offices, Orient House, New Broad street, London, E.C.; Mr. R. M. Horne-Payne, director representing the company in Europe; Mr. H. W. Harding, local secretary.

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What time have each of the Pension Commissioners given to the work of the Board during the year 1917?

2. How many officials are at present employed on the clerical and administrative staff of the Commission?

3. What is the total cost per annum in salaries for Commission and Staff?

4. How many complaints have been received by the Commission on behalf of members of the Canadian Forces or their dependents against amounts for disability allowed by the Board during the year 1917?

5. Is there any appeal from the decision of the Board regarding percentage of disability allowed?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to place the Commission under the control of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. Commander J. K. L. Ross has devoted the bulk of his time to the work of the Board of Pension Commissioners. He accepts no remuneration from the Government, his monthly salary cheque being returned regularly to the Receiver General. When unavoidably absent on account of his financial interests, his private secretary, whom he retains at no expense to the Government, keeps him informed daily as to pension matters. Colonel R. H. Labatt and Major J. L. Todd have devoted their entire time to the duties of their office.

2. The clerical and administrative staff of the board consists of the following: Head office, Ottawa, 437; district offices, 86; London, England, 58. In the case of London, England, pension matters overseas in the year 1917 were administered by the Pensions and Claims Board, the Secretary to the High Commissioner, and the Chief Paymaster, each of whom undertook certain duties in connection with the award of pensions. Commencing April 1, 1918, the Board of Pension Commissioners will take over this work, having established a branch in London with a staff of thirty-eight persons, replacing the fifty-eight persons previously employed by the above bodies.

3. The total cost of salaries for Commission and staff is as follows: Head office, $339,114.50; district offices, $79,338; London, England, $62,900. Under the new arrangement in London, England, the estimated cost to the British Branch of the Board of Pension Commissioners is $38,000 for salaries.

4. Approximately 20,000 pensions were awarded during 1917. Complaints from disability pensioners or their dependents to the number of 828 have been received during this period. Each case received careful consideration and adjustment where necessary. It was found, however, that in the great majority of cases the complaint originated in an insufficient understanding of the Pension Regulations on the part of the person complaining. In a proportion of the cases medical re-examination was ordered, the result being that the opinion of the previous Medical Board was concurred in in practically all cases.

5. Section 5 of the Pension Regulations as amended to October 22, 1917, states as follows:

> There shall be no appeals from the decisions of the Commission, but every applicant for a pension, gratuity, allowance or assistance may present his or her case either personally or by counsel before the full Commission sitting for the purpose of hearing the complaints of those who may have been dissatisfied with the decisions given in the ordinary course of administration.

6. Section 5 of Order in Council P.C. 432 reads as follows:

> "The duties and powers of the Minister of "Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment shall ex- "tend to and include the following:—"
>
> (a) Hospitals, Convalescent Homes, Sanatoria, for C. E. F.
>
> (b) Vocational education and training.
>
> (c) Provision of employment.
>
> (d) All matters relating to pensions for the persons aforesaid;
>
> Provided that nothing herein shall interfere with or affect the powers of authority of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

CUSTOMS, THE PAS AND DAUPHIN.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. What was the amount of Customs revenue received for the last fiscal year, 1916-17, at The Pas, Manitoba?
2. What was the Customs revenue received from the Dauphin Office for the same year?
3. What was the salary paid the Customs Official at The Pas for the year 1916-17?
4. What was the salary paid the Customs officer at Dauphin for the same year?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

2. $15,350.76.
1. $8,170.49.
3. $2,400.
4. Two officers at Dauphin, J. A. Ball $1,100, E. C. Batty $881.26. Officer E. C. Batty was absent on active military service overseas from Dec. 15, 1916, with civil pay equal to the difference between his regular customs salary, $1,000, and his military pay, $401.50.

Mr. NOEL CHASSE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Is Mr. Noël Chassé employed by the Government?
2. If so, what is the position occupied by him, and what salary does he receive?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Yes.
2. Private secretary to the Minister of Inland Revenue; $2,700.

Mr. ALLEYN TASCHEREAU.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Is Mr. Alleyn Tachereau, a Quebec barrister, occupying a position under the Government control, in and for the District of Quebec, in connection with the operation of the Military Service Act?
2. If so, what is said position, the salary thereto attached, and on whose recommendation was the appointment made?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. Chief public representative. Six hundred dollars covering from the 1st February to the 1st April, when Mr. Taschereau has notified the Department of Justice, Military Service Branch, that he proposes to resign the office. Upon the recommendation of the Military Service Council.

RELEASE OF MEN UNDER ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Mr. KAY:

How many men have been released temporarily, and how many permanently, by the Minister of Militia under authority of Order in Council No. 3348, (a) prior to the 17th day of December, 1917, and (b) from December 18, 1917, to March 1, 1918, respectively?

Major-General MEWBURN:

(a) None.
(b) None.

MILITARY EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many representatives were appointed by the Minister of Agriculture under Order in Council No. 3349?
2. What was the number in each of the provinces?
3. How many men have been released from military service to work as agriculturists through the efforts of these representatives?
4. Are any of these representatives attending the tribunals at the present time?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. 116.
2. Province of Ontario, 87; province of Saskatchewan, 29.
3. As the representatives did not report in detail the department is unable to give this information.
4. No.

MILITARY SERVICE.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not certain young men of military age residing in the District of Toronto inflicted wounds upon themselves to avoid military service, as reported in the Montreal Daily Star of February 28, 1918?
2. If so, has any action been taken to punish the said men?
3. If not, will the report be investigated?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.
2. No.
3. If definite facts are given, same will be investigated.

CONVICTION OF BRAULT AND SWAN.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was a man named Brault recently sentenced at Montreal to one year's imprisonment for having made public speeches in violation of the terms of the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. Was a man named Swan recently sentenced at Toronto for the same terms for the same offence?
3. If so, are both men still serving the said sentence?
4. If not, have either or both of them been granted reprieve by the Minister of Justice?
5. Were both offenders treated alike?
6. If not, Why?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No; Brault was sentenced at Toronto, his offence being that he persuaded persons to resist enforcement of the Military Service Act. He was not accused of "having made public speeches."
2. Yes; this man also was not accused of "having made public speeches."
3. No.
4. Swan has been released as a matter of clemency; and an application for clemency for Brault is at present under consideration.

5. The cases of both offenders were dealt with on exactly the same principles. The facts and circumstances bearing on the gravity of the offences and the exercise of clemency in the two cases were very materially different.

6. Answered by No. 5.

PAY OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was an Order in Council passed in May, 1917, or at any time since, increasing the pay of the Medical Examiners under the Military Service Act?
2. If so, how much did they receive before the passing of the said Order in Council?
3. How much do said Medical Examiners receive at the present time?
4. Is the same rate paid to the said Examiners in all the provinces or in all Military Districts?
5. If not, what is the rate in each province or Military District?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. No Order in Council was passed authorizing an increase in the pay of Military Medical Examiners in May, 1917, nor since.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Military Medical Officers receive the pay and allowances of their rank. Civilian Medical Practitioners employed at mobilization centres under Military Service Act receive pay at: $5 per day of 6 hours to 8 hours; $8 per day of 8 hours or more. If away from their homes on duty, they receive $8 per day irrespective of whether they work 8 hours or not.

4. Yes.

5. Answered by No. 4.

RETURN OF SOLDIERS TO CANADA.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has any announcement been made by the Military Authorities that from fifteen to twenty-five thousand soldiers would be brought back from Europe to Canada before the month of June?
2. If so, how many of the soldiers to be so returned have been wounded?
3. How many of the said soldiers are unfit for military service?
4. How many Canadian soldiers are in France at the present time?
5. How many Canadian soldiers are in England at the present time?
6. How many Canadian officers are in France at present?
7. How many Canadian officers are in England at present?

Major General MEWBURN.

1. No.

2. Not available.

3. Not available.

4, 5, 6 and 7. It is not in the public interest to give this information.

[Mr. Doherty.]

STEAMER CHAMPLAIN.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was the service of the steamer Champlain between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay in the Province of Quebec, discontinued on or about the 19th of November, 1917?
2. Was the said service resumed on or after the 17th of December, 1917?
3. If so, why was it discontinued, and why was it resumed?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2 and 3. The C.G.S. Champlain was withdrawn for repairs on the 19th November and returned on the 23rd December, 1917. The vessel was replaced by the C.G.S. Bellechasse from the 19th to the 27th November, 1917.

WORK ON THE ST. CHARLES RIVER.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has work upon the St. Charles River at Quebec been suspended?
2. If so, why?
3. How much has the said work cost to date?
4. If the work has been suspended, will it be resumed at a later date?
5. Have precautions been taken to protect and conserve the work so far completed?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Yes.

2. In view of present conditions, it was not considered absolutely necessary that work should proceed.

3. $1,266.93.

4. The resumption of this work will naturally have to be a matter for future consideration.

5. The Chief Engineer is now investigating with a view to determining just what is required.

DRY DOCK AT LAUZON, QUEBEC.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. When will the dry dock at Lauzon, near Quebec, be completed?
2. What is the total cost of said dry dock to date?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. It is expected that the dock will be completed about August 1st next.

2. $3,077,460.28.

CHARLES DESJARDINS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Was Charles Desjardins, alias Ti-Noir, who is now being tried at Montreal before the Court of King's Bench, ever employed by the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?
3. Did the Department of Justice, or any of its officers, attempt at any time to secure a change in the amount and conditions of bail fixed by His Lordship Mr. Justice Pelletier in the above matter?

4. Did the Department of Justice, or any of its officers, deposit or advance the whole or any part of the amount required to secure the provisional liberty under bonds of the said Charles Desjardins?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Charles Desjardins was employed by the Dominion Police in the capacity of private detective at $2.50 per day. Not aware that he has the alias of Ti-Noir.

3. Yes.

4. The department deposited $10,000 in lieu of bail for Desjardins pending his trial.

QUEBEC POST OFFICE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the construction work on the Quebec post office been finished?
2. If so, since when?
3. What amount has been expended on this work?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1 and 2. Construction work is almost completed, some little work is still required such as polishing floors, completing stairways and removing debris about premises inside and out.

3. $500,100.95.

EXPORTATION OF CORDWOOD.

Mr. MICHAUD:

How many cords of wood have been shipped or exported from Canada to the United States during the year 1917?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: Firewood exported to United States during the calendar year 1917 amounted to 14,689 cords.

RECORD BRANCH OF MILITIA DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FRIPP:

1. How many ladies are employed in the Record Branch of the Militia Department?
2. How many were summarily dismissed on or about the 19th instant?
3. How many of those dismissed have fathers or brothers overseas?
4. (a) How many of those dismissed had no near relatives in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces overseas; (b) and how many of this class were retained?
5. Does the Order in Council, giving preference to returned soldiers to appointments in the Government, not apply equally to their dependents?
6. If so, why were some of such dependents dismissed?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. 586.

2. 211—but they were not summarily dismissed; they were given eight days leave of absence, with pay, when their services were no longer required.

3. 98.

4 (a). 113.

(b). 267.

5 and 6. No employees of this office were dismissed unless or until they: (i) were reported on as unsuitable by their section head; (ii) had appeared before the staff revision board and been classified as other than "good" or "very good." Consistent with efficiency, those employees with relatives serving overseas are looked upon as entitled to preference. In the absence of qualifications to render them suitable for employment, preference would not seem to arise, and the matter is solely one of compassionate grounds.

EXCISE OFFICERS AT BERTHIERVILLE, QUE.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. What are the names of the Excise Officers who are now, and who have been employed in the Melchers Gin and Spirit Distillery Company, Berthierville, during the years 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?
2. What has been, and what are the respective salaries of these officers?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

Snowdon, J. W. $2,000, duty pay $150; Normandin, G. H. $1,550, $1,650, $1,750, $1,850, duty pay $250, $300, $300, $300; Oliver, H. $1,000, $1,000, $1,000, $1,000, duty pay $150, $150, $150, $150; Denis, J. L. $800, $800, $800, $800, duty pay $150, $150, $150, $150; Gariepy, L. N. $1,240, $1,250, $1,250, $1,250, duty pay $137.14, $150, $150, $150; Tellier, J. O. $800, $800, duty pay $125, $50; Oliver, J. A. $775, $875, $1,050, $1,100, duty pay $175, 200, $200, $200; Champagne, A. $900, $900, $900, duty pay $33.33, $116.54, $93.75; Langevin, H. H. $600, $600, $900, $1,100, duty pay $33.33, $116.54, $150, $95.42; Barrette, J. A. $725, duty pay $13.71; Champagne, J. O. $800, $900, $900, duty pay $41.67, $120.83, $150; Parent, D. J. $900, $900, duty pay $18.82, $109.41; Barrette, J. E. $925, duty pay $1,673.

POSTMASTERS—DORCHESTER COUNTY.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Who are the Postmasters in the County of Dorchester?
2. Where are their post offices located?
3. When were they established?
4. What salaries do these postmasters annually receive?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

Abenakis, Ste. Claire, Treffle Laflamme, 1 July, 1883, $50; Anvers Cranbourne, Romeo Bolduc, 24 January, 1917, $50; Asselin, Cranbourne, Maurice Brun, 15 November, 1916, $50; Barnard, St. Malchie, Amedee Girard, 1 June, 1916, $50; Barre, Langevin, Rev. J. Z. Raymond, 1 December, 1916, $50; Cadrin, Joliette, Athanase Royer, 1 February, 1913, $50; Chemin Neuf, Cranbourne, Jos. Bouffard, 1 July, 1913,

$50; Coulombe, St. Isidore, Napoleon Lebreux, 1 January, 1899, $55; Cranbourne, Cranbourne, Patrick Colgan, 1 April, 1854, $50; Culdaff, Cranbourne, John O'Brien, 1 June, 1876, $66; Dijon, Standon, Rev. J. V. Rochette, 11 September, 1917, $50; Drouin, Standon, Chas. Corriveau, 25 January, 1917, $50; Feuille d'Erable, Cranbourne, Odilon Lessard, 18 June, 1912, $114; Fir Grove, Frampton, Napoleon Roy, 1 December, 1900, $54; Frampton, West Frampton, Dr. F. E. Boutin, Prior to 1848, $384.27; Garroz, Watford, Xavier Poulin, 1 December, 1914, $50; Genest, St. Bernard, Nap. Nadeau, 1 September, 1913, $50; Grand Rang, Cranbourne, Philias Laflamme, 1 April, 1894, $54; Guindon, Watford, Mrs. P. Rancourt, 1 November, 1913, $50; Hemison, East Frampton, E. Gregoire, 1 August, 1907, $50; Hennepin, Standon, Jos. Corriveau, 1 May, 1911, $50; Kirouac, Langevin, Mrs. Claudia Hebert, 1 October, 1913, $55; Lacasse, Frampton, Placide Brosseau, 1 January, 1913, $50; Lake Etchemin, Ware, J. L. F. Chabot, 1 March, 1866, $392.59; La Merisiere, Watford, Gualbert Desroches, 1 January, 1916, $50; Langevin, Langevin, Misael Languay, 1 March, 1867, $475.11; Lavery, Metgermette Nord, E. LeBel, 7 June, 1915, $50; Morrisset Station, Watford, P. Veuilleux, 1 July, 1910, $106; Mount Kinsella, Frampton, Jose. Humphrey, 1 November, 1912, $50; Mount Robson, St. Edward de Frampton, C. Hince, 1 December, 1899, $50; O'Farrell, Frampton, Frank Pare, 1 December, 1904, $60; Poliquin, Watford, Dorilla Dallaire, 1 October, 1913, $50; Poulin, Frampton, Philemon Roy, 1 September, 1913, $50; Quatre Chemin, Watford, Nap. Langelier, 1 August, 1903, $69; Rainville, Ware, Louis Jacques, 1 April, 1915, $50; Ravignan, Langevin, Thomas Bedard, 1 September, 1894, $55; Riviere Metgermette Nord, Metgermette Nord, Arch. Lamontagne, 1 February, 1914, $54; Riviere Raquette, Watford, Alph. Poliquin, 1 March, 1911, $123.15; Ruisseau a l'Eau Chaud, Frampton, Simon Fortin, 1 February, 1887, $75; St. Abdon, Ware, Octave Roy, 1 September, 1904, $54; St. Anselme, St. Anselme, E. Filteau, 6 January, 1849, $500.11; St. Anselme Station, St. Anselme, Ludger Audet, 1 November, 1893, $286.61; Ste. Aurelie, Metgermette, Jean Giguere, 1 August, 1884, $68; St. Benjamin, Cranbourne, Miss C. Veilleux, 1 September, 1895, $146; St. Bernard de Dorchester, St. Bernard, Mrs. C. A. Genest, 6 February, 1853, $267.61; Ste. Claire, Ste. Claire, Miss E. Cayouette, 6 January, 1849, $453.92; Ste. Edouard de Frampton, Frampton, Jean G. LeHouillier, 1 March, 1868, $50; Ste. Germaine Station, Ware, Achille Lacasse, 1 March, 1907, $209.80; Ste. Henedine, Ste. Henedine, Alf. Fournier, 1 April, 1854, $410.13; St. Isidore Dorchester, St. Isidore, Jean Turgeon, 6 April, 1852, $279.92; St. Malachie, East Frampton, Miss L. Turgeon, 1 October, 1864, $345.66; St. Malachie Station, Frampton, J. Lacasse, 1 January, 1912, $255; Ste. Marguerite de Dorchester, Ste. Marguerite, J. B. Gagnon, 6 April, 1852, $253.70; St. Nazaire de Buckland, Buckland, Gaudias Bechard, 1 April, 1894, $67; St. Odilon, Cranbourne, Mrs. Jos. Boivin, 1 April, 1883, $249.21; St. Prosper de Dorchester, Watford, Hector Samson, 1 June, 1882, $436.78; Ste. Rose de Watford, Watford, Ephraim Bougie, 1 July, 1882, $166; St. Zacharie, Metgermette, Hormisdas Poulin, 1 June, 1882, $366.25; Sevigny, Langevin, J. E. Audet, 1 February, 1912, $50; Springbrook, Frampton, John Bartholomew, 1 August, 1875, $60; Standon, Standon, Elzear Soucy, 1 February, 1855, $259.22; Vachon, Metgermette Nord, Achille Vachon, 1 April, 1914, $50.

[Mr. Doherty.]

INLAND REVENUE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the names and addresses of the employees of the Department of Inland Revenue who have been appointed since June 1, 1917?
2. What is the nature of their employment?
3. What is the amount of their salaries?
4. On what dates were they appointed?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

Westman, A. E. R., Ottawa, $50 per month, 30 June, 1917; Gray, W. B., Stettler, Alta., $250, 1 July, 1917; Hill, M. E., Ottawa, $600, 3 July, 1917; Rimmer, W. L., Hamilton, $900, 9 July, 1917; Barbeau, A. L., Montreal, $900, 23 July, 1917; Gallagher, W. J., Montreal, $900, 16 July, 1917; Papineau, D. McK., Montreal, $900, refused position; Gariépy, O., Montreal, $900, 23 July, 1917; Huot, D., Montreal, $900, 1 August, 1917; Ham, J. A., Ottawa, $1,100, 19 July, 1917; Hill, W. H., Ottawa, $1,300, 1 July, 1917; Handley, P., Victoria, $900, 25 July, 1917; Johnson, L. E., Ottawa, $1,300, 16 July, 1917; Lefebvre, J. M., Montreal, $900, 25 August, 1917; Steed, Thos., Revelstoke, B.C., $500, 1 July, 1917; Lavallée, J. O., St. Gabriel de Brandon, $1,200, 9 October, 1917; Lachance, L. C., Ottawa, $900, 20 September, 1917; Hibberd, Wm., Halifax, $20 per month, 1 Oct., 1917; Arpin, B. G., St. Hyacinthe, $800, 29 Oct., 1917; Morin, A. L., Quebec, $1,000, 2 Nov., 1917; Lalonde, A. Z., Montreal, $900, 16 Nov., 1917; Sanders, W. J., Ottawa, $1,100, 19 Nov., 1917; Desjardins, J., Ste Victoire, $800, 24 Nov., 1917; Branson, R. A., Winnipeg, $1,000, 22 Nov., 1917; Stubbs, W. R., Winnipeg, $1,000, 21 Nov., 1917; Larochelle, J. G., Montreal, $1,000, 6 Jan., 1918; Desrochers, J. O., Montreal, $1,000, 7 Jan., 1918; Penny, H. B., Calgary, $1,200, 14 Jan., 1918; Genereux, S., Ottawa, $30 per month, 15 Jan., 1918; Stokes, T., Halifax, $1,500, 11 Feb., 1918; Parker, E., Calgary, $1,000, 1 March, 1918; Wilson, J. B., South Hill, B.C., 1 Jan., 1918; McInnes, M., Amyox, B.C., 1 Jan., 1918; McIntyre, D., Penticton, B.C., 1 Jan., 1918; Pollick, W. C., Almonte, Ont., 1 Jan., 1918; McLeod, J. H., Prince Rupert, 1 Jan., 1918; Lesage, E. F., Vancouver Island, 19 Nov., 1917; Campbell, H. S., North Bay, Ont., 1 Dec., 1917; Abrams, B. S., Union Bay, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Ball, A. B., Comox, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Robertson, W. G., Courtenay, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Pineo, C. M., Port Albani, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Johnston, P. T., Esquimault Road, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Corbett, R. S. W., Pender Island, B.C., 1 Oct., 1917; Jarrett, R., Chemainus, B.C., 10 Oct., 1917; Brettingham, F. A., Duncan's Station, B.C., 7 Sept., 1917; Ladouceur, F., Buckingham, Que., 1 July, 1917; Moffat, S., Campbellton, N.B., 1 July, 1917. The last seventeen sell stamps on commission.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For copies of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other papers and documents relating to the appointment of a preventive officer at Mulgrave, N.S., to fill the position made vacant by the death of the late David Murray.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a return showing all the Commissions created since September, 1911, the names of

the Chairman or Presidents and Members of the said Commissions, with the amounts expended in connection therewith including rents, travelling expenses, stationery, printing, advertising, telegrams, telephones, postage and all other expenses, as well as the reports made by the said Commissions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a copy of all memoranda and petitions by Slav subjects of Austria, naturalized in Canada, setting forth grievances and suggesting remedies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a copy of all petitions, letters or communications of any kind either asking for or opposing the importation of coolie labour, from the first of September last to date.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a return showing the total money value of the hard coal, soft coal, oil and gasolene imported into Canada during the years ending March 31, 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, and for each month since March, 1917.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What is the total amount of war contracts fulfilled in the Province of Quebec, from August, 1914, to January, 1918?
2. How many war munitions establishments are in activity in the Province of Quebec?
3. How many shells are manufactured weekly in said province?
4. How many hands are engaged in such establishments in said province?

Mr. CANNON:

1. Who are the contractors for the transportation of His Majesty's Mails in the County of Dorchester?
2. What sums do they receive annually for this work?
3. When were the contracts in each case given, and upon whose recommendation?
4. When does each of these contracts terminate?

Mr. POWER:

1. How many officers who were engaged in active service overseas have returned to Canada during the year 1917?
2. What was the reason for their return?
3. What was the rank of such officers?
4. To what battalion were they attached overseas and in what capacity?
5. What are their respective occupations and the amount of salary paid to them since their return?
6. How many were returned because they refused to revert to a lower rank in order to go to the front?

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What number of Chinese entered into Canada during the months of September, October, November, December, 1917, and January and February, 1918?
2. How many have remained in Canada during the same period?
3. How many of them have gone to work in mining districts?
4. How many of them have gone to work as agriculturists?
5. Under what conditions were they admitted?
6. Was there any representation made to the Government as to the necessity of Asiatic labour? If so, by whom?
7. Was there any representation made to the Government against such immigration? If so, by whom?

Mr. CAHILL:

1. Has any money been paid to the Dundalk Herald, the Flesherton Advance, the Markdale Standard, the Durham Chronicle, the Grey Review, or the Hanover Post, for advertising or for any other reason since October 1, 1917?
2. If so, how much was paid in the case of each of the papers mentioned?

RESTRICTION ON SALE OF PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL SECURITIES.

DISCUSSION ON ORDER IN COUNCIL PASSED BY GOVERNMENT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

For a copy of all letters and telegrams exchanged between the Dominion Government and the various Provincial Executives concerning the Order in Council of December 22, 1917, respecting the sale of securities by provincial, colonial or foreign governments, municipalities and other bodies.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the question alluded to in the notice of motion is one which vitally interests the Dominion of Canada and especially the provinces. We are all aware that prior to Confederation there were two schools of thought as regards the respective powers of the Dominion and the provinces. It is a well known historical fact that at least one of the fathers of Confederation, Sir John Macdonald, was in favour of legislative union, but when it came to the test in England he had to yield to public opinion and to the well known views of his colleagues, notably Sir George Etienne Cartier, who favoured a federative union system. That it is the better system of the two need not be demonstrated. We are a heterogeneous nation, with a population scattered over a very large territory, and as a consequence the separation of powers is absolutely necessary in order to govern efficiently the various parts of this Dominion. A federative union for such a large country as ours is the only system to ensure civil and political liberty. And I would go further, Mr. Speaker, and state, without fear of contradiction, that even for a homogeneous people, scattered over a large territory, the local wants of the people can best be ministered to through a federative union system. If we take the case of the United States, we find that they are one people, speaking practically one language, with one system of laws, and yet

that people, scattered over a very large territory, in order to minister to the local wants of that vast country, has adopted the federative system. It follows, as a matter of course, that if you have this federative union you must have legislative independence for each of the local legislatures.

Although that sound principle, Mr. Speaker, was embalmed in our Act of Confederation, it has been assailed many times since 1867, and the old feuds about the relative powers and jurisdiction of Dominion and provincial parliaments are still fresh in our minds. Sir John Macdonald accepted in the last resort, the principle of federative union. But it is only too true that in the years following Confederation, when Sir John Macdonald was in office, he on many an occasion challenged provincial autonomy. I need only refer to the classical cases, if I may so term them, which were the bones of contention between the Dominion and the various provinces, notably Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and the Maritime Provinces. Let me mention only a few of those cases to refresh the memory of the Provincial Rightists whom I see before me. There were the Insurance case, the Escheats case, the Liquor Licensing case, the Rivers and Streams case; and last, but not least, the famous Ontario boundary dispute. In all those cases the uncompromising champion of centralization was Sir John Macdonald, and the uncompromising champion of provincial autonomy was Sir Oliver Mowat. The provinces, and indeed, the Dominion, owe that great statesman a debt of gratitude for his unfailing devotion to the cause of provincial rights. His policy may be summed up in the one sentence: the provinces were sovereign in their authority in order to make Canada united in its diversity. That policy, Sir, which had as its champion the late Sir Oliver Mowat, rallied around it the prime ministers of the then existing provinces, and many of the giants who played so prominent a part in the affairs of this country in the Dominion Parliament, notably the late Edward Blake, and my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

That policy, Mr. Speaker, has been sustained by many judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The battle for provincial rights has been won. At least that was my impression, and it was the impression of the public, until the month of December last when, after the election, an Order in Council was passed by the present Government, which I shall read in a few moments. I may be told that the fact of our being at war necessitated extraordinary and drastic measures. It is true that we are at war. It is also true that drastic measures are sometimes necessary, provided, however, they are in keeping with the spirit and within the four corners of the British North America Act, which is the Constitution of Canada. But the substitution of Orders in Council for Acts of Parliament on important matters such as the one to which I shall refer, is a dangerous weapon in the hands of any Government. The more dangerous is that weapon when such Orders in Council override, yes, directly override, the constitution. I claim that this is precisely what happened when in December last the Government attempted by Order in Council to control the borrowing powers of the various provinces of this Dominion. In order to make this point clear I shall quote the ipsissima verba of the Order in Council passed on the 22nd of December, 1917. It reads:

Whereas it is advisable that the Canadian investment market should be conserved to facilitate the borrowing of the large sums of money that will be required for the prosecution of the war and to enable His Excellency's Government, if need be, to fully avail itself of the loaning capacity of the country for the paramount purposes of national defence, and that the impairing of the market should be prevented by forbidding the offering and sale thereon of securities for raising money for purposes the execution of which may in the public interest be postponed until peace has been restored, provision being made for the issue by the Minister of Finance of a certificate permitting the offering and sale of such securities as the said Minister shall deem proper to except from such prohibiton;

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance and under the provisions of The War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to enact the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:

1. It shall be unlawful within Canada, by or on behalf of any provincial, colonial or foreign government, municipality, commission, local government, institution, corporation or incorporated company, to issue, sell, offer or advertise for sale, any bonds, debentures or other securities evidencing an obligation to repay money borrowed, which may hereafter be issued by or on behalf of any such colonial or foreign government, municipality, commission, local government, institution, corporation or incorporated company as aforesaid, or any shares which may hereafter be issued of the capital stock, whether preferred or common, of any such corporation or incorporated company, or to purchase or agree to purchase any of the bonds, debentures or other securities or shares of capital stock aforesaid, unless the offering and sale thereof within Canada shall have been first approved by the Minister of

Finance by his certificate of approval in writing:

Provided, that nothing herein shall affect the issue, offering, advertising, sale or purchase of any bonds, debentures or securities of the Government of Canada, or the trading in any bonds, debentures, securities or shares of capital stock, heretofore issued and placed upon the market, or which shall have been originally issued and placed upon the market with the approval of the Minister of Finance evidenced by his certificate as aforesaid.

The Order proceeds to declare that it will be a criminal offence to ignore its provisions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must express my surprise that this Order in Council was passed by a Union Government. I can well imagine old members of the Conservative party who form part of this Government, and who are disciples of the late Sir John Macdonald, appending their signatures to such an Order in Council; but I am surprised beyond expression to find that such staunch provincial rightists as some of the hon. gentlemen who compose the present Government should have given their assent to it. On the other hand, I am pleased to know, and I say it with pride, that the first voice raised against this encroachment on provincial rights, was the voice of the Prime Minister of Quebec. Immediately this Order in Council was passed, the Attorney-General of Quebec, Sir Lomer Gouin, speaking for his Government, used the following language:

That in the opinion of the undersigned, these regulations are beyond the powers of the Federal Parliament which could neither adopt them directly, nor delegate the powers to enact them to the Government of Canada;

That the effect of the said regulations is to restrict the rights, powers and prerogatives of provincial governments, and, in particular, of the government of this province, in so far as regards the matters which the constitution governing us confers exclusively upon them, and that nothing in the British North America Act, 1867, justifies such an encroachment;

That the Order in Council in question was passed without the government of this province having been informed thereof, and that the knowledge that it acquired of it was so acquired through the press.

That it is of importance to strongly protest against this manner of interpreting our constitution by the central government, and against this attempt to do away with a right exclusively belonging to the provinces.

For the above reasons, the hon. the Attorney General recommends: 1. That the Government of Canada be informed that it is the intention of the government of this province to consider these regulations as illegal, unconstitutional, and in no wise binding on this province.

2. That a notice be published in the Quebec Official Gazette informing the public that in the opinion of this government the said Order in Council, dated 22nd December, 1917, concerning the issue of bonds and debentures in Canada is illegal and unconstitutional as far as this province is concerned.

I do not know the nature of the other protests which came from the other provinces, but I am sure that the Government did receive protests from some of the western provinces. I know that there was one from Manitoba and one from Nova Scotia; probably there were others.

I agree with the opinion expressed by the Attorney General of the province of Quebec that this Order in Council of 22nd December encroaches upon the rights of provinces generally, and therefore is absolutely unconstitutional. I cannot for the life of me understand the reasons which impelled the Government to act in that drastic fashion towards the Provincial Governments. The Order in Council was passed immediately after the Victory loan was launched and after all provincial governments had in every particular co-operated with the Minister of Finance to make that loan a success. Speaking of my own native province, I may say that the Government of Quebec subscribed a very large amount to the Victory loan—in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000, I believe. I may be wrong as to the figure, but in any case it was a very large sum. I cannot too strongly—how shall I say it—denounce the manner in which this Order was passed and made public. No notice was given; no consultation with provincial executives was had. I honestly believe that in this very serious time of financial stress through which we are passing, no better means could have been devised to impair and to shatter the credit of the provinces on the foreign markets.

I submit, then, that this Order in Council constitutes an encroachment on provincial rights. What is the guiding principle in the matter of the borrowing powers of the Dominion Government and the provincial legislatures respectively? By section 91, subsection 4, of the British North America Act, the Dominion Government is given, it is true, exclusive legislative authority with respect to the borrowing of money on the public credit. Though general in terms, this expression, "the borrowing of money on the public credit," must manifestly be, and, I submit, is, restricted by the context. How is it so restricted? In the enumeration of the executive powers of the provincial legislatures—section 92, subsection 3 of the British North America Act—we read the following: "The borrowing of money on the sole credit of the province." If it is suggested that there is a conflict between the right of the Dominion Government and that of the

provincial governments to borrow money, I would say that the conflict is only apparent. There is no conflict in the powers granted to the Dominion and to the provinces respectively by the British North America Act with regard to borrowing. The field of legislation is divided between the two, for two distinct purposes. First, the Dominion Parliament has exclusive legislative authority to borrow money on the public credit of Canada for the peace, order and good government of Canada. Second, the provinces have the right to borrow money—to use the words in the enumeration, of executive powers, section 92—"on the sole credit of the province"—in order to the raising of a revenue for purely provincial purposes.

If it be argued that there is conflict—which there is not—between the borrowing powers of the Dominion Government and those of the provincial legislatures, it can be argued also that there is an apparent conflict in the British North America Act as regards taxation. Section 91, subsection 3, assigns to the Parliament of Canada "the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation," while section 92, subsection 2, assigns also to the provinces "direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes." One would think at first sight, therefore, that there is a conflict between the powers of the Dominion Parliament and those of the provincial legislatures in the matter of taxation. The Dominion Government has the right to adopt any system of taxation, while the provinces have recourse only to direct taxation. The question came up before the Privy Council, and in referring to this apparent conflict Sir Montague Smith made the following observations, in the well known case of the Citizen Insurance Company vs. Parsons (7 Appellate Cases, page 108):

> So, "the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation" is enumerated among the classes of subjects in Sect. 91; but, though the description is sufficiently large and general to include "direct taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes", assigned to the provincial legislatures by section 92, obviously could not have been intended that, in this instance also, the general power should override the particular one.

And Mr. Justice Clement, in his work on the Canadian Constitution, page 459, speaking of the financial clauses of section 91, says:

> They are the necessary powers of mutually independent governments. The wider choice of methods allowed to the Dominion on taxation does not touch the question; no one would suggest that its power or indirect taxation could be used to raise a revenue for provincial purposes.

The same analogy exists, I submit, as regards the borrowing powers of the Dominion and the provincial governments. The same conclusions as were reached by the Privy Council concerning the taxing powers of both Governments must be reached in the present instance.

Let us now see whether by inference the Order in Council of the 22nd of December can be considered as constitutional. The only other portions of section 91, under which it is conceivable that an attempt might be made to support the Order in Council, are: first, the general language of the first part of section 91 authorizing Parliament to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada; secondly, the second subsection of section 91, providing that Parliament may legislate with respect to the regulation of trade and commerce; thirdly, the seventh subsection enacting that Parliament may legislate with respect to militia, military and naval service and defence, and fourthly, subsection 27, which confers upon the Dominion Parliament legislative jurisdiction over the subject of criminal law. The peace, order and good government clause is limited by a proviso, and, therefore, cannot be extended. Let me read this clause:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces.

What are the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the legislatures? I find that by section 92, subsection 3, of the British North America Act, the borrowing of money on the sole credit of the province is assigned exclusively to the legislatures. Therefore, the Government could not, under section 91, under the peace, order and good government clause, pass this Order in Council. Could the Government plead that by passing this Order in Council it was merely regulating trade and commerce? What is the object of this Order in Council? Is it to regulate trade and commerce? It is to facilitate the borrowing powers of the Dominion by curtailing the provincial powers of borrowing, and I make the positive statement, which nobody can challenge, that neither the Government nor any of the provincial institutions or commissions aimed at by the Order in Council are engaged in trade and commerce. It might be stated that the Order in

Council mentioned also incorporated companies which are the creatures of the provincial government, but there again the regulation of trade and commerce clause must have a restricted sense. This point was well put in a case with which the Minister of Justice is very familiar. In a case between the city of Montreal and the Montreal Street Railway, Lord Atkinson said:

> The same considerations appeared to Their Lordships to apply to two of the matters enumerated in section 91, namely, that the regulation of trade and commerce taken in their widest sense, these words would authorize legislation by the Parliament of Canada, in respect of several of the matters specifically enumerated in section 92, and would seriously encroach upon the local autonomy of the province.

And in a still more recent reference as to the Insurance Act of 1910, the present Lord Haldane, after referring to the decisions in Russel vs. the Queen, and Hodge vs. the Queen, added:

> Their Lordships think that as the result of these decisions it must now be taken that the authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not extend to the regulation by a licensing system of a particular trade in which Canadians would otherwise be free to engage in the provinces.

Perhaps the best reason, if the Government had any good reason for passing this Order in Council, would, I presume, rest on subsection 7 of section 91, which gives the Dominion Parliament power to organize the militia, military and naval service and defence; but my answer to that is that provision has been made in the British North America Act in the shape of fiscal clauses. The fiscal clauses are subsections 3 and 4 of section 91, so that to provide for the militia, military and naval service and defence, the Dominion Government has within its grasp the necessary instrument either to raise money by any mode or system of taxation, or to borrow money on the public credit of the country. The sinews of war must be obtained in virtue and under the authority of the above subsections; otherwise, Sir, you destroy the autonomy of the provinces, and you may just as well dispense with the necessity of the provincial legislatures if, by an Order in Council, you can prevent the provinces from borrowing on their sole credit.

4 p.m.

In conclusion, let me say that this Order in Council, which came as a painful surprise to the Canadian people, who were under the impression that the battle for provincial autonomy had been fought and won, is, in my humble judgment, ultra vires, not only as regards the provinces themselves, but as regards municipalities, provincial commissions, institutions and other bodies coming within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. If the Dominion can assume control of the borrowing powers of the provinces it can also assume control of the taxing powers of the provinces, and if that can be done you should be logical and suspend the constitution of the country during the present war.

It may be contended, as it was contended on several occasions before the Privy Council, that provinces may sometimes abuse their privileges, their rights, especially in the exercise of such as may be termed concurrent rights with Dominion rights. But as has been decided by the Privy Council, injustice or abuse is no ground of invalidity. In the famous fisheries case I read in the book published by A. H. F. Lefroy, Appeal Cases, 1898, this statement:

> The suggestion that the power might be abused so as to amount to a practical confiscation of property, does not warrant the imposition by the Courts of any limit upon the absolute power of legislation conferred. The supreme legislative power in relation to any subject matter is always capable of abuse, but it is not to be assumed that it will be improperly used; if it is, the only remedy is an appeal to those by whom the legislature is elected.

In another case I find this question is referred to thus:

> They point out that upon the same principle, because under No. 7 of Section 91, of the B. N.A. Act the Dominion Parliament has the exclusive right of legislating as to all matters coming under the head of "militia, military and naval service and defence", and because any part of the land in the province of Quebec might be taken by the Dominion legislature for the purpose of military defence, and because that which had not been done as to some particular land, might possibly have been done, therefore, it not having been done, all power over that land, and, therefore, over all the land in the province of Quebec is taken away, so far as it relates to legislation concerning matters of a purely local or private nature, which they say, they think, neither necessary or reasonable, nor a just or proper construction.

I believe this is a very vital question which has excited public attention of late days. I know that the Government, after having passed this Order in Council, called the various provinces to a conference at Ottawa. I do not know what the result of that conference was, but surely representations must have been made against this drastic and, I humbly submit, unconstitutional Order in Council, and the object of my motion is to get all the papers connected with that Order in Council, the protests which it has elicited from various sources, and to know if the Government still

maintains its position in view of the protests which came from the various provincial governments.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): There can be, and there is, no objection to the hon. gentleman having the papers that he has moved for. I do not purpose following him in detail in the very interesting discussion which he has entered upon with regard to the powers of the provinces and the powers of the Dominion, nor do I intend to take up the gauntlet that apparently he desires to throw down in defence of the attitude of Sir Oliver Mowat and other leaders of the past, with regard to certain questions which arose as between the Dominion and the provinces. These questions, as the hon. gentleman has said, have been settled. I think it was to be expected, when this country was endowed with a new constitution distributing the powers of legislation and the powers of government between the Dominion itself and a number of different provinces, that there would naturally arise questions as to the interpretation of the different dispositions of the Act that made that distribution, and it would naturally fall to those who, when those questions arose, were administering the government of the Dominion to take up the defence, if I may so express myself, of the rights of the Dominion with regard to any particular matter, and equally naturally would it fall to those who were charged with the administration of the government of the respective provinces to, as strenuously as they felt justified in doing, assert the more extensive view of provincial rights. In that condition, what happened is what one would naturally expect, that those charged with the administration of the Federal government figured in the position of defenders of the wider view of the powers of the Parliament of Canada, and the necessarily wider power of the Government of Canada, and that those charged with the administration of the government of their respective provinces found themselves defending and upholding the wider view of the provincial powers.

Those questions have been settled, and I am at a considerable loss to appreciate the hon. gentleman's apprehension that what he describes as the victory of provincial rights has been in any way disturbed or attacked by the Order to which he refers. With all respect for the opinion which he expressed—and I certainly entertain a very high respect for any opinion which he would express on a question of law, and likewise a great respect for the opinion of the hon. Attorney General of the province of Quebec whose professional standing I am very glad indeed to recognize—I venture to say that the view that there is anything unconstitutional in the Order in Council to which the hon. gentleman has referred proceeds upon a misapprehension. As I understand it, the Order in Council does not undertake, and does not in fact, alter or modify the power of the legislature of the province of Quebec to legislate with regard to the raising of money for provincial purposes. The Order in Council by its terms does purport to make it unlawful, and I believe does effectually make it unlawful within Canada, that there should be issued, or offered, or advertized for sale any bonds, debentures or other securities evidencing an obligation to repay money, and, makes it unlawful that this should be done on behalf of any provincial, colonial or foreign government, or any municipality, corporation or incorporated company; and so on. That Order in Council, in its terms, affects the power conferred upon provincial legislatures and their executive by the British North America Act. The power so conferred remains vested in them.

What in effect is the disposition of the Order in Council? It is that the Government of Canada, finding it necessary to avail itself of the resources of Canada for the purpose of enabling it to effectively carry on the operations necessitated by the state of war, has, if I may use the expression, commandeered the Canadian money market. I fancy that if any other of the resources of Canada were deemed necessary for the effective carrying on of the operations for the defence of Canada and of the Empire by this present condition of war, it would be a valid objection to the exercise of that power that any property or any resources of Canada, which this Government might deem it necessary to take in its power, should thereby be withdrawn from the possibility of provincial government or municipal government, or any corporations or persons whatsoever in Canada availing themselves of that resource. We have realized how valuable to Canada at the present time is the borrowing power of her individual citizens, and what an immense aid and assistance that has been to Canada in enabling her to carry on the effort which she has made in connection with this war. What does this Order in Council do other than secure to the Government of Canada the exclusive possibility of availing itself of this resource? If it be conceded, and I do not see how it can be

disputed, that the Parliament of Canada has the right to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada, and more particularly for the defence of Canada, then it must be admitted that she has the right to legislate to secure the greatest possible advantage which can be derived for the purposes coming within the scope of these two powers and of the resources of Canada. That is what, in regard to this particular resource, this Order in Council does.

The Order in Council does not purport to limit the legislative powers of the legislatures of any of the provinces, nor the action of the executive in carrying out any power which it is lawfully entitled to exercise. All of the provinces still have, as they had before, their full legislative power to provide for the borrowing of money for provincial purposes. The only effect that results from this Order in Council is that a market that was open to them is open to them no longer because it has been found that the exclusive control of that market is essential to the Government of the Dominion for the purposes to which I have already referred.

That is the whole extent and effect of the legislation. The provinces remain entitled to borrow in such markets as they have access to. Their legislative power with regard to borrowing certainly remains in effect. What has happened is that this particular market wherein money may be found, and which it was deemed necessary to be preserved or conserved in order that this Dominion Government might have at its disposition these invaluable resources, is no longer open to the provinces and no longer open to any other body, municipality, corporation, or individual. The enactment goes no farther than that. If it be true that incidental to the exercise by the Government of this country of what seems to me its undoubted right in availing itself exclusively of this valuable resource, the operations of provincial governments in putting their loans on the market are hampered, it is a very unfortunate thing, but that does not interfere with their legislative powers in any way whatsoever. If the view that I put forward be sound it would be, I fancy, recognised that the argument of the hon. gentleman as to our interference with the borrowing powers, and as to the respective positions of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the provinces, with respect to legislation concerning the borrowing of money or concerning taxation for provincial purposes on the one hand or Dominion purposes on the other, is beside the question.

I am not able to grasp the analogy which he has endeavoured to establish as existing between this power which the Government has exercised and the power of taxation or the power of borrowing. The two powers, I would be disposed to agree with him, in so far as they are conferred upon the Dominion on the one hand and the provinces on the other, are powers to do the same thing but they are clearly differentiated as between the different purposes for which they were granted. I fail to follow my hon. friend in his contention that this Order in Council is an interference with the legislative powers of the provinces in connection with the raising of money by borrowing, or in connection with the raising of money by taxation. If the view which I have put forward be sound, and I have difficulty in seeing how it can be controverted, it becomes quite unnecessary for us to enter into any discussion of how far this particular legislation may be justified as being a regulation of trade or commerce, and I do not purpose going into that discussion. The Order stands, and I believe that it stands upon a solid foundation. It stands upon the power of this country, this one Canada as a whole, to avail itself of all its resources for the purpose of effectually carrying on these operations in connection with the war which are admittedly operations with regard to which the legislative power is exclusively vested in the Dominion Parliament and with regard to which, therefore, the executive power is necessarily exclusively in the hands of the Government of the Dominion.

Something has been said about the danger of the powers that have been conferred upon the Government of this Dominion by the War Measures Act. There is no doubt that those powers are exceedingly wide, and that they, therefore, impose upon those who are charged with exercising them with prudence and with care the duty of going not a step beyond the very wide bounds which Parliament chose to give to those powers. But, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, so long as the subject matter of this Order in Council is a proper subject matter upon which this Parliament might itself legislate—and of that I respectfully submit there is no doubt—there can be no question under the War Measures Act the last Parliament vested the full power that it had in that regard in the Governor in Council—and I may add that the parliament of that day did that unanimously, fully recognizing the importance of the Government being placed in such a position

that it would be possible for it promptly and effectively to take any or every step that it might deem to be necessary or advisable by reason of the conditions created by this unfortunate war.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think that, upon loking into the terms of the Order in Council, and more particularly its effect, it becomes clear that there is not any intention to attack any constitutional power of any province, and that in its effect it results in no infringement upon the legislative or executive power of any province; that it merely makes available to this Dominion of Canada—to the exclusion of the provinces it is true, as well as to the exclusion of all other bodies whatsoever and of all other persons—the money market of Canada, the borrowing power of the people of Canada.

Now, action of this kind is not without precedent. In the United Kingdom, at a very early stage of the war, the Imperial Government, found it necessary to take over into its own hands the entire control of its money market and to absolutely either exclude or restrict the access to that money market. It is not surprising that the Government of Canada should have found itself in the same position and in face of the same necessity with regard to the money market of Canada. Of course, in the United Kingdom there was no room for the suggestion even of any constitutional question with regard to it. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is in this country as little ground for raising a constitutional question with regard to this exercise of power on the part of this Government. It is true that we necessarily must keep within the limits of the British North America Act, whereas the Parliament of the United Kingdom has no such restriction imposed upon it. But so long as we keep within the limits of the powers conferred upon Parliament by that Act—and I respectfully submit that what I have said makes it clear that we have done that—even if it did happen that inconvenience results to the provinces and other would-be borrowers, that is no sufficient reason to question the constitutionality of the action taken by the Government in this Order in Council.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of the motion. I do not intend to deal with the constitutional question but there is another point of view to which I desire to draw the attention of the

members of this House. The preamble of this Order in Council says:

> Whereas it is advisable that the Canadian investment market should be conserved to facilitate the borrowing of the large sums of money that will be required for the prosecution of the war, and to enable His Excellency's Government, if need be, to fully avail itself of the loaning capacity of the country for the paramount purposes of national defence, and that the impairing of the market should be prevented by forbidding the offering and sale thereon of securities for raising money for purposes the execution of which may in the public interest be postponed until peace has been restored, provision being made for the issue by the Minister of Finance of a certificate permitting the offering and sale of such securities as the said Minister shall deem proper to except from such prohibition.

I quite agree, Sir, that sacrifices of liberty, and temporary suspension of laws can be justified when they are the result of imperious and unavoidable necessities for national defence. But, when they are not strictly based on such considerations, and if they be only the result of the natural tendency of all governments to reach after additional power; if they be the immediate consequence of the executive's scorn towards Parliament, provincial legislatures, municipal and similar institutions and the rights of citizens, then the sacrifice of civic liberties and the suspension of laws are without any possible excuse, and are illicit and worthy of blame. In European countries, where war exists, they have under similar circumstances for the salvation of the nation, suspended temporarily the application of certain laws, but they have never violated their constitutions. By this Order in Council our constitution is torn like a scrap of paper, as has been fully demonstrated by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). Supposing for the sake of argument that this Order in Council is absolutely constitutional, was the Government confronted by perils and unavoidable exigencies of national defence sufficient to justify it? To this question I believe we can answer in the negative. In support of this contention I will quote the opinion of a man whose judgment cannot be suspected of partisanship, and whose opinion is reported in The Montreal Gazette of March 21 as follows:

> Toronto, March 20.—Judge Denton has decided in favour of the London Life Insurance Company in the action brought by Mrs. M. F. Skimin for $500, life insurance on her soldier son Private Garnet Redvers Skimin, killed in action July 25th, 1916. An appeal will be taken.
>
> The question placed before Judge Denton was whether young Skimin was engaged in a military enterprise for the defence of Canada from invasion at the time of his death.

The Company claimed that within the terms of the policy Skimin was not so engaged, and therefore they were not bound to pay the amount of the policy.

Mr. Justice Denton, who rendered judgment in this case, is a member of the Supreme Court of Ontario. I concur in his view when he holds that this war is not a military enterprise for the defence of Canada against the invasion of an enemy, and I believe that I am right in concluding that the motive of national defence invoked in the preamble of the Order in Council in question for the purpose of justification, is, unfortunately, not well taken.

Moreover, there are many other reasons which militate against this Order in Council. In the Order in Council provision is made for the issue by the Minister of Finance of a certificate permitting the offering and sale of such securities as the minister may deem proper to except from such prohibition. How would that work, Sir? Either the sale of all such debentures will be authorized by the Minister of Finance, or authorization will be refused, or authority will be partly granted and partly refused, at the discretion of the minister. If the authorization for sale of all such securities is granted then this Order in Council is useless, and is only an encroachment upon the provincial autonomy, against which I strongly protest. If you interfere with provincial autonomy, Sir, you are going to break up Confederation, and that would be a national calamity.

Sir WILFRI LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: If such authorizations are all refused, for reasons of financial necessity, we have, it seems to me, the conclusive evidence that the Government badly needs all the available money in the country and desires to monopolize it for its own purposes, to the detriment of provincial governments, municipal corporations and school boards, which, just as much as the Federal Government, represent the people of this country, and need funds for the building and maintenance of schools, roads, and all other municipal and local improvements. Finally, if the Minister of Finance uses his discretionary power by partly granting, or partly refusing, such authorization, you have, Sir, the establishment of a new mode of patronage, and a most dangerous one, because it deals with financial interests, and if exercised arbitrarily may cause the ruin of many commercial corporations, while at the same time tending to the benefit of their rivals. Suppose for a moment, there are two commercial bodies who wish to issue and sell such bonds, one friendly to the Government and the other adverse to it. What guarantee have we that in such circumstances there will be no favouritism? In these troublous times the temptations are very numerous, and we know by experience that the present ministers may be led into temptation and exercise the power of patronage.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TRAHAN: Before the election the Government promised the abolition of patronage. But now, by this Order in Council they have created a new source of patronage. Therefore, from whichever point one examines this question, one must conclude that the Order in Council which we are discussing is nefarious and contrary to the public interest and to sound principles of public policy. For the reasons I have given, I, therefore, ask the Government to show that due respect for the law which is a guarantee of the peace, good order, liberty, prosperity and greatness of the nation. The Government must be the first to observe that respect, the first to present an example of proper regard for the Constitution. Otherwise the tampering, the manipulation, or, if you will permit me to use a French word the better to express my idea, the sabotage by the Government of the Constitution will tend, sooner or later, to bring about sabotage of the laws of the country by the people at large. I submit, Sir, that this Order in Council ought to be immediately repealed, because in my humble judgment it is an unqualified violation of the Constitution, an unjust encroachment upon provincial autonomy, harmful to Canadian credit and the development of our resources to their full extent, and because I am desirous of upholding Canadian interests above everything else and for all time.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Trahan) contends that this Order in Council was promulgated by the Government purely and solely for the purpose of invading the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures and of prohibiting school boards, parishes and provinces from raising money by the sale of securities. The hon. gentleman left me with the impression that it was his view that the Government had no other purpose in the promulgation of this Order in Council than that provincial and local interests should be harassed and their rights invaded. Of course, if my hon.

friend chooses to look at the matter in this spirit he cannot possibly understand the reason or the purpose for which the Order in Council was passed. Personally, I cannot see why there should be any lengthy and serious argument upon the constitutionality of this Order in Council. I do not object to the provincial legislatures making their protests upon constitutional grounds; the matter may be debatable as a constitutional question. But I do say that in all the circumstances the provinces, having once stated their objection and expressed their opinion as to the constitutionality of the Order in Council, might well now let the matter there stand.

I do not agree with the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) when he says that the Order in Council was received with pain and surprise by the people of Canada. I deny that assertion. I have, during the past few weeks, come in contact with representatives of many of the provinces of Canada and have had expressed to me by members of provincial governments their approval of this Order in Council. In fact, I know of only one province in Canada which has gone to the trouble of expressing at length a formal protest against the Order. I refer to the province of Quebec—although the intention and purpose of the Government in enacting this Order in Council having been explained, the Government of that province has, I think, also changed its view, if not from the constitutional viewpoint, at least from the practical standpoint.

Does the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan) mean to tell me that the financial necessity of the country in these days should give way to small parochial and provincial interests? He states that the motive in passing this Order in Council was to attack the borrowing powers of school boards, parishes and provinces; that it is an attempt to break the constitution. Well, I do say this: in these days provincial and parochial rights must, if necessary, give may to national interests. It is more important to save this country than it is to save the borrowing powers of small borrowing bodies. This Parliament has no desire—neither has the Government—to invade the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures; but in these days the Government must, at many times, do things which in ordinary times it would not attempt.

Let me explain in a few words the reasons which impelled the Government to pass this Order in Council. In carrying on civil Government and paying for our participation in this war, we are necessarily obliged to raise in one form or another a great deal of money. Hon. gentlemen know as well as I do that it is not possible to raise the necessary large amount for these purposes by the ordinary forms of taxation. We must, in the first place, provide sufficient revenue to carry on civil Government, and, in the next place, raise sufficient revenue to pay for carrying on our part of the war. Not only that; we must provide from time to time credits for carrying on the trade and commerce of the country. We could not export wheat; we could not export cheese; we could not export anything to-day unless the Government of Canada provided the financial resources or the credit in some form or other. In other words, the country must be self-contained financially; therefore, it is necessary that we be borrowers within Canada and for large sums. With these huge commitments for the present and for the future, is it unreasonable to say by Order in Council—particularly when we have the authority—that provinces, municipalities, companies and private individuals shall not issue and sell securities except by license of the Federal Government? It never was the intention of the Government that by this Order in Council provincial governments should be prohibited from borrowing upon the Canadian market. We realized that provincial governments could not go outside of Canada to borrow. None of the provinces can borrow to-day outside of Canada; neither can the Federal Government itself. When the Order was promulgated it became the policy of the Government to assist the provinces so far as they were unable to do so themselves by borrowing. Up to the present time one province has been loaned the sum of $2,500,000. The Dominion Government is also committed to make an advance of $3,000,000 to another province, upon terms, of course. A province which could not borrow upon fair terms in this country to-day could not borrow outside.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Which province, if you please?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not care to mention the province.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not?

Mr. DEVLIN: That is important.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not important.

Mr. BUREAU: It is.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: That is altogether a question of judgment, and I pro-

pose to use my own judgment in the matter, for the time being, at least.

Mr. BUREAU: The Order in Council, I suppose, makes it unimportant.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: We have made it known to all the provincial governments that in the event of their requiring to borrow any substantial sums of money and being unable to make favourable loans in Canada, we shall advance them the sums required for a period of five years at the rate of six and one-half per cent interest, taking the obligation of the borrowing province therefor. Let me repeat that, so far as I know, no province in Canada, since being acquainted with the purposes for which the Government promulgated this Order in Council, has made any objection to it. It would be very undesirable and detrimental to the national interest to have municipalities or corporations selling on the Canadian money market large loans at low prices, which some would in many cases be obliged to do. This would affect adversely our market for Victory Bonds in the future. Last year over $400,000,000 was borrowed in this country by the Canadian Government, practically for carrying on our part of the war, by the sale of Victory Bonds. It will be necessary at the latter part of the present year again to appeal to the Canadian people for a similar loan, and by the same means. It is obvious, therefore, that if provinces and municipalities were allowed to go upon the market making loans at expensive rates, the market might be very seriously impaired for Federal purposes, when we again ask the Canadian public to subscribe to a further issue of Victoria Bonds for the purpose, really, of carrying on the trade and commerce of the country and for paying for our participation in the war. At least the Government is of the opinion it should have power to control the same if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the argument made by the Minister of Justice convinces me that in the circumstances our jurisdiction is complete; that no constitutional argument can be urged against the validity of the Order in Council. As the Minister of Justice states that what we have done is to expropriate the money market of this country for Government purposes. We have not attempted to prevent provinces, or school boards, or parishes from issuing securities and selling them outside of Canada. We have not attempted to prevent provinces from imposing taxation for provincial purposes or anything of that character. All that we do say is that the Canadian money market may be necessary, even for the preservation of our national life, and if that be so, the Government were and are now of the opinion that we should exercise the right, if we have the power, of controlling, until the termination of the war, the securities which will be placed upon the money market of this country, and I think hon. gentlemen, upon reflection, will be disposed to agree with that view.

In the exercise of the control of issues made by provinces or municipalities or corporations, great care should, of course, be exercised. So far, I do not think a license has been refused by the Department of Finance. Our action, however, has had the effect that many issues would have been made were it not for the passage of this Order in Council; that is to say, that many persons knowing that their proposed issues were of very questionable importance, and perhaps even detrimental, to the country at this time, have declined to proceed with their promotions of one kind or another, and consequently have refrained from appearing before the Finance Department to ask for a license to sell issues of securities or shares. I promise my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that in exercising the discretion to refuse or to grant a license to make issues of securities in this country the best judgment will be used. I do not think that up to date any body, any person, or any province is in a position to complain of the exercise already made by the Government under the authority conferred upon it by the Order in Council, and I do not think any opportunity will be given to make objection to the discretion which the Government may exercise in the future.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With the object which the Government may have had in passing this Order in Council, that is, to secure to themselves primarily and preferentially to anybody else the financial resources of the country, no one can find fault. I agree altogether with my hon. friend that it is of the utmost advantage, and I would say more, even necessary, that the Government should endeavour to obtain for themselves, in preference to everybody else, what financial strength there is in this country. The only question is as to the method by which the Government have attempted to carry out this purpose, which is laudable in itself.

5 p.m. They want to keep for themselves the available finances of Canada. The question is whether or not they have, under our constitution, the power to deprive the provinces, and all the other bodies which derive their powers from

the provinces, of a similar advantage. My hon. friend has made a very complete and concrete case to the effect that the British North America Act specifically, in so many words, gives to the provinces the power to borrow. Section 92 of the British North America Act reads:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say,—
> The borrowing of money on the sole credit of the province.

This is so clear that the Minister of Justice does not attempt to dispute it, but his answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) in regard to this, was very technical and, might I say, sophistical. His whole argument was this, and nothing else: We do not propose and we did not intend to, and we did not, in fact, interfere with the powers of the legislatures to borrow; that is to say, notwithstanding the passing of this Order in Council, the legislatures have this power to borrow just the same as they had before. Of course, they have. But laws are passed to be executed; laws are passed to have their effect. The Legislature of Ontario or the Legislature of Quebec may pass a law to borrow money, but it cannot execute that law if this Order in Council places that power in the hands of the Dominion Government. Thus the Minister of Justice leaves to the provinces a power which is barren and of absolutely no effect at all. Why was this power given to the provinces? Because it was well understood that the provinces in carrying out their undertakings might have to borrow, and if a province can pass laws, but cannot execute them, it is mere sophistry to say that the power of the province is not invaded. If a province has the power to pass laws, but not the power to execute them, there is invasion of its power. The argument of my hon. friend is simply sophistical, and it is mere playing with words to tell us that a legislature has power to pass laws which it cannot execute. When it was understood that their powers were being invaded, some of the provinces took alarm and claimed that the Dominion Government was going beyond its powers and was endeavouring to take away from the provinces powers which they had absolutely. I cannot see how my hon. friend can escape from the argument I have made on this point. The Order in Council goes too far. The Minister of Justice said that, under the law, we have, in war time, the right of eminent domain. We have the right of eminent domain at all times, in time of war as well as in time of peace. We can expropriate the property of an individual. We can pass a law to-morrow to take the property of Mr. So and So, but I do not believe that under the constitution we have the power to expropriate the property of a province.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it has been held otherwise in the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not heard of and I would like to know of a case in which it has been held otherwise.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am speaking from recollection. I remember having had occasion to look into the matter a few years ago, and I discovered, a good deal to my surprise, that, if my recollection is correct, the power of the Federal Government to expropriate the property of a state Government has been recognized.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend found it rather surprising. I should imagine he did, and it is to my surprise as it is to his, if it be so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are both surprised.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It may be that under the constitution of the United States there is such a right, but my right hon. friend will not deny that up to the present the interpretation of the constitution of Canada has been that the legislative powers of the provinces were paramount within their spheres and that the legislative power of the Dominion was paramount in its sphere. If that be the proper interpretation of the constitution, I claim that in this country we have no such power as my right hon. friend has just stated. My hon. friend said a moment ago that only the province of Quebec had protested. I think I am right in saying that the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have also protested in the same manner as the province of Quebec. But I shall be sorry to dispose of that question simply upon a technical matter of this kind. While I am altogether behind the Government in their endeavour to secure to themselves primarily and in preference to everybody else the financial resources of the country, the Government, in my estimation, acted very unwisely when they acted as they did.

If they had consulted the provinces before, as they did afterwards, the question might have been settled otherwise and they would have obtained the unanimous consent of all the provinces. If they had said to the gov-

ernments of the different provinces, "We are to-day in the midst of an immense danger, the cause for which we are fighting is paramount, and everything must subside before it" the governments of the provinces would have been willing to stand behind them. If the Government had said to the provinces: "If you have to borrow money, we ask you not to borrow it from outsiders but give us the privilege of lending it to you," it would have been much better. They might have made the same suggestion to the municipalities. The Acting Minister of Finance said they would have lent the provinces the money themselves. If they had said to the provinces, "Do not got to market and try to borrow, but come to us and let us assist you" that would have been the proper course, and I would highly commend the Government for taking it. My only regret is that they should have, in an unduly and in the most highhanded manner, attempted to override the power which the provinces acquired. We must avoid, as far as we can, all difficulties of this nature in normal times, and we must still more avoid them in war times.

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my gratification that the leader of the Opposition thoroughly agrees with the policy which has been carried out, which was aimed at being carried out, under this Order in Council. The manner in which it has been done appears to be displeasing to some hon. gentlemen. The constitution would appear, in the words of the other speakers, to be in great danger, and, having been, for many years, one of the men referred to by the hon. mover of this resolution, as strongly in favour of the maintenance of provincial rights and the careful guardian of constitutional privileges from the provincial standpoint, I feel that I should not neglect the opportunity, on behalf of the provinces of thanking the hon. gentlemen for the extreme interest which they now take in the rights of those provinces. There were times when we could not get quite such strong views from some of them, or even from some of the members on this side of the House in regard to the rights of those provinces, and I am glad to say it is now generally conceded that the constitutional privileges of provinces should be recognized in all respects. In regard to this particular question the argument appears to be one that might more properly be addressed to the Privy Council when this question finally reaches there after the conclusion of the war. The brief that the hon. mover of the resolution had prepared was an extremely good one. It was one that would be very useful in arguing legal questions, but as he himself recognized, it is possible to prepare a brief on both sides of nearly every constitutional question that has arisen since Confederation. There has never been any great difficulty in getting eminent legal gentlemen to prepare very excellent briefs on both sides of the many constitutional questions that he has brought to the attention of the House this afternoon, and there has been, on many of these occasions, a reference to the constitution of the United States. It is one of the favourite places to go for analogy. The constitution of the United States, of course, varies considerably from the constitution of Canada. Their constitutions are ever so much more exact in their wording, being all written, and not depending upon common law at all. It is very easy to argue in regard to what is done and what is not done in the United States. But even in the United States, when occasion arises, we find that the Federal Government assumes authority, as the Federal Government does here on occasion, and the framers of the constitution of the United States would probably have been much surprised if they foresaw that such powers would be assumed as have been assumed by the Federal Government. We find that when the United States declared war their President assumed the power, as a war measure, of confiscating hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property of individuals in the various states, and we find that only the other day the President of the United States assumed control of thousands of miles of railway that were chartered by the various states of the Union, and that were not under the Federal control. These, Mr. Speaker, are matters of the same nature as are provided for in the Order in Council that has been under discussion this afternoon, and while I am not going to discuss this matter from the legal standpoint, as has been done so well by the Minister of Justice and by the mover of the resolution, I say that in this case, as in the cases I referred to, the Government of this country has only done what it was expected by every citizen of the Dominion it should do, to get the money that was actually necessary to conduct the war and to carry on the affairs of this country. This course may properly be followed further, and it may have to be followed further, if this country is to do what is absolutely essential at the present time. The question is vastly more important, even for the provinces themselves and the various

municipalities, than the purely technical question as to whether, for a short time, their powers have been infringed upon by this Order in Council. It is quite proper for those provinces to file a protest with the Minister of Finance in connection with this matter; quite proper for them from a purely provincial standpoint to see that their rights are not infringed upon in a permanent way without protest. I must differ from the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to what the proper course was, because not one of those provinces would have felt they were justified, if they had been asked previously, in giving up one jot or tittle of their provincial authority to the Federal Government. But, it being an accomplished fact, every one of those provinces, I believe, is prepared to join in heart and soul and assist the Minister of Finance in the getting of the money that is absolutely essential at this time.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) and I must admit that his remarks somewhat surprised me, all the more so since he belongs to those western provinces for which the hon. leader of the Opposition did so much while he was at the head of the public affairs of this country.

The hon. minister felt called upon to reproach the hon. leader of the Opposition with having given expression, this afternoon to what is for him a new idea, the idea of protecting the autonomy of the Canadian provinces. I do not know if the hon. minister has a short memory, or whether his knowledge of public affairs is not sufficiently wide, but despite my youth and my inexperience, and although I have seen less of public life than he, I remember, Mr. Speaker, the struggle carried on by the hon. leader of the Opposition for the autonomy of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, at a time when his own province threatened to turn against him because of his principles. But the hon. leader of the Opposition on that occasion proved that he was not a politician who varied his principles to suit the circumstances, but that, always, he guided himself and his party by the immutable principles of that Liberalism to which we belong this year, as we belonged last.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the hon. minister in the English tongue, but I hope that he understands me when I say that we, the Liberals of the province of Quebec, were the first to fight for the liber-

[Mr. Sifton.]

ties which his Government, a Government whose leader he remained until recently, have turned to their advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to retain the attention of this House very long. The main question brought up by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) was very ably discussed by the mover, as by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). But permit me, Mr. Speaker, as a Liberal, to say this: the question before the House today is not a new one. It is the great question which has been raised in all the centres of colonization where the English, after leaving the old land of liberty, came here, on Canadian soil, to open up to civilization a new domain.

When the American colonies struggled and fought against the central power, why did they do so? To try and prevent that central power from destroying the liberty of the individual states.

Here in Canada, there is not a man in this House who does not know of the struggles that were fought in the province of New Brunswick, in the province of Nova Scotia, before these provinces became a part of Confederation; neither is there here a man who does not know of the great struggles that took place in this country before Confederation, and while Confederation was being formed, between the Liberals who wanted the provinces to safeguard their own liberty and the Tories who wanted to centralize all authority in one government.

Mr. Speaker, Confederation was brought about. On what basis was it brought about? It was brought about on the following basis, to wit: that we should have in this country two Governments; the Federal Government which was to concern itself with all questions of a general character and of a national character; and the provincial governments which were to look after matters of local interest, of a less general character. But, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the Act of Confederation is such that the provincial powers are as weighty within the provincial sphere as is the federal power within the federal sphere, and that the government of Quebec, the government of Saskatchewan, the government of Alberta are sovereign governments just as the Government at Ottawa may claim to be.

But, Mr. Speaker, allow me to say this in closing: The hon. minister appealed to the patriotism of those who listened to him. We, of the Opposition, just as much as our friends on the other side of this House, are in favour of the triumph of the sacred cause of the Allies. At this moment we are passing

through a solemn hour. We have as much unrest, as much anxiety in our souls and in our hearts as have our friends on the right. When millions upon millions of men are fighting on the soil of Europe to uphold what is most sacred and most cherished for us all, i.e.: the right to breathe in freedom; when in the old province of Quebec prayers ascend from every hearth for the triumph of the British flag which has given us the constitutional liberties which we enjoy; we must not, while we are laying down our lives, while our children are shedding their blood, we must not forget the fundamental principles which should always guide the governments of this country; it must not be that while on the one hand we go to shed our blood for the cause of Liberty on the other, in our own country, the provinces lose their prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government formed last year is always inspired by the lofty ideas and the great principles which presided at the birth of Confederation; if the Union Government lays aside a policy which sets the provinces against the federal authority and declares for a policy of veritable union, of true understanding, the nine provinces will stand behind it in the prosecution of this struggle which must lead to an ultimate victory, though it may be that just now we are experiencing a few hours of difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the hon. member for Maisonneuve shows that the Liberal party, in this matter, respects the high principles which presided at its birth, which have fortified it in it's struggles, and which allow us young members on this side of the House to hope that as long as these principles are not forgotten, we may perhaps suffer defeat, but the dawn of the morrow will always find us as strong, just as mighty, clothed in the principle which will have guided us thoughout the battle.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION DEPARTMENT.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 11, respecting the Department of Immigration and Colonization, was read the third time.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT.

PROVISION FOR APPOINTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT AND INSPECTORS.

On the motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution; Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to amend the Penitentiary Act, Chapter 147, of the Revised Statutes, and to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint a Superintendent of Penitentiaries, who shall be an officer of the Department of Justice, and superintend the administration and business of the penitentiaries, and who shall be paid such salary as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council; and three Inspectors of Penitentiaries who shall be classified as officers of the Department of Justice, in sub-division B of the First Division of the Civil Service, and shall each receive a minimum salary of twenty-five hundred dollars per annum.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend explain?

Mr. DOHERTY: The reason for introducing this resolution, upon which a Bill is to be founded, consists in the fact that it has been found necessary to provide salaries for the offices that it is proposed to create. The Bill, which will be founded upon this resolution, proposes to modify the present Penitentiary Act in this respect: Under the Act the chief officers in control and having direction of the penitentiaries are two inspectors holding equal rank and performing duties that would belong to an inspector proper, that is the inspection of penitentiaries, and the duty of directing and controlling, under the Minister of course, the administration of the penitentiaries. I have now been connected with the administration of penitentiaries for some few years, and I think I may safely say that in practical operation the system does not work out to the best advantage. It has appeared to me, and I hope when we come to deal with the measure I shall be able to carry conviction to the House, that we would get a more efficient administration of the penitentiaries if we separated the work of inspection from the work of management, control, and direction, taking the latter and putting it into the hands of one officer who, under the minister, would have the responsibility, and providing at the same time for an officer who would hold the title of inspector and who would in reality perform the duties corresponding to that title; that is to say who would inspect the penitentiaries, and report on their condition in order to keep the superintendent, and through him, the department and the minister in touch with what is going on within these institutions. The Bill itself contains provisions, following upon that change of system, with regard to the making of regulations and so forth, transferring in effect that portion of the duties of the present in-

spectors which consists in the general direction of the penitentiaries over to the superintendent and making the modifications in the system which are necessitated by that transfer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask the minister in what respect he has found the present system deficient?

Mr. DOHERTY: It does not seem to me desirable that we should have two officers jointly, and upon a footing of perfect equality, acting in the direction of the penitentiaries. I think unity of control is highly important because it means unity of responsibility. There are great practical inconveniences from combining the duty of direction with that of inspection because the latter necessarily calls for absence from Ottawa. If you are going to have effective inspections of these seven institutions scattered over all the provinces you must necessarily have an officer in a position at any time it is thought desirable to proceed to these different penitentiaries and ascertain what is going on there.

There are advantages even in these visits, perhaps, being made not at stated periods when everybody expects the inspector, but in having all of the institutions in the position where the inspector may drop in at any moment. Now, it is, of course, impossible for the inspector to be in two places at once, "barring he was a bird," as one of my fellow-countrymen said, and we do find it necessary to have some one practically all the time in Ottawa to superintend, control and direct the management of these institutions. I venture to say that it is a more practical and businesslike method to have an officer to do the work of directing operations, and to have officers constantly available for the work of inspection proper. Inspectors, charged simply with the work of inspection, will, of course, not be held as of the same rank and importance as the superintendent or as the inspectors of the present day, and it will be noticed that we provide a smaller salary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask who the inspectors are at the present time?

Mr. DOHERTY: The inspectors at the present time are Mr. Douglas Stewart and Brigadier-General Hughes. General Hughes is absent on leave, and has been absent since the outbreak of the war, serving his country in a military capacity. That fact, of course, has also hampered our operations. We have been trying to get on with one officer who has been carrying on the duties of superintendence as well as of inspection.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not the advantage of knowing Inspector Hughes, but I know Mr. Douglas Stewart very well, and he is a very competent officer, and if the hon. minister could show me and the House the importance of providing assistance to Mr. Stewart, I think it would go very far towards the very natural objection to increasing, at this time especially, the personnel of any department. Mr. Stewart has occupied his present position for more than twenty-five years, and he is one of those servants of the public who have given intelligence, zeal and honesty to the discharge of all his duties, and if the hon. minister were to bring a report to the effect that Mr. Stewart is suggesting this arrangement, for my part I should certainly be disposed to agree at once to the change.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say that the change is the suggestion of Mr. Stewart. It is the result, as I said, of my own experience of the administration of these institutions since 1911, and when we come to deal with the measure itself—we are now dealing with the resolution principally with respect to the question of salaries—I hope to be able to satisfy the House that the proposed system will prove a more effective one; and while it is true that it will operate to increase the number of officers dealing with this function, I may point out that it will not necessarily operate to increase in any material degree the expense of carrying on the work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I cannot see that. At present, I understand, we have only two inspectors to do the work. Under this legislation you will have a superintendent of penitentiaries and three inspectors besides, making an increase of two in the staff.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is an increase of two in the staff, but the two present inspectors cost jointly $8,000. If we have but two inspectors—because we won't necessarily have three—at the salaries mentioned the cost would represent $5,000. If we pay the proposed superintendent the present salary of an inspector, the increase in expense would be only a thousand dollars. While there may be that extra expense, I do very confidently submit to the committee that there must necessarily be an increase of efficiency. It is not a matter of dealing with the personal qualifications of any one holding the office; I am speaking of the system. Where you have a system with one man charged with the direction and the responsibility, and where you have

people who may be thoroughly suitable people to do the inspection charged with the inspection, it does not necessarily follow that the qualities that make a good inspector make a good man to direct and control the administration of the penitentiaries. There is need, I may say, for an improvement in many respects in regard to the carrying on of the work of the penitentiaries, and probably of important changes with regard to the interior administration, more especially in connection with the work to be done by the superintendent. I am satisfied, and I commend that view to the committee, that we will get a situation where it will be more easy to carry out a proper system of efficient administration if we divide these two perfectly distinct classes of work, and if we arrive at a situation where, for the general direction and control, there is one responsible officer.

Mr. BUREAU: Did I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the two present inspectors are costing $8,000 and that the three inspectors will not cost any more, or did I misunderstand him?

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not say they would not necessarily cost any more. I pointed out that the inspectors, if this Bill be passed, would be officers of a quite different class from the present inspectors, and that the salary, at all events the initial salary that is mentioned, would be such that two of these inspectors will cost but a thousand dollars more than one of the inspectors costs at the present time. That to get the better system it will probably cost something more I do not desire to dispute; but I feel very strongly that the better system, which I am satisfied could be got by a reconstitution, is worth any increase that it may necessitate. I pointed out that, if we had but two inspectors under this new system, with a superintendent, and if the salary of the superintendent were fixed at the same amount as that of one of the present inspectors who exercise the superintending power, there would be an increase of a thousand dollars in cost.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Whilst I agree with the leader of the Opposition that this is not the time for increased expenditure, I would forgive the hon. Minister of Justice if, in order to increase the efficiency of the administration of the penitentiaries, there would be, following the creation of these two new offices, some sort of prison reform in the Dominion. There is no doubt that we have many more penitentiaries than we had at the time that Mr. Douglas Stewart was placed at the head of that service, and that the new provinces and the increased population have at least doubled the duties of that office. The point I wish to make is, that, if the creation of the new offices will give a better administration of the penitentiaries in the way of prison reform, I have no objection to the Bill. My hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) knows by past experience in this House that serious revelations have been made as regards the treatment of convicts in our penitentiaries which certainly drew from the Department of Justice very drastic reports. I do not go as far as to say that the administration of our penitentiaries should be on a par with the new system at Sing Sing, where the Governor is the pal of all the convicts, although it has been found that that system has worked wonders in some cases.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But certainly, and I am sincere in what I am now stating, there is need of more efficiency in the superintendence of the penitentiaries. Society is too apt to forget the convict once he has crossed the threshold of the penitentiary, whereas he should be followed into the institution and helped to become a man once more.

It was my good, or bad, fortune, some years ago, to visit the Kingston penitentiary, a splendid institution, but I was sorry on that occasion to notice a number of young convicts of about nineteen years of age associating with older convicts of the age of fifty, sixty, and seventy. I noticed, too, that these young men were breaking stones with the older convicts, and possibly learning by that association the tricks of much more serious crimes than had brought them within the penitentiary's gates. I would point out, also, that there are methods of punishment inflicted on the convicts which are out of date, methods which, though quite proper in the middle ages, are in the present century antiquated and out of place. I repeat that if efficiency in the conduct of the penitentiaries will be increased by the appointment of the officers mentioned I raise no objection to the resolution. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Justice will respond to public sentiment on this matter, for that sentiment is not a fictitious one. I do not go the length of saying that you should allow associations of ladies to send flowers to men condemned to death who are to be conducted to the gallows the next morning; but I say that there are certain means of improving the moral conditions of the convicts which ought to be appreciated by the superin-

tendent of these institutions. Undoubtedly we must change some of the methods now in vogue for the sake of society and in the best interests of those poor creatures who are unfortunate enough to be incarcerated within the walls of a penitentiary.

Resolution, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Mr. Doherty thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the Penitentiaries Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

MONTREAL HARBOUR ADVANCES ACT, 1914.

On motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Bill No. 15, to amend the Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

On section 1—C. 41 of 1914 amended so that advance of $9,000,000 may also be used to pay $300,000 of debentures maturing in 1918.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister please explain?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When this Bill was introduced, the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) asked me to advise him what the programme of the harbour commissioners of Montreal would be for the season of 1918. Following the rigid policy of economy that the Union Government is putting in force, I am holding down as well as I can the expenditure on the port of Montreal for the coming season. The harbour commissioners, subject to my approval, propose to spend during the coming season a total of only $220,000. Their intention is to continue the Montreal harbour system of railways further down the harbour in order to supply the various industries there and new ones which we hope will be located. That is estimated to cost $150,000. Then there is an amount of $15,000 for roadways and railway tracks on wharves. The dredging that will be required in connection with this extension of harbour railways is estimated to cost $50,000. Then there is $5,000 for electric system, power and lighting, making a total expenditure for the coming season of $220,000. In 1917 the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal spent a total of $705,000; in 1916, $1,237,918.31; in 1915, $1,922,581.69. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that the amount we propose to spend for the coming year is very small compared with the amounts spent in previous years. In addition to the $220,000 expenditure to which I have alluded, an amount of $300,000 will be available to retire the debentures that this Bill calls for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The committee will be very much interested in the statement which has just been made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. No work is more familiar to my hon. friend than the work of the Montreal Harbour Commission. Indeed, if I should express regret it is that my hon. friend is not still at the head of that commission rather than in the bad company in which he now finds himself. But, to be serious, while we are speaking of improvements at the harbour of Montreal, may I ask my hon. friend if precautions are being taken in all ports of Canada where munitions are stored to avoid any such disaster as that which occurred at Halifax last December? I am informed by an authority whom my hon. friend knows well— the harbour master of Montreal—that during several months of the year the city of Montreal is exposed to the same danger as that which brought about the disaster which took place at Halifax. I myself have seen the shells and other munitions there. It seems to me that any such danger can be obviated if proper precautions are taken. The people of Montreal and of other ports through which shells are being shipped look upon the minister to prevent in the future the recurrence of what has happened in the past.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I deeply sympathize and so does the Government, with those who suffered by the terrible disaster which overtook the city of Halifax on December 6th last. So far as the port of Montreal is concerned, one of my first acts when I became minister was to call the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to Ottawa and to give them the most explicit and clear instruction that for the coming year no high explosive should be stored or loaded in the centre of the port of Montreal, or in what might be more properly termed the congested area. I have arranged that during the coming year all high explosives will be loaded many miles east of congested portion of the Harbour, in what is known as opposite Pointe aux Trembles. That is another reason why we are extending the

railway tracks down there. A special shed is being built for that purpose, and every precaution is being taken to avoid accident. I am also having expert navigators draw up very carefully prepared rules for the guidance of munition ships entering the port of Montreal or any other of the seaports on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. With the precautions that are being taken in the matter of loading high explosives and the providing of rigid rules for the guidance of munition vessels and all other ships entering seaports, we hope to avoid any such unfortunate disaster as that which took place at Halifax.

Mr. MURPHY: I observe that the first item of $150,000 covers the greater part of the proposed expenditure during next season. To what service will that item be specifically applied?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have their own traffic department; that is to say, all the railways bring their loaded freight cars to a certain point and then the Harbour Commissioners' traffic department, with their own engines, pick up the cars and place them at the various sheds throughout the harbour, or take them further east, as may be required.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On their own rails?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. Prior to the Harbour Commissioners doing that, the port of Montreal was very much congested, because the large railway companies very often used the harbour terminals as their own railway terminals and thereby very seriously blocked the traffic. When I was a member of the Montreal Harbour Commission my colleagues and I organized what was known as a traffic department. We bought our own engines and had our own expert men to handle the traffic and I think they handled considerably over 100,000 cars during the first season. The Harbour Commissioners have now extended the railway quite a considerable distance below the Vickers' shipbuilding yard, and this $150,000 is to continue it further east so as to serve the large industries that are located in that district.

Mr. MURPHY: Approximately how far east?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The railway at the present time goes down, if my memory serves me aright, about one mile below the Vickers' works, and it is the intention to extend it—I cannot give the exact mileage, but I should say a couple, and possibly three miles.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board, salaries and contingencies, $203,212.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the Acting Minister of Finance kindly explain the increases in the various departments?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There have been no additions to the staff of the department, so that the number of employees in this department is exactly the same as last year, and the increases in salaries are due to statutory increases. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the last session of Parliament an Act was passed granting an increase of $100 to the second and upward divisions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A flat increase?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, and owing to that amendment, and promotions which came in the regular course, the total amount for salaries required this year is about $6,000 more than last year. The other increase is for printing and stationery. Last year this vote was $7,500. This year the department is asking for $15,000. This is due to the fact that larger quantities of stationery than usual are required in the Department of Finance on account of public loans and matters of that kind, and it is also due to the increased cost of paper and stationery. I am instructed that the increase is due entirely to these two facts. There is also an increase of $3,500 for sundries which is also due largely to the increased cost of sundry articles from time to time required by the department.

Civil Government—departments generally—contingencies—care and cleaning of departmental buildings, including amount of $100 to E. Snowdon for firing noon gun, $310,000.

Mr. BUREAU: How is the increase of $35,000 justified?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The char service of the Government buildings is attached to the Department of Finance. Possibly it might better be attached to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BUREAU: Was not that work until this year in the care of the Department of Public Works?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. The increase is due to the fact that a larger number of buildings than heretofore are to-day occupied by the Government in the city of Ottawa. It was found necessary during the present year to employ three additional men and 103 additional women. This increase covers increases in wages and the increased cost of some small materials required from time to time.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are these additional employees in connection with the Victory Loan?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Partially.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How many additional clerks have thus far been called into the service on account of the Victory Loan?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am unable to answer the hon. gentleman at the moment. The cost of that service is not included in this appropriation. I should imagine there were some 300 additional clerks employed by reason of the Victory Loan.

Mr. BUREAU: Does that require the use of an additional building, or is their work being transacted in the offices of the Department of Finance?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is largely conducted in the offices in the East block occupied by the Department of Finance, but they are not quite sufficient to house the number of employees, and just a few days ago a building was secured in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BUREAU: Where?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am unable to say exactly where.

Mr. COPP: Is the extra rent of the building secured a few days ago included in this appropriation?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. This has nothing to do with rentals of buildings.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In regard to the housing of the employees of the Department of Finance, I noticed the other day, when going to the office of Mr. Breadner, the gentleman who has charge of the income tax, that hundreds of young girls were being placed in the lobby, working under very great disability and under conditions which were not at all hygienic. I do not know if rooms cannot be found in that building and accommodation provided for those young girls. I should say that the accommodation at present is very poor.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: What building is that?

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: The East block.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry to say a great number of people are employed in the Finance Department who are obliged to work in the hallways of the building. No other space was available in any of the departmental buildings, and space could not be secured anywhere else in the city.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Other places are being secured, are they not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The department rented another building somewhere in the city a few days ago. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is hardly a fair way in which to ask employees to work. The department has in mind asking the Government to construct a temporary wooden building just behind the East block, because it will be necessary to employ a large staff in connection with this loan for some two or three years probably.

Department of Insurance—	
Salaries.. ....$	35,950 00
Contingencies..	32,500 00

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The details of this item appear on page 36 of the estimates. There is a slight increase in this vote, but only one additional person has been added to the service. The increase, therefore, is largely attributable to the statutory increases.

Mr. MURPHY: What services are performed in connection with the item "valuation of securities."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All the insurance companies are obliged under statute, to deposit securities with the Government, particularly foreign companies. I am unable to say at the moment what relation there is between the volume of the business or capital of the company and the amount of securities deposited, but at least there are securities in a very large sum deposited with the insurance branch of the Department of Finance, and I assume it is necessary to have responsible clerks to value these securities.

Mr. MURPHY: Would that not be part of the ordinary duties of some of the members of the staff? My inquiry is directed to ascertain why there is a special item, as distinct from the salaries paid officials.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It has been customary to have this item, and I shall inform my hon. friend about it at some other meeting of the committee.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: I see an item under "Contingencies" of "Printing,

binding and stationery including cost of annual report, $21,000." Can my hon. friend tell me how much is paid yearly for the printing of the annual report of the Insurance Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not the information at hand this moment. If the hon. gentleman desires it, I shall be pleased to give it to him at another meeting of the committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Looking over the Auditor General's Report I find a departure from the custom of previous years, and that instead of printing the Auditor General's Report in both French and English, the headings only are printed in French. I suppose that following the same line of economy, the insurance report, as well as the report of unclaimed balances in the banks, would lend itself to being printed in the same way as the Auditor General's Report is printed. It would even be more appropriate to print only the headings of these reports in French than in the case of the Auditor General's Report. If you introduce economy in this way into the printing of the Auditor General's Report, you should at least provide that items pertaining to Quebec should be printed in French, because they are more looked into by the French people of Quebec than by the people of the other provinces. Be that as it may, if this economy is going to be made in the printing of the report, it ought to be further considered.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The cost of printing and stationery generally, has very much increased over that of two or three years ago. Higher wages are paid to employees, and the cost of paper is very much greater this year than it was twelve months ago. Compared with two years ago I would imagine the increase is at least 100 per cent in some grades of stationery, and more than 100 per cent in other grades. The increase is undoubtedly due to that.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I do not know whether this is the time to ask the question, but on this matter of printing, might I ask the acting-minister if the departments are managing their own printing now? Is the Printing Bureau managing its own printing, or is it given out in job work, as it often has been? And, if any printing is given out, I suppose now that we have struck the age of economy and no patronage, the work will be given by tender and contract, and not as a matter of patronage. Possibly this is not the time to make this statement, but I am reminding the minister of it, and I would like to know if the Printing Bureau itself is managing the printing of the Government or is it given to outside parties?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Whether the hon. gentleman has asked this question at the right time or not, I think we have struck the age of economy and no patronage in public expenditure—at least I hope so. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman feeling perhaps that I am wholly accurate, but I think the departmental reports are largely printed at the Printing Bureau. Considerable printing, however, has heretofore been done outside, but I have been informed by the Secretary of State, who has charge of public printing, that he anticipates that hereafter the department will be able to do most, if not all, of the printing required by the several departments of the Government.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER: I hope I will not be regarded as taking an undue liberty if I ask the hon. gentleman on the front benches on both sides to speak louder. They have pleasant little conversations with each other across the Table, but in other parts of the House we are not in the matter at all, and in order to thoroughly understand what is going on, as we would like to do, we must ask hon. gentlemen on both sides to speak louder.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), in reply to the member for North Cape Breton, remarked that the Government had struck the age of economy and no patronage. Possibly my hon. friend meant that some of his colleagues had struck it so hard that they had knocked it out completely, and restored the old order of patronage, because I can give some instances where the old order still prevails. But that, I admit, would not be particularly germane to these estimates. I merely ask what is the extra clerkship, if it has been filled, and, if so, by whom?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: An additional clerk was added to the third division on the request of the Superintendent of Insurance.

Mr. MURPHY: Has it been filled through the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should think so.

Mr. MURPHY: Does my hon. friend know?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have knowledge of one appointment to that division within the last three or four weeks and that was filled by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that the one we are discussing?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Can the Acting Finance Minister tell me where the Insurance Report was printed last year, whether at the Montreal Gazette office or at the Bureau?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot answer that question.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Can the hon. gentleman tell me where he is going to get it printed this year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That report will be printed at the Printing Bureau, if they are at all able to do the work, and, if not, I suppose it will be printed elsewhere.

An hon. MEMBER: At the Toronto Globe?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I would like to ask if the hon. member for Brome is in the House.

Mr. McMASTER: I am here listening.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I need not remind hon. gentlemen that this is a new Parliament with a great many new men. Items of expenditure will strike this House now perhaps more vividly and forcibly than at any other time. It is well that it should be brought to its attention that whenever we spend money there must be some good reason for it and hon. members will go home with the impression that this is an honest Opposition whatever the Government may be. There is an item of $6,500 for travelling expenses. Some of my good friends from the province of Ontario who are accustomed to living on the farm would think that a man would do a lot of wandering around for $6,500. Perhaps it would be well for the minister to tell us what good results the Dominion of Canada got for this expenditure of $6,500.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope my hon. friend does not assume anything else than that the country received very substantial benefit for any sum paid out in the past for travelling in connection with the superintendence of insurance. I have before me the Auditor General's Report for 1917 and I would gather from it that this amount was required to pay the travelling expenses of officers of the department because they must travel throughout the provinces of Canada inspecting the several insurance companies doing business. My hon. friend will realize that this is absolutely necessary and that it incurs an expenditure.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

We are asking Parliament to vote money for that purpose.

Office of the Auditor General—	
Salaries ....$	150,125 00
Contingencies	10,000 00

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There are two less employees in this branch of the Department of Finance. The increases in salaries to be paid are due to the fact that in the second division, sub-division B, there have been two advances. In the first division and the third division there is a less number required than last year but the result is an increase in salaries of some $3,000. There is an increase in printing and stationery. What I have said in respect to printing and stationery in the other branches of the Department of Finance is equally applicable to this.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the minister to say that the number of employees has decreased and the salaries increased?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: How is it that in the Auditor General's office they can decrease the number of employees at a time when the expenditure of the country has increased a thousandfold? If I understand rightly our organization, that is the branch of the public service where all our financial arrangements and expenditures are controlled. I see that in the Department of Finance they are increasing the number of employees, whereas, in the Auditor General's office, which has to scrutinize the public expenditures, they are decreasing the number of employees and increasing the salaries. There may be something in increasing the salaries and trying to get more work out of the men, but I do not believe that as the work increases you are going to get more efficient service by saddling half of the staff with the whole of the work and leaving the others out altogether. If your work is going to increase in proportion to the increase in expenditures, I do not understand how there can be a proper audit of the public accounts if you decrease the staff in the way that has been suggested by my hon. friend.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the minister state the reason for the falling off in the travelling expenses as between 1917 and 1918? Does that item in 1917 include the expenses of the Auditor General's trip to the old country?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that is the explanation.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did he submit a detailed report of his visit to the old country?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot answer my hon. friend. I imagine he made a report to the department.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have not seen it.

Mr. CANNON: What is the meaning of the item: "including advice to the Auditor General?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Auditor General occasionally requires the advice of counsel and I assume it is considered quite proper that we should make it possible for the Auditor General to obtain it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does he choose his own counsel? He does not have to take the counsel assigned to him by the Department of Finance?

Mr. FIELDING: The very object of this is that he shall have independent counsel if he desires. This is an item that has been in the estimates for many years. In some years I do not think it is used but the object is that if there is a difference of opinion, such as will occasionally arise between the Auditor General and the Government, if he wishes to do so, he may obtain independent counsel. There is nothing new in the item and it is a very useful one.

Mr. BUREAU: I am anxious to know how it is that in the Auditor General's Department, where the work is increasing more than in any other department of the Government, they can afford to dispense with the services of employees. If there is going to be an audit of the expenses of the public treasury we want to know what kind of an audit it is going to be. We want to know what kind of economy it is that diminishes the control over the public expenditure for the sake of a couple of, I suppose, very small salaries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to take the view that the number of employees in any department of the Government should not be diminished whether there be reasons for it or not, and that efficiency can only be maintained by retaining the old number in each department? Apparently there is a decrease in the number of employees in this branch, but I assume that the Auditor General is quite prepared to carry on his work efficiently with the decreased staff as well as he could with the staff of last year. I think it might be said that any department could be carried on much more efficiently by a reorganization and decrease in the number of employees. I had rather hoped that my hon. friend would commend the department for assuming to carry on the work of this branch with a lesser number of employees than before.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would not the reason naturally be that during the war the expenditures in connection with the ordinary departments of Government have fallen off and are now concentrated in the Militia Department?

Mr. BUREAU: Are the accounts of the Militia Department audited by the Auditor General?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not personally acquainted with the matter of the auditing of the militia accounts as hon. gentlemen will well understand. I understand that the Militia Department has its own auditing staff, and I assume that its accounts are subject to the control and supervision of the Auditor General. The suggestion is being made at the present time that the auditing staff of the Militia Department be taken over by the Auditor General, and it is now being considered by the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend asked me just now if I thought the efficiency of the department depended upon the number of employees. I do not consider numbers alone, but quality as well. It might be that in other departments you could decrease the number of men just now without affecting the service very much. But what I want to impress upon my hon. friend is that, of all the departments of the Government the one which is most heavily saddled just now on account of the war and of the increased expenditure and the enormous amounts to be vouchered through is the Auditor General's Department, and for the life of me I cannot see how it is that when we were spending 120 millions a year there was a staff the same size as there is to-day, and now when we are spending 300 or 400 millions annually we are going to decrease the number of employees. I do not think the Auditor General can accomplish treble the work by decreasing the number of men at his disposal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I have informed the committee, it will be understood that while the expenditures of the Militia Department are exceedingly great to-day, still they have their departmental audit which, of course, relieves the Auditor General of a great deal of work. A great proportion of the purchases of the Militia Department and of the Naval Department are made by the War Purchasing Commission. In that

branch of the service they have something equivalent to an audit, or, at any rate, their system of conducting the purchases for these departments naturally relieves the Auditor General's staff of a great deal of work. I think it is quite possible for the Auditor General to carry on his work with the number of men he has been accustomed to have, namely about 100. He is an officer perfectly independent of any branch of the Government, and if he feels he has not sufficient assistance he knows that he can readily get it by asking Parliament.

Mr. CANNON: Can the hon. minister tell me where the printing for the department was done last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At the Printing Bureau largely.

Mr. CANNON: Not at L'Evénement, at Quebec?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not sure as to that. If my hon. friend suspects that there was any done there, or knows that there was, I shall be prepared to accept his statement.

Mr. CANNON: I have no statement to make.

Mr. BUREAU: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there were auditors in the Militia Department and also in the War Purchasing Commission?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I did not say they had auditors.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, what have they got?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have quite a large staff—

Mr. BUREAU: Excepting auditors.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The staff which purchases independently of the departments the necessary commodities for our Canadian army and navy—

Mr. BUREAU: That is not what I want to get at. Who controls the accounts and the amounts that are paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Ultimately, they are subject, of course, to an audit by the Auditor General.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the Auditor General is not relieved of any work that my hon. friend claims he is relieved of by having the purchases made outside the department?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would think that if purchases for our army and navy are made by an independent commission, established purely for that purpose, it would tend to lessen the audit work of the Auditor General. I think he should feel, at least, that the purchasing would be less liable to errors and discrepancies of one kind and another.

Mr. BUREAU: What difference is there between the purchases made by an independent commission or purchases made by the Department of Public Works? Will the hon. gentleman insinuate, for instance, that the purchases made by the Minister of Public Works——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman cannot get me to insinuate anything.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who is accountable for his department, and who sits in this House where he can be criticised, be subject to an audit and a man who has no responsibility whatever, who is appointed by Order in Council, so subject? I say that cannot be explained, and I cannot swallow that explanation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend has been swallowing it for two or three years.

Mr. BUREAU: I left it to you to test, which you did at that time.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am talking about the matter of auditing. My hon. friend is putting up a man of straw for the pleasure of knocking him down. If my hon. friend wants me to make some insinuation against somebody else——

Mr. BUREAU. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not my way of discussing. I want to get the explanation. I want to know what difference there is between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and these gentlemen who are appointed by Order in Council in the matter of auditing. You want his accounts to be audited, but you do not want Mr. Flavelle's accounts to be audited.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Militia, or the Minister of Naval Affairs, is as responsible as any other minister for the expenditure of his department notwithstanding the fact that to some extent purchases are made by the War Purchasing Commission for the two departments mentioned. I cannot quite follow the protest of my hon. friend. If it amounts to anything it is this: that he objects to the Auditor General's Department having ninety-nine persons upon the staff. Does

he think it should be 101 or 120? I think he should commend the efforts of the Auditor General to perform his duties with a smaller staff than he had last year.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend cannot shift his ground like that. I do not object to the number of men. What I object to is that these gentlemen appointed by the Government, or appointed at the suggestion of the Government, who are not responsible to the people, will buy goods and spend the public money—for, after all, it is our money whether raised by taxation or by Victory Loans; it is the people's money and they have to pay it back —without being subject to the same surveillance as the other members of the Government who are at the head of a department. One of two things is true: either the Auditor General is relieved of a certain amount of work because the purchases made by this Commission are not audited——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They are audited.

Mr. BUREAU: If so, where does the the Auditor General's relief come in? His work must increase because the amounts to be audited are increasing. If the Auditor General can do all this work with a smaller staff, we have reason to be suspicious and to have doubts as to whether this work is not being done in too much of a hurry. Either these accounts are audited or they are not. If ten times the number of accounts are being audited to-day than were being handled two or three years ago, I do not see how he can decrease his staff, unless the Auditor General's Department has been a home for loafers in days gone by. I say the country does not get the protection it is entitled to, and the people have not all the safeguards they should have around the expenditure of this money.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would there be anything in the suggestion that another party was in power a few years ago, and that the Auditor General required more men to do the work?

Mr. BUREAU: I refer to last year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, when my hon. friend's party was in power.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) is labouring under some misapprehension. The payments made by the Government, no matter in what branch, are audited by the Auditor General. While it is true that public expenditures are very much greater this year than in pre-war times, it does not follow that the Auditor General's staff need necessarily be increased to any great extent. It might not require more work to audit an expenditure of a million dollars than one of $100; possibly it might be very much easier, because in connection with military and naval affairs expenditures are made involving large amounts in the aggregate, but nevertheless they are very easily audited and the details of the expenditure very easily and readily acquired.

Mr. BUREAU: There are new items of expenditure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I assume, that the number of the staff at the Auditor General's Department as now constituted, namely, ninety-nine, is sufficient to audit the public accounts of this country, but if that official needs further assistance I suppose he will make the necessary request. Until he does I do not think any department of the Government will be, or should be, anxious to add more men to his staff.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not.

Mr. DEVLIN: In my opinion the Auditor General, Mr. Fraser, should be commended by this House for the way in which he carries out his work. I do not think there has ever been a more competent servant of the country than the present Auditor General.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN: He carefully scrutinizes the accounts and he certainly gives entire satisfaction. Any one who goes through the Auditor General's Report will find that whenever there is any doubt as to any items of expenditure the Auditor General is certain to call for vouchers with respect to it. I have listened to the remarks of my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and to the answers given by the Minister of Finance, and I think that the point raised by the former is very well taken, and ought to commend itself to the very serious and earnest consideration of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). I am sure that though some people's memory may be very short, he at least cannot forget that there was a time in his existence when he was a Reformer. When seated on this side of the House he, in common with others in our ranks, sought to suggest certain reforms to the gentlemen occupying the ministerial benches. To-night he has been advised by another Reformer, (Mr. Bureau) and he meets that advice by the remark: "Oh, well, this has existed three years, and there was no very great criticism about it." What existed two or three years ago

was the system of verifying accounts in the different departments. There has been one Auditor General to review the expenditures for Canada, but a system has grown up under which there are too many auditors in the different departments who try to induce the Auditor General to accept their audit and are not willing that he should criticise the audit which they make. That system ought to be abolished, and Mr. Fraser should be given the necessary staff to audit all the accounts, I do not care how many it may take. We learned from an Order in Council laid upon the Table the other day that a staff had been appointed through the introduction of an innovation which will cost the country over $200,000. I refer to the staff of the Food Controller. We have that official expending thousands of dollars upon food control in this country and from that expenditure we have obtained absolutely nothing. There has been some advice to the women of the country and to the grocers and other dealers, and a great deal of advice to Sir Joseph Flavelle and the companies in which he is interested, but there has been absolutely no action taken. That money could very well be saved to this country. I suggest in all good nature to the new Minister of Finance that one of the reforms which he should inaugurate in the present Government is a reform along the lines proposed by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), viz., to cut out the different auditing systems in the several departments, and place that auditing under the one head, Mr. Fraser. We find, and I am sorry to note it, that the expenditure on civil government for this year is going to cost over $1,000,000 more than it did for the past twelve months. One would almost think that we were going through an absolutely normal period, one would almost forget that we are passing through the most critical period, not only in the history of Canada, but of the Empire. We have been informed by the Finance Minister no later than to-day that we cannot borrow money in the United States or in England, and I know that we are not going to Japan, to the West Indies or to China to try and get it. We have got to raise whatever money we need in this country, and we will do so if the people are in a position to lend whatever money is needed. In view of the prevailing situation it becomes imperative for the new blood in the Cabinet—and there are good and earnest men there—to introduce reforms. Some of the old timber has disappeared, and although some of it is still left, it will disappear.

[Mr. Devlin.]

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: There is very little left of it to-night.

Mr. DEVLIN: I suggest to the new timber that they should try and save the money of the people of Canada. A glance at these estimates would not disclose that we are in a wartime period. One would imagine that we could go to Washington as often as we liked and continue those trips that Sir Thomas White made for the purpose of getting money. And yet, the present Minister of Finance tells us that we cannot obtain money outside the country. In that case it becomes imperative to save every twenty-five cent piece, and I say this increasing of staffs and multiplication of departments where they are not necessary is an extravagance. I appeal to my hon. friends upon the other side of the House, who for want of a better name I will call the new timber in the Cabinet, to do their utmost to try and get the old members of the Government to forget the old system of expenditure and audit which used to prevail and try and introduce some reforms.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: On this question it is suggested that the Auditor General does not exercise the same functions or powers as formerly. The ordinary member of the House, such as myself, believes that we have some protection in the Auditor General, that everything in the way of expenditure has to go under his eye, and that he has to be satisfied that it is for a good and sufficiently proper purpose before the money is paid out. If it is the fact that round-about methods have been found by which the vouchers are passed, cheques signed, and the people's money paid out for commodities without undergoing the rigid scrutiny of the Auditor General, we most certainly protest against it. I would like to ask the minister if there were many appeals from the Auditor General this year to the Treasury Board in which the Auditor General was overruled?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am a member of the Treasury Board, and as far as I am concerned I do not recall any such appeals last year.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Railways understands to what I am referring. He knows that in the past there have been a great many of these appeals in which the Auditor General has been overruled.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not remember of any such case last year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Report of the Auditor General will disclose whether there have been any such appeals or not.

Department of Public Works—	
Salaries ....$	574,955 00
Contingencies..	56,000 00

Mr. BUREAU: How does that compare with last year?

Mr. CARVELL: The decrease would be $45,000 but for the statutory increases, which bring it down to about $31,000. In addition, the number of clerks and officials in the department has been reduced from 396 to 350. Among the 350 there are 20 or 21 vacancies which will not be filled. Salaries are provided for in this vote for the 20 or 21 who are not there and who will not be there, but during the year certain officials are entitled to promotion, and if a man is promoted from subdivision B to subdivision A of the second division and there is no provision for his salary in the higher class, he could not receive it. This vote is left in the estimates, therefore, for that purpose. I assure the committee that not one of the positions will be filled except by promotion. About 25 men who are away from the department on military service are drawing full civil pay. These are the men who enlistetd prior to the Order in Council of November or December, 1915. Then, we have made up a list of 62 officials who are available for other departments of the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: Does that mean dismissal?

Mr. CARVELL: No, but they are available for other departments of the Government if their services are required. I see no reason why it would not be possible to absorb these unnecessary officials into other departments which require increased staffs, and it is the intention so to absorb them if at all possible, rather than bring in outside men. There may be a number of these whose services could be dispensed with; some may be old men who would not be acceptable to another department requiring assistance. There are in the department—I think I might as well make the suggestion here, because it has to be faced—probably 20 employees who have outlived their usefulness; men and women who have spent the greater part of their lives in the department and who are not entitled to superannuation or retiring allowance of any kind. Their services are not required; indeed, they are not rendering very much service to the department. It would be cruel to turn them out on the world, and I think that provision should be made for a retiring allowance of some kind to cover employees of this class. We could then get rid of them in the department, save the room which they are occupying, and get along without filling their positions by younger persons. On the whole I am satisfied that we could make a reduction of about 100 officials in the department and do very nicely indeed whatever work may be necessary. Not much work is being done in the department at present, and this very largely accounts for the statement which I have just made. We could however, get along without quite a number that we now have on the pay roll.

Mr. CAHILL: I notice that in the item for printing and stationery there is a saving of $6,000. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works could inform the acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) where he expects to get his printing done.

Mr. CARVELL: I have had so many things to think about during the last three or four months that I have not gone into this matter. I only know that my deputy says that he can get along with $11,000 instead of $17,000 and when he tells me that I know he means it. I have no knowledge of where the printing has been done. I do know that the report of the department which I have in my desk—I intended to table it to-day, but I was talking to my colleague when motions were called; I shall lay it on the Table to-morrow—has been very much reduced in size, and that accounts to some extent for the reduction. I cannot give the details now, but I will furnish them to my hon. friend if he so desires. It will be noticed also that there is a large reduction in clerical and other assistance, a reduction of $14,000 in travelling expenses, and a small reduction in sundries. The expenditure for contingencies is reduced from $85,000 to $56,000. I am satisfied that we can keep within the amount asked for in this vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have seen in the press of late that Mr. Horwood has been given leave of absence. Is that a temporary or a permanent leave of absence, and if Mr. Horwood has resigned, on what ground did he do so?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Horwood's leave of absence is permanent.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has said that 62 officials are available for other departments. At Three Rivers there is a resident engineer and also a district or consulting engineer. In the Public Works office at that point there is a staff of five or six and I understood when I left home that there was great anxiety among them.

It was reported to me, not that they were to be transferred to other departments, but that they were to have the same fate as Mr. Horwood; leave of absence, the permanency of which would be confirmed. Is there ground for such a fear on the part of these men, and if so are they to be available for other departments, or will their services be entirely dispensed with?

Mr. CARVELL: The 62 officials to whom I referred are in the inside service at Ottawa; the list has no reference to persons in the outside service. I have not yet been able to make up a list of the officials outside of Ottawa whose services can be dispensed with, either temporarily or permanently. I can assure my hon. friend that the number is very large. I will endeavour to transfer these officials from one part of Canada to another in order to find employment for them where it is possible. I may as well say that it is my opinion that I shall be unable to find employment for a great many of these men. I regret it exceedingly; I realize that it is a hardship, but on account of the reduction of business in the department I see nothing to do but to ask them to obtain employment in some other capacity.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are many of these men fit for overseas service?

Mr. CARVELL: I really could not answer the question. I should imagine that—in fact, so far as I know, every man who comes within the Military Service Act has been drafted. I know some of them have. The great majority of these men are middle-aged men, and I again state I am very sorry to have to make the announcement. There are many good men throughout the Dominion, most of them in the engineering and architectural branches of the department whose services are simply not required, and I have hesitated to relieve them permanently. I am getting reports from every engineering district in Canada; in fact, I have them in most cases. I find that the chiefs of the engineering departments are as reluctant as I am to make recommendations dispensing with the services of those men, but nevertheless that must be done, and while it may be a hardship, I see nothing to do but to do business on business principles.

Mr. BUREAU: This answer was elicited by my question having special reference to Three Rivers. I may tell my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) that so far as Three Rivers is concerned, the six or seven engineers, into whose souls the fear of God has entered and, perhaps a little more, the fear of losing their situation, are all married men and fathers.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the Minister of Public Works appointed a successor to Mr. Horwood?

Mr. CARVELL: No successor has as yet been appointed.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the minister intend to appoint a successor?

Mr. CARVELL: I should imagine we could not get along very well in the Public Works Department without a chief architect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then I would say: Let Mr. Ewart come back, and be chief architect. He has always been a very honest and efficent official, and I do not know why he was put out of the department under the late Administration. Mr. Ewart is quite able to fill the position to the satisfaction of the public.

Mr. CARVELL: I think my hon. friend will allow me to say that Mr. Ewart has no warmer admirer in Canada than myself. I have known Mr. Ewart since I first became a member of Parliament. I know that he is a man of the highest integrity and possessed of the greatest ability. Mr. Ewart, is seventy-seven years of age and he now occupies a very responsible position as consulting architect on the new Parliament Buildings. I do not think—I do not want to state any question of policy—Mr. Ewart would consider the position for a moment, and possibly it would not be fair to ask a man of his advanced age to assume the duties of chief architect of the Department of Public Works, in view of the very important work which he is now performing.

Mr. BUREAU: Last year the Minister of Railways and Canals was Acting Minister of Public Works when we passed the estimates. There was an item of $4,000 for an architect. If I remember aright, we were told at that time that the item was for salary for one Mr. Wright, and for once during that session there was unanimous praise and unanimous consent on both sides of the House that Mr. Wright should get the appointment and salary. We all knew Mr. Wright very well. The Minister of Railways and Canals, as has usually happened, quietly swam away from the question and said he could not promise anything; that he was not Minister of Public Works; that he was only acting; but he led us to believe that Mr. Wright was in his mind at the time and had been in the mind of the Minister of Public Works, and the impression was conveyed that he was to get

the appointment. May I ask the minister if the same amount is being re-voted, and if there has been any switch to this appointment of Mr. Wright?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not a mind reader; much less would I try to read the mind of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BUREAU: Especially a year ago.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I have a recollection of the incident to which my hon. friend refers. I have always been a fairly close attender on the sessions of the House, and I can only say that Mr. Wright has been in the service of the Government down to the present time in another capacity. He has been either architect or consulting architect of some kind in connection with the Union station that is now being erected in Toronto. It seems that a certain percentage of that station is being paid for and looked after by the Federal Government to be used in connection with federal purposes, and Mr. Wright has been employed in the capacity of architect. Mr. Wright is now back in Ottawa in the office of the chief architect, and I think I can assure my hon. friend that the country will not lose the services of Mr. Wright.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps we shall be asking the Minister of Public Works to take us too much into his confidence if we ask him how he proposes dealing with the outside service of his department. It is not very large, but there is considerable outside work in connection with the Department of Public Works. Now that patronage is dispensed with and members have nothing more to say about who shall be appointed as inspector of a breakwater, or inspector of a wharf, or inspector of any other work that will be going on outside, the minister would, perhaps, be getting clear of questions if he would tell us once and for all how he proposes dealing with the outside service, who shall be his agents in order to obtain the service he must have in connection with outside work, and, in short, what method of operation he is going to substitute for the old fashioned way of patronage?

Mr. CARVELL: The answer is very simple. Immediately on assuming the duties of this office, I invariably ask the engineers of the different districts or the chief government officials of the departments interested to make recommendations to all such positions as those to which my hon. friend has referred. That method was continued for a few months. If my hon. friend will read the Order in Council tabled a few days ago regarding the duties of the Civil Service Commission, he will find that so far as all employees of every class and distinction are concerned, they must be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Some of the positions require an examination. In the case of temporary employees and ordinary workmen, which class would include the foremen to whom my hon. friend refers, such appointments are made by the recognized agent of Government—I think those are the words of the Order in Council. I think the names must be sent within thirty days to the Civil Service Commission, who have the right to confirm the appointment. The net result of the transaction will be that the district engineers, so far as the engineering department is concerned, or the superintendent of buildings —I think there is such an official in most of the provinces—will have the right of appointment of the class of officials of which my hon. friend has spoken, subject to the confirmation of the Civil Service Commission. That is the manner in which these people will be appointed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that apply to ordinary labourers?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. The Order in Council says: All temporary employees. That takes in foremen of works, all persons except those who would come strictly within the Civil Service; that is the class of officials who would require to stand the competitive examination, from a list of which persons the appointments would be made.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: In connection with the engineers, I would like to bring a matter to the notice of the minister. We have in the Maritime Provinces a great many public wharves, breakwaters and structures of that kind, on which a great deal of money has been expended, and these structures are very useful to the public. Repairs to those structures and wharves generally—almost always—awaited a report from the member. The member for the county would report to the engineer, or to the minister, that such and such a place required some expenditure. Very often that is neglected, and very often no attention is paid to the recommendation the member might make. It might be thought he was looking for patronage or the expenditure of money in his county. I would like the minister to make his engineers responsible for the upkeep of those structures. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars lost by reason of the fact that those structures are allowed to fall into decay and not properly looked after, and if the engineer is made responsible for the condition of those

works he will be called upon to say what repairs are required, look after them, report them and have the work done, and prevent such waste as I have mentioned, and the responsibility of reporting as to what may be required for improvements of that kind would not be thrown upon the member.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first time I have ever heard the engineers criticised for not submitting reports to the department. I have not had time to read them all, I have tried to study up the items to some extent in preparing the estimates as printed. I think I am safe in saying that if I had incorporated in these estimates all the reports that have come from the engineers as to works that would be reasonably necessary I would have had a great many million dollars in the estimates that are not there to-day. I am always glad to have the advice of members as to necessary public works in their constituencies. I have tried to listen to every hon. gentleman who has had a suggestion to make, although, I am sorry to say, during the last week I have not been able to find time for all who wished to see me, but in the future I will be only too happy to listen to the recommendations of any member of the House. I want to assure members, however, that after I receive their recommendations I shall invariably ask the engineer for a report. I have sent out to all engineers in Canada a circular letter informing them that when I ask for information I want facts, and we will draw the conclusions in the office, and I intend to act upon those recommendations just as far as it is possible to do so.

This raises the question which I might as well discuss for a moment. Under the present financial conditions, as I view them, it is simply impossible to obtain money to be expended on public works that can be allowed to stand for two or three years. I dislike turning down a request for a public work in any portion of Canada, as much as any man who ever occupied this position. I would like to be able to go on and build. I think I could build in a fairly economical manner, but until such time as the financial condition of the country is different from to-day I do not feel justified in spending money on any public work that is not actually necessary. And, unless I change my mind very much, I do not think I will spend very much money during this year or next, except on the class of work I refer to. I realize that very nice questions arise as to what is necessarily a public work, and possibly there might be a very sharp distinction between my definition of the term and the definition suggested by other people in Canada. When that occasion arises we will have to apply to the engineers and exercise the very best business principles which we are able to command, and I want to assure the House that any decisions at which we arrive will certainly be along business principles, and also in accordance with the policy of not spending one dollar which the public service of this country can get along fairly efficiently without spending.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not hear me, or else he misunderstood what I said. I did not suggest for one minute that, as far as I was concerned, I was asking for any new public work.

Mr. CARVELL: I certainly did not intend to insinuate such a thing, and do not know why my hon. friend should have taken such an inference from my remarks.

Mr. McKENZIE: I refer to works which have been constructed which are allowed to fall into decay because they are not looked after. I find in my county that engineers expected me to report to them, or expected me to report to the department where repairs were necessary, and then the department would ask them to make a report. That has been the practice in my part of the country. Somebody would tell me a wharf was out of repair, perhaps the end was out of it, the ballast was falling out, and the wharf was going to pieces generally. I would report that to the minister, and he would ask the engineer to report on it. That was a roundabout way, causing delay and loss. I am saying to the minister that the responsibility of seeing those works are kept in proper condition should be on the engineer, and that means that he should acquire that knowledge and look after that. I did not refer necessarily to any new public work.

Mr. CARVELL: I think, on reflection, I did not answer that branch of my hon. friend's question. I quite agree with him that the duty should be placed upon the engineer in charge to make the necessary recommendation to the department, and to see that the public works are kept in as reasonable a state of repair as possible, and it is certainly my intention in future to see that the engineers acquaint themselves with the conditions in their respective districts and keep the department properly advised.

Mr. FIELDING: I would cordially commend the decision of the minister with respect to new works, and, for that matter, with respect to old works, if they are not of an urgent character. I notice in the estimates quite a number of items for repairs. I take it for granted they are necessary and proper. I would not like to assume that only those mentioned in the estimates are in need of repair. I think if my hon. friend will inquire of the engineers in the different parts of the country he will find there are many items which should be dealt with in the supplementary estimates. If I could think my hon. friend had them in mind, I should be quite content, but I should not like to assume for a moment that in the section of the country from which I come this list represents all repairs needed. I hope my hon. friend will ask the engineers of the district to report, not in regard to the ordinary repairs, but with regard to those really urgent, to prevent the works going into decay. I trust when the supplementary estimates come down works of that character will be provided for.

Mr. CARVELL: This is a new phase of the question to me. I have never heard it presented in this way before. I have had some experience on both sides of the House, and I have myself occasionally, I think, if I remember correctly, criticised over expenditures. I have not been in the habit, however, of inviting the Government to go on and make additional expenditures. Therefore, this is really a new situation to me. Notwithstanding the very earnest appeal made by the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne, I think if very high hopes are being built upon a long list of supplementaries, there are some disappointments in store for hon. members, because we have combed these items pretty carefully. We have reports from engineers as to requirements, and, as I said a little while ago, if we had to comply with all the requirements of the different engineers these estimates would contain a great many more millions, and while I do not say there will be no supplementaries, yet I do not want to hold out any alluring hopes that the list will be extensive.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not desire a long list of supplementary estimates. If we had such a list I should feel at liberty to criticise them, but I want to follow the line taken by the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton and Victoria in regard to the maintenance of works already in existence. I would stand with the hon. minister in respect of new works. I think new works almost of every kind might properly be postponed for the present, and I certainly would not ask my hon. friend to undertake to build any new works, unless the circumstances were extraordinary, and I do not anticipate that, but I know all over the country works are going into decay, and I have a shrewd suspicion that the main list which the hon. gentleman has in his estimates by no means covers the cases of the urgent and necessary repairs.

All I suggest is that my hon. friend shall obtain reports from the engineers. I do not want him to obtain them from the member for the county. I am not so familiar with the scheme which the hon. member for North Cape Breton suggests, but I think that in better days—and this is a policy which the Government might resume—we did not allow a member to dictate what was going to be done. We want the present Government to obtain from engineers and responsible officers in different parts of the country reports as to what repairs are necessary in order that the work already done may not go to decay. If it be a wasteful work, if it is a work that should never have been constructed, let it go to decay, but if it is a useful work, let us try to keep it alive.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not gone over these estimates very accurately, but I think hon. gentlemen will find that there are general votes in practically all the estimates which can be used for necessary repairs to works of a small nature. That is the reason these votes are put in. If there are any places, such as have been referred to by the two hon. members from constituencies in Nova Scotia, where repairs are necessary, I will be very glad if they will give me the details.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Get the engineers to give the details.

Mr. CARVELL: I will get the engineers to give the details too. We have reports from nearly every engineer in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: Of recent date?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, within the last four or five months they have all made reports.

Mr. FIELDING: The reports upon which estimates are prepared are generally sent in quite a considerable time before the estimates are made up and by the time the estimates reach the House very often there are later and other works which need attention. That has been my experience in the past.

Mr. CARVELL. I would be only too happy to give the matter my very best consideration, but I still think that provision has been made in these estimates for all really necessary repairs to public works.

Mr. PARENT: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) referred this afternoon to the St. Charles River works at Quebec. These works have cost up to date about $1,300,000 although they are not in a very advanced state. It is currently rumoured in the streets that if these works are not attended to right away they are bound to fall into a very bad condition with the result that the country will lose a very large amount of money. I would like my hon. friend to attend to this matter. I would suggest that he ask for a special report on these works. Probably he can find some means of getting the money through supplementary estimates, to provide for the carrying on of these works.

Mr. CARVELL: While these do not come under the civil list, I would be very glad to answer the hon. member (Mr. Parent) or any other hon. member, with regard to any public works in Canada. I did not personally visit the St. Charles River works but I have no hesitation in saying that the St. Charles River development works, if that is the proper name, are not essential public works in Canada to-day. The work at that point was discontinued advisedly but every precaution has been taken to see that there shall be no deterioration in the portion of the work that has been constructed. We attempted to effect a settlement with the contractors. The larger portion of the money due them, including the deposit and drawback, has been returned to them. The balance is ready for them at any time. They are asking to be paid a certain amount of money on account of the closing down of the works. That is a matter under negotiation by the department and therefore I would not be justified in discussing the details of it.

Mr. FONTAINE (translation): Mr. Chairman, will the minister state whether provision is made in the estimates of the Public Works Department for repairs to the bridge called the Chaudière bridge, between Hull and Ottawa. That bridge is in very bad condition. Care must be taken not to allow too heavy loads to be carried over it, and automobiles must reduce their speed to five miles an hour when crossing over it. I should like to know whether an item has been put in the estimates for repairs to that bridge. It seems to me that such a work would come within the scope of urgent public works.

Mr. CARVELL: In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Fontaine) I may say that he will find on page 73 of the estimates an item of $120,000 for a new bridge to replace the present Union bridge over the Ottawa river between Ottawa and Hull. That was voted in 1917-18. My hon. friend will see that the same amount is in the estimates to-day as a revote. I am not in a position to state to him exactly what the department will do about this very important matter but for fear that there should be any misunderstanding about my attitude at least I want to say that I never could see by what reason the Dominion of Canada should build a bridge for the people of Ottawa and Hull across the Chaudiere falls. There may be some reason for it. Possibly there may have been some old arrangement; I do not think there was an agreement. I have been trying to investigate the matter. I can say to my hon. friend that negotiations are now under way between the Public Works Department and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario by which I hope provisions may be made for the reconstruction of this bridge. These negotiations have reached pretty nearly the concluding point. Perhaps it would not be quite proper that I should state what they are until the matter is finally settled, but I have very strong reasons for believing that an arrangement will be made by which the bridge will be constructed, but not entirely at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that we are wandering very far away from the item under discussion. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fontaine) the first time he arose to speak in this House, but in spite of the good will of the hon. the Minister of Public Works I think I must courteously draw his attention to the fact that the item under consideration is salaries in the department and that we should not wander any further away from this item at the present time.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not wandering because I had not begun to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not mention the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. McKENZIE: When I wander it will be time enough for the Chairman to call

me to order. I was just saying to the minister, just to finish this wandering, that I understand it is a sort of conventional understanding in Canada that all interprovincial bridges are built, or at least assisted, by the Federal Government. I always thought that was the practice.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In connection with the letting out of a number of the officers of the department, engineers and officers of one class and another, which the minister has referred to, might I make a suggestion? We have a new department, that of Immigration and Colonization. At the conclusion of the war there will be scope for measures of a great deal of usefulness to that department. From one end of the Dominion to the other there will be need for the building of roads, for the construction of railways, for systems of drainage, to open up the new parts of the Dominion in order to carry on the necessary works in connection with colonization, upon which these officers could be employed. I should like to make this suggestion to the new Minister of Colonization.

Mr. CARVELL: I accept that suggestion as being a very wise one. I may tell the hon. gentleman that a committee of the Government was formed something over two weeks ago which is now investigating the conditions of the Civil Service in all the different departments with the object in view of ascertaining how many officers, both in the Inside and Outside Services, will be available for just such work as my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend referred to an Order in Council that had been passed some time ago in regard to appointments to the Outside Service, an order which must commend itself to every member of this House. Does that order refer only to his own department or to all departments of the Government?

Mr. CARVELL: To all departments of the Government.

Mr. COPP: Will postmasters have to pass examinations?

Mr. CARVELL: It means that postmasters will have to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I do not know what kind of an examination will be required. It does not necessarily mean an educational test, but an examination of fitness and character; and, I would say among all other things, the location of his place of residence or shop or whatever it may be. It will be an examination in order to see that he is properly qualified for the position.

Mr. COPP: In every particular.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope so.

An hon. MEMBER: He would not have to be a man of letters, I suppose?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. CARVELL: If he can read the postcards, I suppose he will be satisfactory.

Department of External Affairs—
Salaries ....$ 49,137 50
Contingencies.. .... 15,500 00

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The increase is due to the fact that a portion of the staff has been transferred to the Department of External Affairs from the Privy Council on account of the Prime Minister becoming Minister of External Affairs and relinquishing his position as President of the Privy Council.

Mr. CANNON: Will Sir Joseph Pope be the head of the department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: As he is now?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: There is an increase in the third division, sub-division A.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That increase is due to the transfer of a portion of the staff from the Privy Council to the External Affairs. When I went over to the Department of External Affairs I took them with me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Department of External Affairs publish an annual report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries, including Assistant to Minister at $5,000; Solicitor at $5,000; Inspecting Engineer at $4,000; Chief Auditor at $2,800; Assistant Engineer at $2,800; C. E. Stevens at $2,100; R. Dorman at $1,800; J. H. Arthurs at $,600—$203,112.50—Contingencies—$28,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: In the details of this estimate, which appear on page 29, you will see that there is an increase to the assistant to the minister, Mr. Graham Bell, from $4,500 to $5,000. There is also an increase to the Solicitor, Mr. Fairweather, from $4,500 to $5,000. In the first division, sub-division A, it would appear that there is an increase in the number of officials from 13 to 16. This does not really mean that we are increasing our staff. We are bringing in from the Outide Service Mr. Alexander Ferguson as Inspecting Engineer

at the same salary that he has been receiving. Then Mr. F. M. MacLellan, the Chief Auditor, is being promoted from the second division sub-division A. We are making provision in that class for a private secretary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A private secretary to whom?

Mr. J. D. REID: To the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What became of Mr. Yates?

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Yates is still in that class, although he is doing work in the Privy Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is a very excellent official.

Mr. J. D. REID: A splendid official.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the private secretary have to pass the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. In the first division, sub-division B, two additions are being made. They are Mr. R. H. Lang, Assistant Accountant, who was promoted, and Mr. C. E. Stevens, who has been brought in from the outside service.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is Mr. Stevens located at Moncton?

Mr. REID: I cannot say at the moment. In the second division, subdivision A, we are promoting Mr. R. Dorman from $1,600 in subdivision B to $1,800 in subdivision A, and we are transferring Mr. J. H. Arthurs, auditor, from the Outside Service to the Inside Service. In second division B, there are three vacancies which will not be filled, and in the third division A we are dropping one appointment. While it might appear that we have one more official on the list than last year, the staff is not really being increased; we are transferring some of our men from the Outside to the Inside Service.

Mr. CANNON: Does this item include the staff working on the construction of telephones?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. CANNON: Does not the minister's department look after the construction of the telephones?

Mr. REID: No, the Department of Public Works.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the $500 increase to the assistant to the minister a statutory one?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the increase of $500 to the solicitor statutory?

Mr. REID: No.

Department of Customs—	
Salaries ....$	361,775 00
Contingencies..	25,000 00

Mr. SIFTON: These are practically all statutory increases with the exception of one.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the one in question? Is it a new position?

Mr. SIFTON: It has reference to my private secretary.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the minister in a position to tell us what amount was collected through Customs last year in comparison with the year before, so that we can see what ratio of expense it took to collect the revenue that was collected by the department?

Mr. SIFTON: The amount collected was considerably larger, and the estimates amount to exactly the same.

Department of Naval Service—	
Salaries ....$	208,850 00
Contingencies..	50,000 00

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The number of employees in the Naval Service is 139, an increase of six over the number provided for in 1917-18. The increase is to provide for the appointment first, of an officer in charge of the Western Division of Fisheries, and five extra stenographers; all, of course, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. The others are the usual votes.

Mr. MURPHY: There are five increases in the first division, subdivision B. Will the minister explain what they are?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is an appropriation for the appointment of an assistant to the Superintendent of Fisheries, and two promotions in the tidal service, two in the Accounts Branch, and one in the Fisheries Branch.

Mr. CANNON: What does the item of $50,000 for contingencies cover?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This item is the same as last year and covers all items of office expenses, travelling expenses, stationery, printing, telegraph and telephone calls, and also any temporary clerks that are needed.

Mr. McKENZIE: I notice for the first time a new title, that of Deputy Minister and Controller. Will the minister please

tell us what is meant by controller? What does he control?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that I cannot inform the hon. member what that means. But I presume the deputy minister has always been designated as Deputy Minister and Controller of the Naval Service.

Mr. McKENZIE: The title may have been there before, but I have never noticed it.

Mr. CANNON: Last year the employees of the Marine Department were subject to the recommendations of a committee, entitled, The Conservative Committee of Patronage. Has the minister received of late any recommendations from that committee, and if so, have the recommendations been considered?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very glad to inform the hon. member that I have received no such recommendations, and if I had I certainly would not pay the least attention to them. While I have the honour of being Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Naval Service, I am going to administer this important portfolio to the best of my ability, and I do not intend to recognize any patronage committees at all.

Mr. CANNON: I congratulate the minister upon that decision. We are evidently going to witness a change for the better.

Mr. POWER: Will the same principle apply to dismissals?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly.

Department of Inland Revenue—	
Salaries ....$	190,025 00
Contingencies	28,000 00

Mr. SIFTON: There is a small decrease in the number of clerks; 123 last year, and we are voting now for only 120.

Mr. BUREAU: We have seen in the papers that the Department of Inland Revenue is to be merged in the Department of Customs. The member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) some time ago asked a question in the House in regard to this matter and the Prime Minister replied that he would make a statement shortly. Before we vote any moneys under the head of Inland Revenue we should know exactly what is proposed to be done with that department. If it is to be merged with the Department of Customs, the committee should be informed what branch of the latter department will handle the work heretofore done by the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. SIFTON: I am sorry that I cannot give full information, but I will give the hon. gentleman all that I have. At present I am acting-Minister of Inland Revenue. Nothing further than that has yet been done. There is a Bill before the House in connection with changes in departments, and if Parliament passes that Bill, possibly something may be done along the line of merging the two departments. If there is a merging, it will be of the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments.

Mr. BUREAU: The Bill before the House does not give much information. If it is the Bill that I have seen—and I suppose it is the Bill to which my hon. friend refers—the Governor in Council is given power to transfer one department to another or to make any change without the House having any knowledge of it and without Parliament first passing upon it. If the two departments are merged, does it mean that they will keep their identity while under one minister? Will the work of the deputy ministers be done by only one deputy minister? We now have the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Commissioner of Customs, which corresponds to the position of deputy minister. Surely the Bill which is before the House has not been introduced without some action being thought of or contemplated. There must be some plan in the mind of the minister or of the Government as to what change is to be made and how the merger is to be effected. I should like the details with regard to these points; they would help a good deal when the Bill to which my hon. friend has referred comes before the House. Before I agree to give the Government the right to form a department or to change, combine, or create new departments, I want to know exactly what these new departments are going to be. Heretofore all new departments have been created by the legislative power which at the time of the enactment knew what the authority of the department was to be, the scope of its activities, the officials to comprise it, and so on.

Mr. SIFTON: I am sorry that it will not be possible to give an absolutely definite statement to-night as to what may happen with regard to a suggested union of two departments which it has not yet been decided to unite. I would think that after the passing of the Bill would be quite time enough to decide what officials in connection with the two departments would be necessary. So far as the Inside Service of these departments is concerned, I would say that

it would be largely necessary to carry them on separately. They are distinct and separate classes of work, and, at this point at least, would have to be looked after by different classes of men. In a large number of places outside of Ottawa, particularly in small districts, it might be possible to unite the work almost completely and to effect a considerable saving, or at least to secure greater efficiency by opening additional offices for the accommodation of the public with the same expenditure. Very large economies could be made in some places in Canada and a better class of work done by the officials of both departments. If the amalgamation proceeds, it is along that line that the economies will take place and more satisfactory work in the interest of the community be done.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will there be a private secretary in each department if the two departments are amalgamated?

Mr. SIFTON: If the two departments are under one minister I would not think it essential, but he would be apt to work at something else.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Who is the private secretary at present?

Mr. SIFTON: I have no idea.

Mr. CANNON: I was told this afternoon that the private secretary of the Minister of Inland Revenue was a gentleman by the name of Chasse, who receives a salary of $2,700. How can he draw a salary of $2,700? In the estimates of last year only $600 was voted for this purpose.

Mr. SIFTON: A private secretary enters the department in one of the subdivisions of the Inside Service, and the $600 is voted separately and added to his salary so long as he remains private secretary. If his salary is $2,700, $2,100 is voted in one of these divisions and $600 as private secretary. If he ceases to be private secretary he goes back to the other division at $2,100 and loses the $600.

Mr. CANNON: He would be occupying two positions for which he would be receiving $2,700, $600 as private secretary and $2,100 for his work in the department?

Mr. SIFTON: No, he would be voted $2,100 plus $600, but he would not be doing any work in the division while he was occupying his position as private secretary.

Mr. CANNON: Who is head of the department now?

Mr. SIFTON: Temporarily, I am.

[Mr. Sifton.]

Mr. CANNON: The former minister is on leave?

Mr. SIFTON: I am not aware of that; I was appointed acting minister.

Mr. CANNON: Has he been given permanent leave?

Mr. SIFTON: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister, in speaking about the changes that are to be made in the department, says he is not exactly aware what changes are to take place. The minister says: When we get authority to do the thing, then we shall see what we shall do. My contention is that the minister should tell us what he is going to do before we decide whether we shall give the authority to do it or not. That is where the cleavage comes in between the minister and myself. I claim that the House of Commons ought to know exactly what it is legislating on. If changes are required to be made in the department, and we are to be asked to authorize those changes, we should know what things we are voting before we vote, and before we agree to this Bill, we ought to know exactly what the Bill means and what it is intended for. That is where the minister and I do not exactly agree.

Mr. SIFTON: I would not like to disagree with the hon. member at all. My contention in regard to this was that it had nothing to do with these estimates, and that when the Prime Minister brought up the Bill and asked the House of Commons to pass it, then would be the proper time to find out what he meant by it. I have no doubt he will be able to give the House full information as to what it is for and what he would like to have done under it, but this has nothing at all to do with the salaries of the Inland Revenue Department, upon which, as far as is possible, I am willing to give all the information, and I am also willing to give information in regard to anything else that I know, but I cannot give any information in regard to what somebody else knows.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought the proper man to apply to was the minister who was at the head of or to be at the head of the particular department.

Mr. SIFTON: The Prime Minister settles that.

Mr. BUREAU: The question is now that there is going to be a merger of two departments, and my hon. friend, being acting minister of one and minister of the

other, ought certainly to be the man whom the Prime Minister would consult if any changes were to be made.

Mr. SIFTON: Possibly he will do so.

Mr. BUREAU: The Prime Minister would also probably accept the suggestions and recommendations of this particular head, because I suppose the Prime Minister has enough to do without being the active administrative head of each department of the service. I do not want to get into the confidence of the minister or to have him betray any secrets; but if this merger is going to take place under the authority of Parliament, I want to warn the minister if he is called upon to give any information, we shall endeavour to the best of our ability to exact this information from him if this Bill is going to be utilized to merge the Department of Inland Revenue with the Department of Customs.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps at a later stage I shall ask the minister about this matter that I wish to speak about. I know of my own knowledge that in my constituency two preventive officers in the Inland Revenue Department have been dismissed. I have not been able to ascertain why they have been dismissed, but I was told by a very reputable gentleman from a part of the country where one of the officials was dismissed that since the dismissal illicit stills have sprung up in that place and a very undesirable condition has arisen.

Mr. CARVELL: In Cape Breton?

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not mention any place.

Mr. CARVELL: I should hope not.

Mr. McKENZIE: On the general principle that everything of a live nature is going on in Cape Breton, perhaps the hon. gentleman is right. I wish most seriously to call the attention of the minister to the matter. This officer was keeping down this sort of thing. The place is in an out-of-the-way part of the country, and I am told by this gentleman, who is the parish priest in this place, that the moment this man was dismissed, old troubles began, old stills were started up in the woods, and a condition of things brought about that is highly undesirable. I would ask the minister to inquire from his deputy in that department why those men were dismissed, and if it is his intention to keep some supervision over those districts by making other appointments.

Mr. SIFTON: Will the hon. gentleman tell me the names of those men?

Mr. McKENZIE: The man who was dismissed from the locality to which I referred was Donald McLellan. The name of the other man was John J. McKinnon, who was preventive officer in a part of the country quite distant from where Mr. McLellan is officiating. The part of the country where the trouble has arisen is where Mr. McLellan was officiating.

Mr. CANNON: The other day I asked the Prime Minister whether the two departments of Customs and Inland Revenue were to be merged, and the Prime Minister replied that in a few days he would give out a statement in regard to the matter. If such is the case, I do not think it is fair for the Government to ask the Opposition to vote this special item before the statement is given. Who is to administer this money? Who is to be responsible to the people? Who is to be responsible to the members of Parliament? We do not know. I do not think there is any haste or hurry. Why not delay the item until the statement is given? Then we shall be in a better position to judge if the money is put into proper hands.

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture—
Salaries and contingencies....$ 633,850 00

Mr. CRERAR: The increase in salaries is due to the usual statutory increases. The other items remain the same as they were last year.

Mr. CANNON: Would the minister say if there is a gentleman whose occupation is that of distributing bulls throughout the Dominion? Maybe the minister is not aware of this special matter, but last year there was quite a discussion in this House on a most interesting subject, that of cattle distributed freely throughout the county of Dorchester, then represented by a minister in Sir Robert Borden's Cabinet. I would be very much interested, as being the successor of this hon. minister and also as residing in the same county, to know the name of the gentleman who made the distribution last year, what was his salary and how many bulls he distributed.

Mr. CRERAR: I regret that I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he desires. I can assure him, however, that the item, if there is such an item, is not included in this list.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—
Salaries, including transfer of F. A. Willsher at $2,200, and of G. L. MacLaren and T. F. Murdock at $1,450 each $224,500 00
Contingencies.. .... 31,000 00

Mr. BUREAU. May I ask for an explanation about the transfer of Mr. Willsher and Mr. Murdock? Are they transferred from one branch to another?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: These three employees have been transferred from the Marine and Fisheries Department at Prescott to Ottawa, and we particularly need the services of these men now in connection with our shipping programme. They are expert draftsmen.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the principle apply to the department as regards the outside service, that all appointments will be made under the Civil Service Commission? I understand that the Harbour Commission of Montreal and the Harbour Commission of Quebec have certain appointments to make. Are these appointments subject to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and Quebec have full jurisdiction in these matters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They retain their own standing?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Just as in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand the position of Harbour Master of Quebec is vacant. I do not know if any recommendation has been made to the department through the Commission in Quebec, but, if none has been made, I would be pleased to recommend to my hon. friend the name of Capt. Bernier, the gentleman who has done so much for Canada, who has discovered new lands and planted the British flag in the northern regions of Baffin's Bay. I simply throw out the suggestion to my hon. friend.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No representation or recommendation has been made by the Harbour Commission of Quebec, but when it is made I shall be most happy to take into consideration what the hon. member has said with regard to Capt. Bernier.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will not take the matter up to-night, but I suggest to the hon. minister that, on some future occasion, he should take the House into his confidence in regard to the shipbuilding industry in Canada, and also in regard to the question of transhipping of fish in frozen compartments overseas.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to bring to the notice of the minister that he has two deputies in his department, one in the Department of Naval Affairs and the other in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I observe that one of those deputies receives

$5,000 and the other $6,000. I observe in the estimates the items of the Department of Agriculture appear on page 26 and items of the Department of Marine and Fisheries on page 27. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture gets $6,000, and the able and efficient Deputy of Marine and Fisheries receives $5,000. I should like to know from the minister why there is such a striking difference between those two men. I venture to think there is not a more efficient deputy in the whole outfit than the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I cannot see why he should not be getting $6,000 as well as any other deputy in the department.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Include the Deputy Minister of Militia also. I should like to say a word for the Deputy Minister of Militia. He is an excellent officer, and has worked for many years at a salary of $5,000. I have always been endeavouring to have his salary increased to $6,000, but have never succeeded.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should suggest to the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence that he will only get the crown of life by persisting to the end, and I should like to tell him to continue to persist until the deputy minister gets $6,000. I hope the suggestion I make to the minister will be adopted, because the distinction is somewhat striking, and might be regarded as odious, that one department is divided into two branches, and the head of the more important branch only receives $5,000, while the head of the other gets $6,000. That requires some explanation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is very pleasing to hear the words of commendation that the hon. member has been good enough to express in regard to Mr. Johnston, the most efficient deputy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I quite agree with all the hon. member has said, and, without committing any breach of confidence with my colleagues, I might say that I have been on various occasions fighting very strenuously to put the efficient and able Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the same footing as the efficient deputy in charge of the Naval Service.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: But I find in my brief experience in public life that the wheels of Government move slowly, and one cannot accomplish all that he sets out to do, and I am sorry that Mr. Johnston's salary does not stand at $6,000 instead of $5,000. I still have some hopes that before Parliament adjourns in some way or an-

other some suitable recognition of Mr. Johnston's services may be made. For the moment, I am sorry the salary has to stand at $5,000, but I thank the hon. gentleman for what he has said. I cannot speak too highly of Mr. Johnston. He is a very efficient, loyal and painstaking officer.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the officials transferred from the Outside to the Inside Service, what becomes of the positions vacated? Are the positions in the Outside Service to be filled or abolished?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I was not expecting the Civil Government estimates to come up to-night, and I could not get in touch with Mr. Johnston and I have not all the details I would like to have, but I should judge, inasmuch as the number of employees this year is 125, four less than last year, that the positions at Prescott are not being filled, but I will not give that as a positive answer. I will furnish the information at some other time.

Mr. MURPHY: When the hon. minister mentions Prescott, he at once makes me suspicious. He has told me somthing I did not know, and I want to point out to my hon. friend that there would be no indication in these estimates as to what becomes of the positions in the Outside Service to which I referred. These relate only to the Inside Service, and my inquiry is, what becomes of the positions in the Outside Service from which transfers have been made to the Inside Service?

Mr. J. D. REID: My hon. friend need not be much alarmed about Prescott. The only one in this list who comes from Prescott is Mr. T. F. Murdock. He was appointed to a position at Prescott probably eight or nine years ago. He is a very capable young man, and was transferred to Ottawa, promoted probably some three or four years ago. He is now being put on the Inside Service, and it is a promotion for him. He will get his statutory increase. He is a fine young man, born in Prescott—

Mr. McKENZIE: He could not help that, I suppose.

Mr. REID: and deserves every consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand from the minister that he was transferred some three or four years ago from the Inside Service to the Outside Service?

Mr. REID: No, he was transferred from the town of Prescott, where he was employed in the Marine and Fisheries Department. The department here called him from Prescott and gave him employment and promoted him. Now I see they are transferring him from the Outside Service to the Inside Service permanently.

General Consulting Engineer to Dominion Government—	
Salaries.. ....$	7,600 00
Contingencies	150 00

Mr. J. D. REID: This is an item that has been in the estimates for many years. This was to pay the salary of the late Sir Collingwood Schreiber $6,000, and his private secretary $1,600. I am sorry to say that Sir Collingwood Schreiber died two or three days ago. But his place will have to be filled and I would like to have this item remain in the estimates.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the minister's reason for saying that his place will likely have to be filled? What work will a successor to Sir Collingwood Schreiber be required to do?

Mr. J. D. REID: In the Department of Railways and Canals they have always had a consulting engineer. Sir Collingwood Schreiber has filled that position for many years.

Mr. MURPHY: He was the first.

Mr. J. D. REID: He was there for many years. There are more railways being added to the system and there will probably be a great deal more work to do. At all events I feel like leaving that item there in the meantime until we can consider the situation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will this come under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. J. D. REID: I presume so; they will have to issue a certificate.

Mr. MURPHY: Why is this position necessary in view of the very excellent appointment made by the minister, according to the newspapers, of Mr. Gordon Grant, formerly engineer of the Transcontinental railway? He has been added, I understand, to the hon. gentleman's staff. Why does the minister want this item, if that is the case?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member, of course, is aware that Mr. Gordon Grant occupied the position of chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway. He has always been paid out of that vote. That vote may eventually cease. Then, of course, Mr. Grant's position would be ended. If I had an item of this kind in the estimates, and I found it necessary to have a consulting

engineeer, Mr. Grant might be used there or elsewhere; at all events, it has been necessary to have a consulting engineer. I believe that the increased work that will be necessary in the Railway Department on account of the increase in the railway systems to be attached to the department will necessitate the employment of a consulting engineer. For that reason I would ask that the item remain for the present year.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not understand the position as stated by the minister. My recollection of the statement in the newspapers is that the hon. gentleman had added three engineers to the staff. Mr. Gordon Grant was one, another was a railway and bridge engineer and there was another. Is that the fact?

Mr. J. D. REID: I brought into the department a gentleman named Mr. A. E. Warren who was operating man on the Canadian Northern railway and who, from all I could hear previous to his coming in, was an excellent man. He has certainly done great work during the past winter in assisting in the operating of the railways.

Mr. MURPHY: What is his salary?

Mr. J. D. REID: He has been an employee of the Canadian Northern railway, and he has not yet been transferred to the department. He is still being paid by the Canadian Northern railway. He has been general manager at Winnipeg. I intend getting him into the department because of the good work he has done. It will be necessary to have an expert operating man in the department because of the large addition to the Government railway system. Then I also have made arrangements to secure the services of Mr. Monserrat, who designed, and was chief engineer of, the Quebec bridge. He was the engineer in charge of the construction of the bridge. I think every hon. member will agree that Mr. Montserrat deserves every credit for the splendid work he did in connection with that work. Although the bridge is practically completed it has not been taken off the contractors' hands. We are operating it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It has not yet been accepted by the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: It has not yet been finally accepted. Mr. Monserrat's services would be dispensed with when the work was finally taken off the contractor's hands, which may possibly be within a few months. Mr. Monserrat called upon me and asked whether his services would be dispensed with immediately on taking the bridge off the contractor's hands. He stated that when he accepted this position his intention was, when the work was through, to settle in Montreal and take up the work of a consulting engineer. He also said that when they built the bridge over the Clyde they thought it well to employ an engineer for a year to take notes and see if there were any deflections. Mr. Monserrat asked me if I would retain him for a year for that purpose. At times during the last year we used Mr. Monserrat in the several departments in cases of arbitrations. He is a very high class man. I asked him if he would come to Ottawa and assist us at Ottawa not only in the Department of Railways and Canals but in any department in so far as consulting or arbitration work was concerned, and also keep in touch with the Quebec bridge work during the coming year. Mr. Monserrat agreed to do that. Therefore we will have Mr. Monserrat's services at Ottawa during the time that it will not be necessary for him to spend on the Quebec bridge. I have increased the staff by these two men. I feel that I will have to get probably one or two of the best men that we can get in connection with the railway system right here in Ottawa because of the increase in the work resulting from the addition to the Government railway system. That is the situation so far as the Department of Railways is concerned.

Mr. MURPHY: What is Mr. Montserrat's salary?

Mr. J. D. REID: He was paid $12,000 a year as Chief Engineer of the Quebec bridge, and I agreed with Mr. Monserrat that his salary would, of course, remain the same, at least while he is still in charge of the Quebec bridge. It was finally decided that it was not necessary to have a man of his experience and ability in that position after completion of the construction.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask the hon. minister what portion of the $7,600 is to be paid to Mr. Monserrat and what portion to the other gentleman?

Mr. J. D. REID: There will be no portion of that amount granted to Mr. Monserrat. There is an item in the estimates for the Quebec bridge, to pay the final amounts that may be due, and Mr. Montserrat will be paid out of that vote. If I find that it is necessary to have some other expert in the Railway Department this item would be used for that purpose entirely. If not, there will be no expenditure made in connection with it.

Mr. PARENT: Would the minister tell the House who is operating Quebec bridge now?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government Railway system is operating it, and as the hon. member knows, there is quite a large traffic over that bridge, both passengers and freight.

Mr. PARENT: I understand that the Government is allowing that traffic, although the bridge has not been accepted by the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the Government paying any toll for using the bridge while it is still the property of the contractors, or has any specific arrangement of that kind been made?

Mr. J. D. REID: We are simply taking it over.

Mr. CANNON: Do any railways pay toll?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order. The Quebec bridge is very far from the item under consideration.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister states that he will require the services of another gentleman to replace the general consulting engineer, because of some roads that they are taking over. Would he be good enough to tell us what roads are proposed to be taken over by the Department of Railways and Canals, and whether they are to be operated by the Minister of Railways. Also if the employees will come under the Civil Service Act, or if that will be a patronage outlet for the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: On the regular estimates of the department it is my custom to make a statement of the whole railway situation, and on those items I will be able to give the hon. member a full answer.

Mr. CAHILL: The question arises as to why this man should be appointed, and why this item should be voted, and the answer, apparently, is that the Government purposes taking over some railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course, the hon. member was not in the House last year, but he has, no doubt, read the newspapers and knows that we have taken over the Canadian Northern system.

Mr. CAHILL: I have never seen any statements in the newspapers to the effect that the railways were to be operated by the Railway Department.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is just one word I wish to say to the minister. I am always anxious that the minister should secure the very best talent that he can get for his department.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have always suggested that they should get big men, not only in the minister's department, but in all others, so that when anything unusual comes up, or any big business had to be done, they would not be obliged to run around the country looking for men. But I would advise the minister to get the very best engineer that he can get, and to make him, not a consulting engineer, but his chief engineer, placing the other officials in their proper order under him. If he has a first class chief engineer at the present time he does not require a consulting engineer at all. Let him make his best man his chief engineer, and put the others as subordinates under him.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Maclean the House adjourned at eleven p. m.

Tuesday, March 26, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Carvell.

Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Crothers.

RESIGNATION OF HON MR. SEVIGNY.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I have the permission of His Excellency the Governor General to communicate to the House the letter of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) conveying his resignation and the reply I made to that letter:

Ottawa, Ont., March 7, 1918.

Dear Sir Robert,—

In view of the result of the election in the Province of Quebec, I deem it advisable to render my resignation as a member of the Government.

Since I entered the Cabinet, I did my utmost, together with you and my colleagues, to fulfil my duty in the interest of the country. The

hard exigencies of the war imposed upon us tasks difficult but necessary, and the conduct of our soldiers and of the Canadian people since the month of August, 1914, gave us to understand that we could not ignore our responsibilities. The immense majority of the people have declared by their vote that their patriotism and courage have not been lessened by the terrible trials of these last years. That vote of confidence in our policy is certainly a great consolation to me, notwithstanding the defeat I have suffered in my Province. Another consolation I experience is to have remained true to those who fell on the field of honour, to those who made the glory of our country, at the price of the most noble sacrifices, and also to have remained faithful to their families who have suffered for the holy cause our country espoused freely and unanimously in August, 1914.

I hope, dear Sir Robert, that the French Canadian minority will soon consent to have representation in the Government. I know you have done everything possible to urge Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other French Canadians to enter Union Government. I have witnessed your efforts to obtain the union of all races and, as a French Canadian I do not hesitate to hold responsible for the present isolation of Quebec those who failed to carry out their sacred duty of giving to my Province a proper and patriotic direction in this terrible crisis which our country has to face with the rest of humanity.

Rest assured that the great majority of the French Canadians want representation in the Government and that you will soon learn that the Province of Quebec does not wish its isolation. I am convinced that you will always be disposed to treat with justice the French Canadian minority, as your responsibilities show you clearly that the future and welfare of Canada rest upon union and harmony between the races inhabiting our country.

I was pleased to ascertain, in my conversations with my colleagues, that they wish the present division to cease.

I shall always retain very pleasant recollections of my relations with you, particularly since I entered the Cabinet. Often, in the trials I had to endure, I found consolation in your kind words and in your noble conduct.

Despite the difficulties caused us by the exigencies of the war, I have confidence in the future of my country, because you and your colleagues have decided to devote to Canada all your ability and patriotism.

Believe me, dear Sir Robert,

Yours very truly,

ALBERT SEVIGNY.

To which I replied as follows on the 9th of March:

Ottawa, Ont., March 9, 1918.

Dear Mr. Sevigny,—

I have your letter of the 7th instant, and I have received with great regret the announcement that you consider it your duty to tender your resignation as a member of the Government. Under conditions of great difficulty and trial you have exhibited remarkable courage and devotion in adhering steadfastly to your ideal of duty. Although for the present you have failed to secure from your Province the support to which you were entitled, I am confident that the not-distant future will bring to you well deserved vindication and a thorough justification of your attitude upon the great questions which have been debated and determined during the past year. As you well know, it has been my constant desire that the historic Province of Quebec should at all times be adequately represented in the government of the country. If my efforts have been unavailing, I am not responsible for that result. I should esteem it my duty as well as my pleasure to use my best endeavours for the consummation of such arrangements as would enable you to remain in the Government. On the other hand I realize the force of the considerations which you expressed to me in conversation and which in your opinion make it desirable that you should retire for the present. I have no doubt, however, that you have still before you a great future in the public life of the country. Be assured that I have the happiest memories of my association with you in public affairs; and I send my best wishes for every success in the years to come.

Believe me, dear Mr. Sevigny,

Yours faithfully,

R. L. BORDEN.

Hon. Albert Sevigny,
Ottawa.

The resignation has not yet been formally accepted but it will be accepted at the end of this week. It is the intention to consolidate the Department of Inland Revenue with the Department of Customs under the Act which has just passed its third reading in this House.

WEDNESDAY NIGHT SITTINGS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That, on Wednesday, the 3rd April next, and on all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the Session, the House shall meet at three o'clock p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That, on and after Wednesday, the 3rd day of April, Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays, until the end of the Session, over all business except questions by Members and Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr Speaker, I am sure that it is the intention of every one to have as short a session as possible. I would suggest to my right hon. friend that he leave Wednesday, the 3rd of April, for private members, amending his motion to read "after Wednesday, the 3rd day of April."

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That will be agreeable.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion passes with the omission of the words " on and."

Motion agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 27th instant, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 2nd day of April next.

Motion agreed to.

THE WAR.

ENEMY VIOLATION OF RED CROSS RULES. HEROISM OF CANADIAN NURSES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram with regard to the great offensive now being carried on on the Western front by the enemy, but it contains nothing, I think, of importance beyond what has already been communicated to hon. members and to the public generally through the press. I have, however, a telegram from Sir Edward Kemp, which I should like to read. It is prefaced by a statement that it embodies a message which was received from Mr. Rowland Hill. It has been submitted to the Censor, and is, therefore, proper for publication. It is dated March 25th:

Premier,
Ottawa.

London, March 25th, 1918.
War Correspondents' headquarters, France,
March 21st.

"Deliberate violation of Red Cross rules marked the opening of the Huns' much advertised great western offensive. Long range guns of the Germans have searched out hospitals which have been established over two years. Two Canadian casualty clearing stations, which have worked unceasingly through battle storm and lull of more peaceful times, were among the sufferers. The railway siding on which they were situated was considered out of the zone of ordinary shell fire. It was known to the Huns as a hospital centre, for, in one of his communications, he mentioned the fact that he had bombarded it "as reprisal" for alleged dropping of bombs on one of his hospitals.

"Day by day wounded have been gathered into these four hospitals—two British units adjoined Canadians—there to be patched up and rested until fit for comparatively comfortable trip south in well-fitted ambulance trains which regularly loaded at siding. When terrors of attack and counter attack at Passchaendaele were raging seven or eight miles away it was these hospitals that bore the brunt. One of the Canadian units has a record of over three thousand cases "cleared" in one day.

"Work went on without cessation—Australians, Imperials, Canadians, Germans, too, salved from the human wreckage on the ridge. It is hard to make an operating hut light-proof. It is impossible to operate on a wounded man in the dark, so the Hun bombers night after night in those busy days forgot immunity of Red Cross and dropped their bombs around hospitals. Plucky Canadian and British nurses stuck it through the great battle which ended with our troops taking Passchaendaele, although some of these brave, devoted women, finally had to be sent south to where there was rest haven for nurses. They left their bright home in Flanders, in which they took so much pride, in as short a time as possible. It had become an oasis in this almost deserted part of Belgium. Friends in the Canadian Railway troops who worked in the sector had built them fireplaces in their huts and fitted other little touches of home, and they themselves had put the care and labour of months into making them comfortable. The luxury of arm chairs, damask curtains, polished brass, even cut glass and original oil paintings, helped these nurses from overseas to remember there were such things back in that world they had left across the Atlantic when they volunteered for duty. Their environment kept them gentle, womanly, Canadian, among all the flotsam of war, and it was reflected to the thousands of shrapnel-torn, mangled patients they helped on the first stage of the road to recovery. Then came the eruption. In the middle of the night two big high explosive shells (their bases showed they were from a German twelve-inch naval gun) landed twenty yards from the Nursing Sisters' quarters. Steel splinters tore through the sides of their huts as though they were paper. Fortunately not a sister was wounded and, as the Canadian girls assembled at emergency call, two more shells hit almost in the centre of the hospital camp. Officers and sisters and staff worked heroically to clear out patients during the dismal rainy night. There were many delicate cases to be handled where sudden jars perhaps meant death, but all through the night, punctuated by the devilishly regular explosion of other shells, wounded were loaded on hospital train and sent to safety. Only then did nurses seek shelter in another Canadian hospital out of line of fire.

"With daylight, news arrived that the storm had broken on another part of the line. 'Have surgical teams ready proceed on duty immediately'—the message from headquarters. That meant Canadian surgeons ready to go anywhere, and those steel-nerved girls from the Dominion who deftly act as surgeons' extra right hand here in these operating theatres along the front, where a second lost means the difference between life and death, to go with them. There they are to-day, working bravely and stoically, though in the spare moments they occasionally have their thoughts must go back to that home they so suddenly left—that little home in the west up in Flanders they had become so attached to. It is not always in the fighting line you feel the hardships of war."

Kemp.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce), moved the second reading of Bill No. 4, to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the solar mean time during the summer months.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year, in introducing this Bill on the 23rd of July, I gave a short resumé of the history of daylight-saving legislation. I do not intend to repeat

that history to-day, but as there are a large number of new members in this House, hon. gentlemen will probably bear with me while I make a very short summary of what I stated last year, following it up with a statement of what has occurred since that time along this same line. Daylight saving legislation has not been many years in force in any country. It is an example, probably, of one of the most rapid changes from a merely academic question to great practical use and benefit, through enactments in the law and practice of the countries in which it has been adopted. Without going into the history of the agitation before the early enactments, it is sufficient to say that the first daylight saving legislation was passed in Germany about the year 1914, the year of the beginning of the war. In 1916 it was adopted as an experiment in Great Britain, and put into operation for a period of between four and five months. After that experiment, a committee was formed to make a thorough examination of the effects. In France, in Austria, in Holland, and in about ten other European countries bordering on those communities, daylight saving legislation was put into force in 1915 and 1916. The British Parliamentary Committee formed to make an investigation, not only took cognizance of the effects in Great Britain, but continued and extended their investigations to these other European countries as well. Therefore their report covered the whole area of practical daylight service in legislation and in practice. That report was handed in during the late fall of 1916 or winter of 1917. It is now to be found in the records of this Parliament and can be referred to by any person. The report was an exhaustive one; questionnaires were sent out to all possible sources of authoritative information, embracing all classes of business and of general activities. The investigation was not confined to the economic effects of the measure, but also went into the effects of daylight saving upon the public health and public morals, its effects upon the schools, and generally almost every activity of life. After saying that the report of that committee was entirely favourable to the re-enactment of daylight saving legislation in Great Britain, I think it would be well to give two or three quotations from their report with reference to special phases of it, and I will trouble the House to that extent.

In respect to public health the delivery of the committee was in one section as follows:

> We have devoted particular attention to the question of the effect of "summer time" on the health of children, and we have been glad to find that, in spite of certain statements which have been made to the contrary, the bulk of the evidence favours the conclusion that in the case of children also "summer time" has proved a success.

The committee made investigation with reference to public health and morals, and their conclusion is favourable along that line as well. As to the general workers interested, this is their statement:

> The general view of employers, as expressed in the replies to the questionaires, was that their employees had taken full advantage of the extra hour's daylight; and while the majority were not in a position, with so short a period of observation, to state positively whether or not an improvement in health had resulted, a number had noticed increased vitality in their workers, and in some cases an improvement in the standard of the work. Only one or two employers recorded the appearance of any ill effects in the shape of tiredness and irregular time keeping. We have had evidence from all sources of the value of the extra daylight to the very large number of workers who cultivate gardens and allotments.

They conclude:

> Taking the whole of the evidence, we are satisfied that the great bulk of the working classes are favourable to summer time, and we are convinced that they stand to profit by it as much as, and in many cases more than, any other section of the community. Such real inconveniences as have been experienced will, we believe, be remedied with a little more experience of summer time conditions.

With regard to children's sleep, this is their utterance:

> We are glad to be able to report, as a result of all the evidence which we have received, that while in a certain number of districts a tendency to shortened sleeping hours has been noticed, the fears which were entertained in the matter have not in the main been justified.

As to trade, industry and commerce, they conclude:

> The comprehensive inquiries which we have described in paragraph 9 above, show beyond all question that the opinion of employers in every trade, industry, and business throughout the country, is overwhelmingly in favour of summer time.

Economies in artificial light and fuel are thoroughly satisfactory.

Coming to agriculture, in regard to which more objections have been raised than with reference to any other branch of activity, they say:

> In spite of such difficulties as have been recorded, a very large majority of farmers and war agriculture committees are in favour of the renewal of the Act, and the majority even of those who are of opinion that it was not advantageous to agriculture consider that it should be renewed, as they recognize its great benefits to the community at large.

As to foreign countries, the committee reports upon France, Germany and Austria, and in the main, come to about the same conclusions as they arrived at from their investigation of conditions and effects in Great Britain. Summing up I will read the paragraph in which they conclude their report.

> Taking the evidence we have received as a whole, we can unhesitatingly say that the vast preponderance of opinion throughout Great Britain is enthusiastically in favour of summer time and of its renewal, not only as a war measure, but as a permanent institution. As we have already pointed out, some difficulties have undoubtedly been experienced, but not to anything like the extent predicted by the critics of the scheme, and we have not heard of any that could not be overcome with good-will and organization. Indeed, the experience of summer time in 1916 has converted many of its former opponents into hearty supporters. Moreover, as we have pointed out elsewhere, many of those who still hold the view that summer time may be prejudicial to their own interests admit that the general public advantages arising from it more than outweigh any inconveniences that may be caused in particular cases.
>
> In a few years we believe that what opposition still remains to summer time will have completely disappeared, and that the whole nation will regard it as a wholly beneficent measure. We recommend, therefore, that summer time should be reintroduced in 1917 and in subsequent years.

It was reintroduced in 1917 in Great Britain, and Great Britain had an additional summer experience of its workings. It worked so well last year in Great Britain that this year they have put it into operation again, but with an extension of the period, thus bearing testimony to their view of its advantages. On 24th March the clock was set forward one hour in Great Britain, and will remain set forward until 29th September, when it will revert again to the old position. That shows, then, the progress as resulting from experiment, then examination and report, and then another year of experiment, insofar as Great Britain is concerned.

Coming to the United States, last year the Senate made a very thorough investigation into the whole question, taking in all activities, all associations, all societies, all forms of work in the United States. The Senate carried on that investigation for a number of weeks, and it was participated in by those who might be counted as speaking for the intelligent, forward-looking and enterprising people of the country generally. As a result of that investigation, the Senate not only recommended, but passed a Daylight Saving Bill. But it was in late June, 1917, when they passed it, and they came to the conclusion that at that late period of the year it would be better not to put it into force, and so they transmitted their Bill to the House of Representatives. In the House of Representatives the Bill came up early in the year. It is worthy of special note that whilst the measure was under discussion in the House of Representatives two gentlemen appeared there in support of the measure, and even in favour of an extension of the time set in the Senate Bill by adding a month at each end of the period. Mr. Garfield, Chairman of the Fuel Committee of the United States, and Mr. Hoover, Chairman and Director of food production and regulation in the United States, were the gentlemen who appeared and made those pleas, one representing fuel conservation, the other food production generally. As a result, the Bill passed in the House of Representatives by a large majority; I think the vote was 252 to 40—you might almost say it passed unanimously. This was the decision after thorough examination of the subject and after hearing representative delegations from every industry and activity in all parts of the United States. If there is one thing more than another pressed forward in Great Britain to-day, it is production, and especially food production. The Daylight Saving law has been in force during two summer seasons and has now been placed a third time in operation. In the United States the two great questions are fuel conservation and food production. After full examination and after the results of that examination had been allowed to be canvassed for more than six months the House of Representatives, as I have said, made its own investigation and then gave the measure practically unanimous approval. The inference from these instances is plain, and I know it will commend itself to this House and to the Canadian people as well.

Probably it would be a good thing to read briefly from the report of the Interstate Commerce Committee which took the matter up first in the routine order in the House of Representatives, examined it, and passed on their report to the House. First, I would refer to the general industries of the country. The United States chamber of commerce has a membership of about 450,000, has its affiliations all over the United States, and is probably the foremost and most representative business body or association of business men in the world. The chamber of commerce took this up before the agitation reached the Senate, and, through their organizations, obtained expressions of opinion from all the wide area

that they represented. Their chairman, in making his report, says:

> We have acted favourably on this question. Our committee have presented a report. Some of the members of the committee are here. It was passed unanimously by that body, meaning that the manufacturers, mercantile houses, and business establishments throughout the country, real estate interests, banking interests, and others that you might call general business interests, are in favour of the proposition.

That expresses broadly the sentiment of the business interests of the United States, as represented through these chambers of commerce. With reference to the federation of labour, it is well to put on Hansard, I think, the resolution of the American federation of labour. It reads:

> That we urge the inauguration of the daylight saving project for the conservation of time and opportunity for greater leisure and open-air exercise for the masses of the people, and we insist that in order that the change may be beneficial it must have its general application throughout the whole United States. We will gratefully receive from and actively give to any groups the fullest support in the attainment of the daylight saving project, so long as it shall be utilized for the purposes herein declared.

I may say, incidentally, that President Gompers is entirely in favour of the daylight saving measure, and used his very great and widely extended influence towards its passage, through the Senate and House of Representatives. The latter part of the report of the interstate commerce committee of the House of Representatives, has this to say:

> The hearings contain information as to the result of similar legislation in foreign countries. It is believed by the committee that the possible benefits to be derived from such a measure are more than sufficient to offset the objections which have been presented. It is recognized that these objections are not without some foundation and force. In view, however, of the increased food production which will be brought about under the Bill, the comfort and convenience which it will bring to labourers and the public generally, and the saving of expenses, especially relating to light and fuel, it is believed by our committee that the measure should be enacted.

It was upon that representation, with others, that the Bill was passed by the majority which I have already stated.

So far as Canada is concerned, hon. gentlemen probably know as much about the question as I do. There have been attempts for restricted operation of daylight saving in municipalities, towns and cities in various parts of our country. It has always, however, been felt that the localizing of daylight saving is a handicap, because you get out of touch with general time and with all the activities and operations that are carried out under general time. In some cities which tried daylight saving, they had one, two, or three different kinds of time, and that, of course, caused confusion. Notwithstanding all that, the testimony from the towns that have tried it is, in the main, very favourable to its operation and results, and quite a number of cities in Canada retain it until this day.

It has, however, always been felt in Canada that there were two objections to daylight saving: first, that to be effective it should be nation-wide, and secondly, that in our peculiar apposition to the United States of America along such a long border line, it would conduce to the smooth and efficient working out of the system if the two countries acted on a parity in this matter. The present Bill tends to meet both those objections. If it is adopted, we shall have nation-wide daylight saving operating in the Dominion of Canada, and we shall have also coterminous with us the operation of the daylight system in the whole of the United States of America. The Act which was passed and which received the President's signature a few weeks ago is of a double nature. In the first place, it establishes a standard time with zones over which this time is operative. In the second place, it fixes the daylight saving period from the 31st day of March to the 31st day of October, making it a seven months' period, or two months longer than that provided for in the Bill first passed by the United States Senate. Therefore, at two o'clock in the morning on the 1st day of April, United States' clocks will be set one hour ahead, and from that date until the 31st of October time will be operated on that basis.

It was probably possible for the Dominion Government to have put daylight saving into operation under the War Measures Act, but some of our critics have incidentally mentioned the fact that the War Measures Act appears to have been pretty hard-worked during the last year or so, and as Parliament was on the point of being assembled, it was thought better that we should bring this measure before Parliament, even at the risk, if it were favourably received, that we should not be able to begin its operation coterminously with the United States. The Bill provides that it shall come into operation on proclamation by the Governor in Council, so that it may be brought into operation at any time it is considered most advantageous. Bearing in mind, then, the fact that

these two objections which have hitherto had a good deal of weight will, by this measure and by the legislative action of the United States of America, be done away with, the problem is a plain and easy one for us to make up our minds upon. I think I can state, without going beyond what is actually the fact, that all interests, certainly all the important interests, in the Dominion of Canada are, under the circumstances, strongly in favour of following the lead of the United States and the other great and progressive countries of the world by establishing a daylight saving system in Canada. I think that is true of all the business interests, without any exception. I have here a large number of recommendations which I do not intend to read to the House. They will be placed upon the Table so that those who wish to consult them may do so.

Almost the only objections that come are from rural communities, on behalf of the productive interests as carried out by general farming operations. Insofar as small-lot production, adjacent to towns, cities and villages, is concerned, there is no doubt at all that the daylight saving, giving the extra hour at the end of the day, will very greatly tend to increase that kind of production, but the farmer in a larger way is a little bit suspicious as to how it will work in reference to his operations. I want to put before that class, and the gentlemen who represent that class, the consideration to which I adverted a moment ago. Surely the result of examination and actual experiment on the part of ten or twelve great countries of the world for three or four years, and particularly of countries in which agricultural development is a great activity, should hold good also for the farming communities of Canada. In Great Britain, the United States of America, Denmark, Holland, Sweden—all very large'y agricultural countries—we find the consensus of opinion overwhelmingly in favour of the continuation of the system after an experiment of a year or two years, or after thorough inquiry, as in the United States. Granted all the uncertainty as to how a new measure may work out, and still the weight of argument seems to be favourable to the belief that our fears or suspicions in this case are not very well grounded. Anyway, co-operation and goodwill, as the committee report, will go a long way towards remedying those difficulties which at first will occur. In Great Britain even though agriculturists in certain sections felt that the scheme had been productive of difficulties in their case, yet the large majority felt otherwise, and even the minority felt that if it was for the general interest then the general interest should rule. I think analysis and a little thought will convince one that the measure would not be a menace or danger to the general farming interests. This legislation does not make any man get up an hour earlier or eat his dinner at a different time unless he chooses to do as others do. Sometimes it is almost borne in on one that the backbone of the opposition to this scheme with some persons is that it is interfering with Providence; that as Providence placed the sun in the heavens as the basis for our time, we should therefore not interfere with Providence; it is almost an act of impiety, they think, to put on the clock for an hour. Now I do not think we need push our theology that far, as a moment's consideration will show. We do not go by the sun now; we go by the clock; and the clock is a convention, which is kept up in order to avoid the innumerable difficulties which would be encountered if every man on every meridian went by solar time. But the clock is not our only convention. After we have had that for a great many years, the general business interests of the country, particularly the transport interests, come along and say that we must have another convention in addition to the clock, and so they arrange zones within which the time will be the same; that is simply an artificial contrivance the purpose of which is to enable communities to act together, where keeping to the solar time, or even to the clock. would cause great inconvenience.

You will excuse me, Mr. Speaker, for turning my back on you, but I had to do that, relying on old friendship, or else be "hollered" at by the gentlemen at the back who cannot hear me speak when I address the Chair; so I acted on the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. I think I have said all that is necessary in putting this matter before the House, and I will leave it to the sense of the House to take the measure up and push it through. Some one told me to-day that I was trying to knock daylight out of people, that is not quite correct. I am on neutral ground; if I knock one hour of daylight out of people at one end of the day, I knock another hour into them at the other end of the day.

Mr. E. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): If this legislation is put through I presume

the railways will be compelled to conform to it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That was the rock on which we split in Winnipeg. We adopted daylight saving there two years ago, but were obliged to discontiue it because the railways had a different time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked a similar question last year, I think I mentioned the view of the railways and read a communication from Sir George Bury, in which he set all fears on that score at rest. Only to-day I received communications from the railways wanting to know whether it could not be arranged to have the measure go into operation simultaneously with the American measure.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent): Mr. Speaker, this being the first opportunity I have had of speaking since the new Parliament assembled, let me join with your former colleagues and other hon. gentlemen in extending to you my hearty congratulations on again being elected as the Presiding Officer of this House. With regard to this Bill, I was elected as an independent Liberal, with full authority to support any measure the Government brought forward which I thought would be in the best interests of the prosecution of the war. I regret that on the first occasion I rise in this House, it is to oppose the legislation just brought down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and which he has so ably explained in his address. I regret that in bringing forward this Bill he has not given to the labouring people and the producers of this country the attention they deserve. I represent a rural constituency and urban, perhaps the largest constituency in this house, and since this Bill has been on the Order Paper I have taken every opportunity of ascertaining the views of the labouring people in my home city and in other large towns, and I say without hesitation that in interviewing these people I have received no demand or request of any sort for such a change as is now proposed. The measure has no support whatever in the rural sections. Every agriculturist whom I have come in contact with is absolutely opposed to changing the time. One gentleman said to me: "It will mean a great decrease in production if the measure is put into force." It means that the farmers will have to wait one hour more in the morning before going on their land.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's argument might be made stronger if a question were asked now and then. What is there is this Bill to prevent a farmer going on the land at any hour that he chooses?

Mr. McCOIG: There is nothing to interfere with the farmer going on his land when he pleases. The trouble is, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent his employees quitting when they please. They will quit at six o'clock, which is the universal hour. When this Bill goes into effect the farmer will lose one hour's work, and that will lessen production to a very great extent. The main argument advanced by the minister in favour of the measure was that it was a measure of reciprocity with the United States; the United States was doing it, therefore Canada should do it. The minister thinks we should be very considerate of the United States at the present time. Let me tell him that what the producers of this country most desire is reciprocity in the seeds we require. If the minister would direct his energy along that line it would be appreciated by all the producers in Canada. He might go further and give us reciprocity in the implements required for production, thereby preventing the corporations exacting exorbitant profits from our farmers, and I sincerely hope some action will be taken along that line.

I have had representations from almost every farmers' club in Canada protesting against this legislation. Digressing for a moment, let me point out that the reason why the farmers are organizing these clubs is because they believe the Government are not thoroughly in touch with their requirements. Let me read a resolution adopted by the Wallaceburg Branch of the United Farmers of Ontario bearing on this question:

To A. B. McCoig, M.P.,

Dear Sir:—We the members of the Wallaceburg Branch of the United Farmers of Ontario feel that if the daylight saving scheme, as proposed at the present time, is put into effect, it will greatly inconvenience us in our farming operations.

In farming as in no other industry we are dealing with the successful growing and harvesting of plants which require the strict observance of certain fundamental principles. Many of these principles are dependent entirely on weather conditions over which we have no control, as we instance here. In the cultivation of certain hoed crops, when they are very young, when the harrow or weeder is used, the young plants are very brittle in the early morning, but in the late afternoon can be and are successfully worked; especially is

this true of corn and beans. Beans in this country are very much subjected to disease. At no time in the life of the bean is disease more easily spread than when the plant is wet with dew. One of the most closely observed rules in prevention of the spread of this disease is never to work among the plants when they are damp, as this retards morning operations rather than hastens them.

I can assure the minister from my own experience that the plants can be very easily injured when they are damp, as those who have had any experience with this particular crop will agree. The same remark applies to the other hoed crops in southwestern Ontario, and hon. gentlemen will readily see the objection to getting men out from the city to work on these crops, and then when they are on the farm being unable to put them to work for an hour later. The resolution continues:

The same is true in the harvesting of all crops. Hay, especially the clovers, which are the most valuable for hay purposes, should never be cut or handled when the dew is on them. Exterior water moisture when incorporated in clovers decreases their palatability and keeping qualities.

That is absolutely true. Every agriculturist in the House will agree that we have to wait until half past eight or nine in the morning until we can safely go into the hayfield. If this measure passes, the quitting hour for the hired man will be one hour hour earlier, that is five o'clock, and the farmer will therefore lose one hour of valuable time. This measure will shorten the day to such an extent that a large portion of the hay crop will be damaged, if not rendered unfit for the purpose required. The resolution goes on:

Grain cut and bound up into sheaves, damp, requires a longer period to dry in the stook, and has a tendency to become musty.

This measure, if passed, will mean that we shall not only be unable to harvest the crop as successfully, but when threshing time comes the day will be one hour shorter. It is impossible to start threshing or cutting grain until it is dry, otherwise sweating will take place and diminish the feeding quality of the grain. The resolution goes on:

We believe that everything should be done to increase production and save our crops in the best possible manner. Moving the clocks on one hour means the addition of time to that part of the day when cultivation and harvest can least afford it, and cutting off from the part of the day which is most valuable. All this is not so much related to the farmer himself, as to his hired help. The farmer has often to work into the night because he cannot work in the grain early in the morning; but most of his day labour will not do it, and often much of his regular help.

As I said before, the hired help will quit at five o'clock and the farmer will have to work on from that hour himself, short-handed. It goes on:

The high school boy and factory hand, used to his hours, will demand the observance of the change of time that he may enjoy the extra hour's fun in town in the evening with his fellows, thus losing to us that hour of the day when it is most valuable. Cultivation starts in earnest in May, and harvest is not done till Fall, so the farmer is due to lose much valuable labour throughout the season when it is most needed.

We therefore urge you to carefully consider our point of view, and to defend us in this urgent year of greater production.

Yours sincerely,
United Farmers of Ontario,
Wallaceburg Branch,
Wm. McCreary, President.
Leo O'Neil, Secretary.

This is only one of the many petitions which have been forwarded to me, but I shall not read the others as I feel this puts the case very clearly before the House. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) is not in his seat. We are all looking for great results from the administration of one who has had such a vast experience in the western provinces, and I hope soon to be able to congratulate him on bringing down meeasures which will be of a progressive character. But a measure such as this is more in the interests of the pleasure-seekers in the large centers than in the interests of the producers, and if we are to have greater production this year, some more effective measure than this will have to be introduced.

Mr. THOMAS HAY (Selkirk): I have listened with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McCoig), and I am very much in accord with his views. I think production in Canada will be lessened by the passing of this measure. My hon. friend has stated the facts correctly with reference to the hay crop and the harvesting of grain. Very often we have to wait for an hour in the morning, and sometimes two hours, until the sun is sufficiently strong to dry the grain. From the standpoint of the working people also, I am opposed to this legislation. I am satisfied that in western Canada, at all events, with our long period of daylight, this measure would mean the taking off of one hour from the working classes in the morning, which could not be made up to them at night. By this legislation they will be compelled to get up and go to work an hour earlier, but certainly they will not go to bed an hour

earlier, for people will not go to bed as long as daylight is over the land; so these people will not get the extra hour's rest in the evening. Daylight saving is largely an experiment.

While it seems to have worked all right in European countries, and while we have certain reports to that effect from those countries, I am satisfied that it is still in the experimental stage. Brandon and Winnipeg tried it in 1916 and they have discontinued it since. That does not say much for the Bill. The only real, good argument that could be advanced for the adoption of this Bill at this time would be the fact that the United States are adopting the same system. With reference to the school children, if the schools were all opened and closed according to the time proposed by this Bill, it would not be in the interest of the health of the children. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) says that according to reports the health of the children has not been impaired in the older countries, but I do not see how it can work out in this country if the working men and the school children are compelled to get up an hour earlier and lose an hour's rest in the evening. That certainly would not be in the interest of the children. I cannot see how production would be increased by the adoption of the Bill. Personally, I feel satisfied that production would not be increased. If the farmers and the farmers' wives were compelled to observe the time prescribed by this Bill, it would mean that they would have to rise an hour earlier. The hired help would quit an hour earlier in the evening. That, in my opinion would not increase production. My right hon. friend said that the most important industries of the country were unanimous in asking that this Bill be adopted. I have not heard any request from any of the organized bodies of farmers for a change of this kind. I do not think they have made such a request and I do not think it is their intention to do so. The great problem before Canada to-day is that of the production of more food and I am satisfied that food would not be produced as largely if this Bill were adopted as it would under the old time.

Mr. F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I shall be able to throw any light, whether daylight or otherwise, on this Bill, but I would like to say as one of the members from the western part of Canada, where they have long daylight, or rather twilight—and I do not know whether they have it any longer than any other place of the same latitude—that we have tried this daylight system municipally for years past and we have found it a thorough success. We would not under any circumstances go back to the old system. The reason for adopting this system was to give artisans one more hour of daylight in the summer months. I have seen, prior to the war, men from stores, shops and factories down in the Current River park playing their full game of baseball after their evening meal. Surely that is beneficial to them. I know of no objection to this Bill. Certainly there is none with regard to the school children. We have tried that out also and it has been successful. At first the mothers had some difficulty in the summer months, in getting the children to go to bed a little earlier than they were accustomed to before, but the experience in that part of Canada has proved that daylight saving is practical and beneficial.

I do admit that in so far as the agricultural labouring classes are concerned there may be something to be said on the other side, but I would point out, as the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, that there is nothing in this Bill to tell the man to go to work before the dew is off the grass or compel him to stop work whilst there is time for him to work. If it is necessary in the interest of production, he will continue to work especially if the farmer sees fit to give him extra pay for overtime as he ought to. I am one of those who believe that the farm labourer should receive his overtime just the same as the worker in the manufacturing industries. If there be any hardship caused by the adoption of this system, it can be compensated for by extra pay.

As to increased production, I think a little consideration will show that it will be decidedly helped by the adoption of this measure. Take, for example, what occurred in the cities at the head of the lakes. Last year, by the cultivation of gardens and vacant lots, they produced about $100,000 of increased value; Fort William about $50,000, and Port Arthur about the same amount. That was done by men after hours, chiefly. I have had communications from there already asking that the shops and stores be ordered closed at five o'clock to allow them to get on the land and to do their work. The people of these cities are greatly interested in the increased production of food in order to help our allies across the seas. I have been connected with the food control work since last October and I know something of what this garden work means and the extent to which it has been carried on all

over Canada. My firm conviction is that, while we may lose the work of five agricultural labourers, we will gain that of more than a hundred industrial labourers within the cities and towns. I urge the adoption of this Bill strongly in behalf of increased production.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of diffidence that I, as a new member, rise in this House to voice my opinions, but I have risen for the same reason that my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) has addressed the House. I did not know that my hon. friend from Port Arthur was going to speak on the Bill, or probably I would have advised him to handle it entirely from the standpoint of a city where this method of advancing the time has been in force for a number of years. Just as my hon. friend from Port Arthur has stated, at the head of the lakes, at Fort William and Port Arthur, this method of saving daylight has been in force for many years, and there has never been any complaint from any group of people or any class with regard to the conditions caused by it. On the contrary, the great consensus of opinion is that it is conducive to health and advantageous in all manner of works. Besides representing the city, both the member for Port Arthur and myself represent rural constituencies. My constituents knew that this Bill was coming before the House, and although I have had a great many letters from them on different matters pertaining to my work here, no one has mentioned any opposition to the Daylight Saving Bill.

There are many reasons why this Bill should be adopted. First, let us consider it from the medical standpoint. I have been practising for fourteen or fifteen years, and I think I can speak with some authority on the medical side of the question. In what I say from this standpoint I believe that I am voicing the opinion of a number of medical men in this House. And just here, in passing, let me say that I am very much pleased that there are so many medical men in the House. A good deal of opposition is manifested in the press at times to so many lawyers being in the House, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the medical men who have come here in such large numbers will endeavour to counteract any evil influence of the lawyers.

Coming to medical reasons, I believe, as every one who looks into hygienic questions believes, that sunlight is necessary for health. Every little boy who has ever gone fishing knows that if he picks up a board to look for worms he will find the grass underneath the board white and anaemic, because the sunlight has been excluded. The same thing applies to human life. I know of quite a little experiment which, no doubt, all of the medical men in this House have read of, in regard to an infection of tuberculosis, which was experimented with on rats some years ago, and the same thing applies to human life just as it does to any other form of life. A dozen rats were infected with tubercle bacilli. Six of them were put in the cellar of a house where the surroundings were unsanitary, and where the sunlight was excluded. The other six rats were allowed to run about in the fresh air and sunlight. I remember distinctly that the six rats which were kept in the cellar of the house and prevented from taking in the proper amount of fresh air and sunlight died as a result of the small degree of inoculation which they had received. The other six lived because of the counteracting effect of the fresh air and sunlight. That is a little point, in passing, from the medical standpoint, but I believe it an important one.

Then, there is the economic standpoint, which is of great importance at the present time. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has very ably dealt with that side, and probably I should not presume to mention it. But there is the point of the saving in coal which will result from the lack of necessity of generating so much electricity for the house to use. There would also be a saving of oil, where oil lamps are used in the country where electricity is not available. This will result in a saving of fuel, and we all know that the fuel situation is a difficult one to handle. As a consequence there will be a saving of transportation. Honourable gentlemen from the West know that the transportation question is also a very difficult one to handle, particularly at the time of the year when the great crops of the West are coming East. They know that a saving in transportation at that time will be an advantage to the country. So that these two questions, coal and electricity, fuel and transportation, will be helped.

I have heard a number of hon. members object on the ground of loss of production. I was going to mention the same fact that the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) referred to in connection with the head of the lakes. We have had this daylight saving rule in operation for some years, and whatever action may be taken here, we have no intention of going back.

At the head of the lakes, production has been marvellously increased, particularly in the vacant lot gardens, to the extent, as the hon. member said, of $100,000, at the cost of a few hundred dollars for minor clerical work. I believe that all over this country you will find that a greater production will result, particularly of the garden variety. I do not doubt that hon. members from more rural constituencies than mine know whereof they speak, and that there will be some disadvantages. The greatest objection is due to the fact of the misconception that we will be getting up earlier in the morning. Except for the one night, when the hands of the clock are shoved one hour ahead, and you do miss one hour's sleep, there is absolutely no difference. I venture to say when one travels to Port Arthur or to Fort William—which use eastern time, but which should use western time—if he did not change his watch he would notice no difference.

Then, there is one point that has not been mentioned, and in these days of moral uplift it may be worth mentioning, that is the effect of daylight saving on the morals of the people. It has been claimed that morals have been greatly elevated as a result of this measure. I know very little of the actions, or of the methods of acting, of the Devil, but some of my friends who claim they do, tell me that he prefers to act in the dark. I believe we may even raise the morals of this country slightly in this matter.

Then, there is another little point, affecting the returned soldier. Hundreds and thousands of soldiers are coming back here, maimed and broken. If they are given longer hours of daylight it will make it easier for these men to get around. Some will think this suggestion far fetched, but it is a fact that it will be much more difficult for a man using crutches—and we shall have many of them in this country—to get around in the dark than in the day. I wish to support very strongly the passing of this Bill. I think it will be a good thing in peace times, and I consider it is a much better thing in war times.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the arguments in this debate, and while I am unprepared, owing to not knowing that this Bill would come up to-day, I must give you the views of a farmer. I have been a farmer all my life, and if this Bill passes I think it will do a very great deal of harm to the farming industry of this country. There is no question that, if it went to a vote, ninety per cent of the farmers would vote against the proposal. I was rather amused to hear an hon. member say, in effect: Make it a law, and you farmers can break that law. Now, farmers are not lawbreakers; we want a law made that will give us justice. It has been advocated by medical men who do not know very much about it, but I, who have practised farming all my life, say it will be a very great handicap, in the time of harvest especially. For one, I would not say to the business men of the cities, towns and villages that this law should not be passed. But do not at the same time bind the farmers hand and foot to lose the best part of the day for us, which is in the evening. In the morning we have to wait until the dew dries. We cannot handle our hay, or our grain in the early morning, because if you bind it up wet it will rot; you have to wait until about eight o'clock.

Then the hired help has been mentioned. The hired help will work according to the whistle of the city. This is war time, and the farmers are interested in the welfare of the country and are trying to produce all they possibly can. If you handicap us so that we cannot work there is going to be a very serious loss. I trust that hon. gentlemen will eliminate that part of the measure which has anything to do with the farming community, and let farmers use their judgment as they see fit. We are told that daylight saving has been adopted in the United States, and in other countries, but I want to ask hon. gentlemen what has been done by the board of trade of the city of Hamilton? They are up right straight against this plan being adopted. I have many letters from my constituents, which I did not bring to-day, stating that a petition could be circulated and that they could bring down one thousand farmers from the county of Carleton to protest against this measure in the interest of the agriculturist.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of a real city, I would like to express my approval of the Bill. As a matter of increased production, allow me to point out that it has been estimated that in the cultivation of the back yards in the city of Toronto a million dollars worth of produce can be grown annually. During the past two or three years a large quantity of produce has been secured from back-yard gardens. It has had a most important and elevating effect upon the whole population. There is no doubt at all that engaging in gardening

operations has an uplifting moral effect, and if there is one thing that is necessary in a large city like Toronto or Montreal it is that anything that conduces to that uplift should be adopted.

Now, under the present hours, if we can produce a million dollars worth of garden truck in the city of Toronto, with an extra hour of daylight in the evening that production could be very greatly increased in Toronto and elsewhere. As you know, Sir, in our city nearly every house is a self-contained home. Our people all have pieces of garden land, and if we could get them to undertake this production, and we are succeeding in doing to a very satisfactory degree, it would mean a great deal for the city of Toronto.

I submit for the consideration of the farmer members of the House that it is the duty of Parliament to consider with some care the situation in a big city. The people who reside in the rural districts live under the very best conditions that human nature can enjoy. Those who live in the cities, in surroundings more or less congested, merit some special consideration from the law-making power; and anything that will conduce to their welfare is well worthy of the careful and thoughtful attention of the House and of the farming community as well. I think it will be found that the urban population in Ontario is about as large as the rural population if not larger, and bearing in mind the possibilities of increased production in all the towns and cities of the country; that means a very great deal in the way of increased production. Take cities like Woodstock, Guelph, St. Thomas and Galt, where the workmen employed in the factories live in houses with an acre or so of land attached, the extra hour possible under this Bill will enable those men to cultivate their lands, with very much better results than can possibly be achieved under existing conditions. The farmer's business is to cultivate the land. If the dew did not rise until twelve o'clock he would have to gather in his grain or his hay after that time, and it would be just as easy for him to engage in some other occupation in the meantime, and to garner his crops later in the day. I quite concede that those who have to employ labour to work their farms might have some difficulties with individuals, but it seems to me that is a matter which can be easily arranged between the employer and the employee. No hardship would be involved in asking the employee to work the statutory hours fixed under this Bill, instead of those which prevail at the present time. I think those who speak for the farmer are anticipating a difficulty which is not likely to arise to any great degree. In my opinion a little suavity and kindness, as well as consideration in the dealings of the farmers with those who work for them, would overcome any difficulties that are likely to exist. I feel satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that a year's experiment with daylight saving would result in the conviction in the farming as well as the urban communities that this legislation is something that should be permanently adopted.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): Like the member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer), I can speak from experience on this subject, because in the city of Regina, from which I come, daylight saving has obtained for, I think, the past four years. I have during all that time opposed daylight saving, not because of any demerits in the measure itself, but because of the fact that we found ourselves out of harmony with the surrounding villages and towns. But, as far as the city of Regina itself is concerned, you could not induce it now to repeal the daylight saving by-law, although on two occasions during the past four years we have made efforts to do so. At one time petitions were circulated throughout the city asking that a by-law be again submitted to the people for a vote on the question, but enough signatures to that petition could not be obtained to make it worth while dealing with the matter. That will indicate to you, Sir, that the people in the city in question, living under daylight saving, as they have done for four years, are fairly satisfied with it. Furthermore, one of the members of the Regina city council happens to be the largest farmer in that locality, and we find that the farmers contiguous to the city have all adopted the one-hour-past time to be in harmony with Regina itself. The surrounding towns and villages, of course, have not yet done so. The farmers, however, who live contiguous to the city have done so, and all speak strongly in its favour. The farmer member of the Regina City Council to whom I have referred, indeed was the strongest supporter of the past-time hour that we have in that body. Therefore, my experience indicates to me that it would be wise to follow the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this matter and give daylight saving a nation-wide trial. While on this subject let me say that the city of Regina enjoys the distinction of being the most advanced of all Canadian cities in the

matter of vacant-lot gardening. In this we have really set the pace, and our city in the summer time, by reason of the fact, is well worth seeing. If such is the case it is because we have had daylight saving in operation for the past four years. Under all the circumstances, I most heartily support the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Bill which he has submitted to the House.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): As usual, we have the city representatives telling the farming communities how they should operate their farms, and what treatment they should accord to their help in order to get them to work an extra hour, after the city people have gone to their different recreations. I represent a constituency in the Maritime Provinces where there are not only farmers, but towns and cities in which manufacturing and other industries are carried on. Last year, when this Bill was introduced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I received a very large number of letters and telegrams in opposition to the measure from agriculturists in my constituency. Since Parliament opened I have received other communications to the same effect. It seems to me there are only one or two practical considerations arising in regard to this measure: one is the advantage—and an advantage it is—to those who are employed in shops, factories, and work of that character, to have the extra hour in the evening for recreation. No doubt there is something in favour of the Bill to be said on that account. The argument advanced by my hon. friend from Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) that he had seen clerks employed in dry goods establishments enjoying a game of baseball after their day's work is all very well for those men; but it seems to me that at the present time the vital interests of the people of this country are concerned in the question of greater production. To secure that result appeals have been made to the farmers of the country, not only by this Parliament, and by the ministers of agriculture of the Dominion and the several provinces, but men have been specially sent out from the cities to impress upon the agricultural population in the different localities that it was their bounden duty to their country to produce more. Now to achieve that result the farmers must have all the facilities that can possibly be provided. So far as the great majority of the people of Canada are concerned, I do not think it matters at all whether we have daylight saving or whether we do not. When we get down to the question of greater production—and I am speaking from a local point of view only because I am not familiar with the farming operations in the province of Ontario and in the greater provinces of the West—we must bear in mind practical conditions. In the Maritime Provinces the heavy dews remain two or three hours in the morning, and it is impossible for farmers to do work during that time.

You cannot work with the hay, nor with the grain, you cannot cultivate root crops because of the dampness. It is against the growth of the crop if you work while the dew and dampness are on the ground While I am not what you would call a farmer absolutely, I do some farming in the way of cutting and curing hay, and I know that during haying operations in my county, and the Maritime Provinces generally, for hay-making and harvesting the hour between five and six o'clock in the afternoon is worth any two or three hours in the morning, and it is important to the people who have this work to do that they should have this hour. The answer might be made that there is nothing to prevent the farmer going into the field and working the extra hour. That is very true, and they do it; they not only work that extra hour provided by the Daylight Savings Bill, but they have in the past worked an extra two hours to save their crop. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a large number of the farmers in my section of the country are compelled to hire a great deal of labour to assist in harvesting their crops, and the farm labourers will stop work at six o'clock, the same as the working men in the cities and towns adjoining. For that reason I say it is a very great inconvenience to the farmer, it would be a great hindrance to him in producing and harvesting his crop, and would prove a very great disadvantage. Personally, it makes no difference to me, and I have no feeling one way or the other, but on behalf of the farming population, a large number of whom I represent, I protest against the passage of this Bill.

Mr. EVAN E. FRASER (Welland): I did not intend to speak on this measure because I thought it would be argued out along slightly different lines, but I may say that the first money I earned in my life was working for a farmer during haying and harvesting, and every morning at half past two he would get up and say: "Hurry up, boys, get up, day is breaking, time to go to work." If I were working for that farmer at the present time I would hate

to see this Bill come into force, but representing, as I do, eight large townships, and knowing that that custom is not in vogue now, and having had occasion during last September, October and November to go around and call at their houses on my own private business, I found, on looking at their clocks, that in nearly every house the clock was pushed on anywhere from a quarter of an hour to an hour, and when I would make a remark as to the time they would say: "It's all right, Fraser, we know that clock is three-quarters of an hour fast." I have not had any protest from the farmers of the county of Welland against this Bill, and I am heartily in accord with it because I spent last summer over in England and France, where dalight saving was in force, and outside of the first week, when we had to get up an hour earlier than usual, everything moved along like clockwork.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): I would remind the House of a practice that was initiated by the city of Portage la Prairie which is of importance in this time of greater production. The business men of that place began closing their business places at four or four thirty, and motor parties were formed, who took the employees and the businessmen themselves to the fields where they stooked the grain. Thousands of acres of grain were put up in that way, which would not have been put up but for that assistance. They worked from the time they arrived in the fields until dark. The passage of this Bill will add one hour to that labour, because it is a class of labour that is right at the doors of the farmer, and in this time of shortage of labour which apparently threatens us for the coming year, it will add millions of hours to the assistance the farmer gets in the fields and will offset, at least in the West, any loss that the speakers who have put up a contention in favour of the farmer have referred to.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): As representing one of the purely agricultural districts in the Dominion of Canada, in Prince Edward Island, I want to say that the objections of hon. gentlemen to this Bill are not well taken. In our province the farmers get up any time after five o'clock in the morning, and, as a matter of fact, as far as labour is concerned, we have no labour. The people have to do the work themselves. The women and children have to turn out and work, and there is nothing in the Bill to stop people from working as late as they like. The hon. promoter of the Bill (Sir George Foster) pointed out the fact that the United States had adopted this measure, and because they had adopted it we should adopt it. In other words, I am glad to see my hon. friend is beginning to view the question of reciprocity in its proper light. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman, and I want to tell the House that what is true in regard to this Bill, so far as reciprocity with the United States is concerned, was also true of the old Bill that was voted down in 1911. The advantages are all on the side of Canada. Hon. gentlemen who live in the far north of this country will, perhaps, know that the days are very much longer in that district than in the parallel of latitude to the south of it. The further north we go the longer the day becomes in the summer time, and, consequently, whatever advantage there is in the United States is of two-fold advantage to the Dominion of Canada, so far as the question of solar light is concerned, because our days, after the 21st and 22nd of March up to the 22nd of September, are always longer than the days in the United States, which are all south of the 49th parallel of latitude. Consequently, if the Americans have adopted a good system, and it is an advantage to them, it will be of very much more advantage to the people of Canada.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): As representing one of the constituencies of the Pacific coast, I support the Bill. Although we have not had daylight saving in British Columbia, the matter has been discussed a great deal. The late Col. Hart McHarg—whom, no doubt, a number of the members of this House knew—who went over with the first contingent, and gave up his life to the cause of the Empire, was largely instrumental in bringing the matter before the different organizations, such as boards of trade, and so forth. I think I can safely say that all those organizations passed resolutions in favour of the Bill, and I know that in my constituency, which is a farming community to a certain extent—perhaps the best farming district in the whole of British Columbia—there is absolutely no objection to the Bill. Other organizations are also favourable to it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated the case in favour of the Bill so well that I do not care to add anything further, except to say that in our constituency we are very much in favour of it, and were very much disappointed last year when it was dropped.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I should like to say one word in approval of this measure. I do so at the request of a

large number of my rural constituents. I think we are wandering away from the subject. We are discussing theories which, after all, will probably prove to be without any foundation in fact. We are forgetting that daylight saving has been tried out in Germany, France, England, and that it has proved an entire success. I myself was serving with the forces in France when daylight saving was first introduced there, and I never heard one objection to it from any person, although I talked with people in the farming communities, with people in the cities and with my comrades in the army. I did the same thing in England, and daylight saving is voted by one and all as being a great advantage to a country. I do not think that the objections which have been raised here have any foundation at all in the face of the fact that we have the actual experience of the countries that have tried it out.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): As the debate this afternoon has developed into a general discussion, I would be remiss if I did not put on record before the House the feeling of my constituents. As you know, Sir, the riding that I have the honour to represent is purely an urban one. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), said that he spoke for a city that was a city. I speak for a city that was a city when Toronto was "Muddy York." I speak for a city that, I am happy to say, has in time past been a conservative city, and one that to-day has shown itself ready to adopt new ideas, and I am, therefore, in favour of this Bill. When this question of daylight saving was first advanced in this country, I thought it was a new fad that would only be adopted by faddists, but I had the privilege in 1916 of being in England, and one thing that impressed me was this, that the daylight saving or longer hours of daylight that might be enjoyed by the people, was an immense advantage, particularly to the working classes. They left work nominally at the same hour by the clock, but really one hour earlier by the sun, and it gave them a singular opportunity of enjoying outdoor life in a way that they never had before, and so far as I could gather, public sentiment, one and all, approved the change and thought it was a change that should be made annually. Viewing the matter also from the point of view of the children—and I think in a subject of this sort the children should be considered, particularly, the children of the cities, the children in the country always have plenty of fresh air, but the children of the cities, particularly those who live in large cities or industrial centres, have not as much opportunity of enjoying the fresh air and sunlight as we would like them to have—this daylight saving scheme has certainly meant for them one hour more of outdoor life. Objections have been raised by parents of one class of children, that is the child that is only sufficiently old to remain up until, as we now measure time, about seven o'clock. Parents in England told me that they found some little difficulty in getting children of that age to bed at seven o'clock, but they thought the balance of convenience to family life was in favour of daylight saving, as they considered their other children were stronger and healthier because they had the opportunity of being more out of doors.

I would like to make the plea to the House on another ground and that is on the ground of the heaviness with which the high cost of living is bearing on the mechanics and labouring classes of the cities. The cost of food has been enhanced very much during the past few years, and although wages have made a radical advance, they have not increased as rapidly as has the cost of living. The net result is that many people, in order

5 p.m.

to make both ends meet, have found it incumbent upon them to cut off from their daily diet many things they should have. Last year in the city of Kingston we inaugurated a municipal gardening scheme. The people seized upon it with avidity, and they worked at it enthusiastically, with the result that many people this year had a supply of fresh vegetables that, if that scheme had not been effected, they would have had to deny themselves. I am thoroughly convinced that if we can get one more hour of daylight, it will mean a very much greater increase of production by the city people, and I would like to see those who represent rural ridings try to meet us in this way.

I do not think the objection launched by certain members in this House to the Bill, on the ground that it means the public will go to bed by sunlight, is sound or tenable. I have sent for a Canadian Almanac, and I find that practically speaking, in this part of Canada and as far west as Fort William, the sun goes to rest at eight o'clock, with the result that twilight will be over at nine, as we to-day measure time, and, if the clocks were set back one hour, at ten o'clock night would

be on for practical purposes and for the purpose of sleeping. I do not know how it is with farmers in other parts of the country, but so far as farmers in that part of the country from which I come are concerned—and I live in the country during the summer—they do not work by the clock; they work by the sun, and those of my constituents who go out into the country for summer work tell me that one of the objections they have is that they do not work so many hours by the day, but that just as soon as the first cock's crow is heard, the voice of the farmer's son is also heard calling them to work, and that sleep comes only when night sets in. It seems to me, taking everything into view, that the passage of this Bill would be advantageous to the country at this time, as it would increase production in the cities, be an economic saving, and certainly if there was enthusiastic co-operation on the part of the country people, I believe there would be no less production in that part of Canada.

Mr. AUGUSTE T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): As the representative of a farming constituency in the Maritime Provinces, I think it is my duty to say a few words on this Bill. I agree with many speakers that in cities and towns daylight saving will certainly be acceptable, but in the communities surrounding those cities and towns, it will not, so far as I know, be acceptable. As a farmer I find it difficult, in the little town in which I live, to hold the men to their work after six o'clock. As has been said by several speakers in this debate, in the forenoon nothing can be accomplished so far as harvesting the hay or grain crop is concerned. Therefore, the farmers, in order to harvest their crops, have to make use of the afternoon and the evening until a late hour. If this Bill becomes law, it will certainly cause very great injury to farmers residing within a few miles of every town and city. The hired man will not work for half an hour after six o'clock, which under this Bill will be five o'clock. Most of the harvesting is done between noon and six or seven o'clock in the evening; otherwise it is almost impossible for any large farmer to house his grain in good condition. The farmers who reside near cities and towns say that if this measure becomes law, they will not be able to keep their men on the farms, nor their sons who have learned to be farmers.

The people in the cities and towns will be enjoying themselves while these sons will be right on the farm and working to a late hour in the evening. The sons will say to their father: We are not going to stay on the farm, because here we do not enjoy the pleasures of the people in the cities and the towns. I believe the adoption of this Bill will discourage many young men in the country and will prevent them from staying on the farm as they should. The agriculture of this country ought to be encouraged instead of being discouraged. I think the time has not yet arrived when such a Bill as this should be adopted. Representing as I do a constituency composed mostly of farmers, I did not want to allow the occasion to pass without saying a few words on this important measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I was brought up with the idea that early to bed, early to rise, makes a man healthy and wise. I still believe that. It may make him wealthy, too. But if it makes him healthy instead of wealthy, or both, so much the better. There is a principle underlying all legislation. Those who have discussed legislation have laid down certain principles concerning it and they have laid down the principle that legislation must work itself out, it must justify itself. The only thing to do is to make the experiment. All progress in the way of legislation is largely experimental. I would like to see the experiment tried. I am disposed to support the Bill and to have the experiment made. If it is wrong, and if it does injure the farmer, then the law may be repealed. I agree with what has been said by farmers in the House to-day that in the early hours of the morning you cannot go on the land. I have noticed the ploughs held up in the morning, when they were doing fall ploughing, by frost in the ground. But there is a way of overcoming that, and then there is other work on the farm that can be done. What has been said about the hay crop and other crops is also true; you cannot go to work early in the morning. I agree with what the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger), has said in regard to his locality, that you cannot do work so well in the morning as later on. But these things must adjust themselves. A way must be found of adjusting the farm labour question, of paying the farm labourers for their work and applying that work at such times as will best conduce to production on the farm. All this has to be worked out. Another reason in favour of this change is that the United States of America believes that it will be to the general advantage to have the clock put forward an hour, and therefore my idea is that the experiment ought to be made

here. We ought to try it out and if it is as advantageous as it has been in many other countries, we ought to make the experiment. If it is not successful, we can repeal the law.

We have now come to a point in the world's history where we are confronted with the question of the reconstruction of the world, by reason of this war. There are a lot of progressive measures that must be adopted. Perhaps this is one of them. The reconstruction of the calendar is another, and the standardizing of weights and measures is another. All these things are going to be tried out and experimented with. I think that most of them will be dealt with on the lines of progress. Our railway and transportation questions is a most important one, and the transportation question in Canada is the same as it is in the United States. They are going to take up in the United States this daylight saving proposal. We will have to do it here. We have the same system of running our railways in Canada that they have in the United States. The signals and the rules governing the men who operate the railways are absolutely the same; they have been continentalized; and if we are going to keep up with the march of progress we must continentalize a lot of things. There are other interests as well as the farming interests in this country, and I believe the farmers will have to put up for a time with the operation of this Bill while we see how it works out. The great economic re-organization in America is at hand, it is here now; it is up to us and we must move on progressive, continental lines. We have got to continentalize the law; we must make changes in the general law. We have to define what the maker of a note is and what the endorser of a note is, and we have to do it on broad, general lines. We have been giving too much time in the past to defending local interpretations of these things. If America is to be what it ought to be, and if we realize the meaning of this war of democracy, of progress and of reconstruction, we have to start out on broad lines and on many questions we have to do as our neighbours to the south of us have done.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: My hon. friend says "hear, hear," and I know what he is coming back to. I am prepared to argue that question again if it has to be argued. But in view of that reconstruction, in view of the fact that we have the same labour laws and that labour unions work practically on the same lines, we have to get in line with the rest of the continent and at least go the length of making experiments. I say to the farmers: Try this system, and if it cannot be worked out you will have a grievance and we can then repeal it. I believe that, to farm well, you must farm in the afternoon. Perhaps the best way to increase production, if I may suggest it, is to have a double shift on the farm. It might mean time and a half or pay and a half, but that is the way you get increased production.

An hon. MEMBER: Where are you going to get the labour?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: There is a capital way of raising labour, and that is for every man to raise a family. I know Quebec and I commend Quebec in regard to that. They have not perhaps that scarcity of labour that we have in the West. Well, then, follow Quebec's example; go any place where you get a good example. I agree with what the doctors and others have said, that a good reason, in the line of uplift, for adopting this Daylight Saving Bill would be that it would enable people to do their work in daylight. That principle ought to be applied to lots of things. I would like to see the public offices all over the country opened at seven or eight in the morning. I would like to see the public offices here in Ottawa opened early in the morning. They do start at nine o'clock now, and a great improvement has been made in that respect. Business in the cities and work on the farm could be better done earlier in the morning than later in the afternoon. Perhaps a fair compromise would be to make the noon hour longer. But there is a way out of all these things and the proposition now before the House is that we make the experiment. For that reason I am going to support the Bill. I am going to be governed by the experience of the countries where the experiment has been tried, and wherever that experiment has been made the consensus of opinion is that the law ought to be continued. Our farmers from the West have a good reason for their objection, that you cannot harvest in the morning, that there are certain crops you cannot touch in the morning with tools, and that the best time in the day to take in the crop is late in the afternoon when everything is dry. But if daylight saving becomes the general law we shall have to adapt our farming to it. How far it can be worked out I cannot say, but I believe it will work out perfectly. However, let us make the experiment and keep ourselves in line with American progress and American democracy. And, speaking of American democracy, it is making its fight to-day

against the tyranny of the dynasties of Europe, and we have got to march in line, and we are marching in line, and the Americans are with us now and we are with them, and we have these great progressive reform movements coming, and they are coming with a rapid march. We are starting now, I think, the reconstitution of the world. My whole advice is: Let us see if we cannot work out a new set of conditions in America, suited to ourselves and suited to America; and by that we will do much more for the benefit of our whole people. Now, this measure is on that line; it is simply an experiment, and it has proved to be a successful experiment wherever it has been made, and I think the House and the country will endorse this proposal.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill. My only object in rising this afternoon is to correct a slight inaccuracy of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. In his remarks this afternoon, he stated that this measure, or a measure similar to this, originated in Germany a few years ago. He evidently overlooked the fact—because I know that he is a great Biblical scholar, having given a great deal of attention to the Bible before becoming immersed in Tory politics—that my great ancestor, Joshua, three thousand years ago, commanded the sun to stand still. You remember that it was at a time when my people were at war with their enemies. The British army to-day is in occupation of that very country which Joshua at that time occupied, and we can very well say, therefore, in passing this Bill, that it is purely a war measure and nothing else, and I am sure that fact will satisfy very many of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House, who do not seem to be following the lead of the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this important question.

We had the Franchise Act passed last year, which we were assured was introduced purely as a war measure, and which was passed with the approval of hon. members opposite, with the result that subsequently at the general elections the present Government were returned to power. Then we have the Women's Franchise Bill, which is being introduced this year, during war times, five years ahead of another election, but, of course, that is also a war measure; and this Daylight Saving Bill can also be considered to be a war measure for the reason that I have already mentioned.

With regard to our friends, the farmers, I have no sympathy at all with those gentlemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JACOBS: We who live in the city, who are obliged to dwell in the city, when forced to pay extortionate prices for commodities produced by the farmers, how can they expect us to have any sympathy with them? I firmly believe that the reason they are opposing this daylight saving is because they imagine that when we in the cities utilize our little back yards we will come into competition with them and help to reduce the cost of living. Therefore, from whatever point of view you look at this question, I am sure that this House will not concur at all in the views of our friends the farmers, and will adopt the attitude of those of us who are obliged to live in the cities. They may say: "As we are not disturbing your red light, why disturb our daylight?" Perhaps some of the red lights in our district are patronized by a good many of the "daylight" gentlemen who come in from the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. JACOBS: I wish to say that I am heartily in support of the Bill, and I trust the hon. members on this side of the House will give their undivided support to it, because it is a Bill which ought to meet with the approval of all right-thinking and progressive men.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the hon member for South York (Mr. Maclean) began his address this afternoon—in the course of which he discussed daylight saving, the railway situation, the war in Europe and several other minor matters—with a quotation, that those who go to bed early and rise early become wealthy and wise—

Early to bed and early to rise,
Makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that there ever was a saying which was a bigger lie than that one, at least, in its application to those who live in country districts, and who follow at least two of the suggestions contained in that proverb: they go to bed early and they rise early. Those whom we are pleased to designate as the backbone of the this country, at least once in every four years, immediately before the election, certainly as long as I have known or read of that old saw, have been in the habit of going to bed early and of rising early, and of working long hours, and while that custom may have added to their sum of wisdom, and though I am doubtful as to whether it has improved their health, I am very certain it did not add to their wealth.

I am also quite certain that hon. gentlemen in this House at various times, like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Jacobs), who was complaining or whining, if I may use the word, about the high cost of living, never expressed any particular concern about the agriculturist or farmer who went to bed early and rose early and worked long hours, when he was only obtaining seven or eight cents a dozen for his eggs and, perhaps, fourteen or fifteen cents a pound for his butter. It has come to the time now when the farmer is getting a price for his eggs, for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to sit up late at night and to introduce a Bill to regulate the weight in a dozen of eggs, a measure which will have the result of forcing the farmer to breed a type of hens whose output will weigh a pound and a half to the dozen, because under the Bill, the farmer will not be able to sell any eggs that weigh less than a pound and a half to the dozen.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) informed the House, with due modesty, that he spent a part of each year in the country. I do not think daylight saving will affect the movements of the hon. member for Kingston in his farming operations during the time he spends in the country. You do not need to think he is supporting the Bill on that ground.

I want to ask this House seriously to consider one question. We have had a good deal said and written about greater production. The Government, acting in co-operation with the provincial governments, inaugurated last fall a greater production movement. They sent men through the country districts, asking the farmers to increase the amount of their acreage, to get ready a larger acreage for seeding in 1918, and to increase the amount of their live-stock, and, especially, to raise more hogs. The situation at present in the province of Ontario, at least in the part I come from, is this: that because our farmers cannot obtain to-day bran and shorts for the feeding of their hogs they are being compelled at the present time to feed some of the grain which they require for seeding this year. I have heard of no specific action on the part of the Government seeking to control those who handle these commodities, to prevent them from forcing the farmer, when he applies for two or three hundred of bran or shorts, to take at the same time an equal amount of flour, otherwise they will not give him the feed required for his stock. Therefore, while we have theoretical encouragement to the farmers and a great many lectures on greater production and all that sort of thing, when it comes down to actual practice it seems to me they get very little to encourage them.

Now, am I right or not in stating that during the season of 1917 the farmers of this country, to use a common expression, were up against it for getting labour; they found it exceedingly difficult to get help? It was harder for the farmer to get the necessary help to carry on his operations in 1917 than it was in 1916, and I venture to say it will be much harder for him to get the necessary help to carry on his operations in 1918 than it was last year. That is, I believe, a fact. Is not this also a fact?—that you increase the difficulty of the farmer to get the necessary help on his farm if you make conditions in the cities and towns so much more attractive than those conditions can possibly be made in the country districts.

The man in the country is up against the seven, eight or nine-hour movement which the labouring man demands in the cities and towns. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) speaks of two shifts on a farm. If the hon. gentleman does not know any more about farming than about other matters which he asks the House to experiment on we had better not follow his advice. I venture to say, if you were to put in small print what the hon. gentleman does not know about farming it would make a larger book than any now existing in this country between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans. The hon. member talks glibly and theoretically of two shifts on a farm, when it is impossible to get sufficient men for one shift on a farm at the present time, and if he knows anything about the conditions in this country he ought to be aware of that fact.

I am free to admit that daylight saving is an attractive thing for people residing in cities and towns, and I do not blame those members who represent urban constituencies for supporting the Bill. If the enactment of the measure were for the general benefit of the whole country, I would say: Very good, let those who will not be benefited submit. But will it be in the general interest of the country? Do not the farming class compose the majority of the population of this country? When the Minister of Trade and Commerce refers to legislation similar to this having been adopted in England, France, Germany or Holland, I tell him that in my judgment the conditions here are not the same as in the countries enumerated, and therefore, that argument loses weight. The farming population form

the majority in Canada, and I would ask whether any real attempt has been made to ascertain their opinion with regard to this measure which affects them so vitally, as everybody must admit. It is quite easy in cities and towns to judge the trend of popular sentiment and submit it to the Government through the medium of boards of trade, municipal councils and other organizations. It is not so easy to ascertain the views of the people living in the rural districts, and I am not so certain that we are at all times as anxious to ascertain their opinion as we should be. I honestly believe that if this Bill passes at the present time it will increase the difficulty which the farmer already has in getting that labour which is absolutely necessary to him if he is to carry on his production. Arguments that might be put forth under normal conditions fall to the ground at the present time, when a great war is raging. Whereas this Bill might be right and proper in normal times, I believe that at present, when the farmer is being urged to put forth every possible effort to produce all he can, it is not wise to do anything which will lessen his opportunity of getting the help he must secure if he is to produce what we are expecting and asking him to produce.

Reference has been made to what has been done in cities and towns in the way of cultivating back gardens. So much has been done in Port Arthur and Fort William, so much in the city of Toronto, and so much in the city of Kingston. Why, it reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of certain gentlemen who undertoook to give advice to the farmers in the matter of production, but who knew very little about the subject. They knew that potatoes were cut up and planted in order to secure a crop, and they thought the same thing applied to raising turnips; they thought you should slice up turnips and plant them and then you might expect a crop.

The farmers, Mr. Speaker, I need not say work early and late; and yet some people complain that they receive too much for what they produce at the present time. How many of those who complain about the price they have to pay for a bag of potatoes or a pound of butter have gone to the trouble of ascertaining how much their production cost the farmer? The consumer estimates the farmer's profits by the amount charged him for produce but ignores the fact that not only the farmer but his wife and every one of his children with unremitting toil have participated in the work of production. In the case of an article produced in a city factory you are told what the overhead charges were; so much capital was invested in the building and plant, and so much in the machinery, and all that sort of thing. It is figured out exactly how many people are required to produce that particular article and the amount the manufacturer should receive by way of profit. But in estimating what it costs the farmer to produce his crops the factors of expense to him are not taken into consideration at all. No regard is paid to the capital he invested or the money he has spent on machinery, or what earnings should be credited to himself and to his wife and family for their work. In my judgment, no matter what argument may be advanced in favour of adopting daylight saving, its enactment at this particular time will greatly increase the farmer's difficulty in obtaining help in order to carry on his operations. Believing that, and also believing that no real effort has been made to ascertain the opinions of the farming class, who form the majority of our population, I desire to express my opposition to this measure.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): The fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has again brought forward this year a Bill which he introduced last year is a great tribute to his tenacity, but I do not know that it is quite as strong a tribute to his political sagacity. I do not think that the Bill had a friend in the House last year except himself. The thing that strikes one most about the debate which has just taken place is the acute division of opinion between those dwelling in the country and those dwelling in towns. I myself have very grave doubts, under the circumstances in which the Bill received so little approval last year, followed by the circumstances in which the Bill produces such an acute division as that to which I have just referred this year, about the wisdom of the Government in having introduced the measure.

I was not impressed with the speech of my hon. friend the minister (Sir George Foster). It is not the first time that he has failed to impress me, but when he has a good case he can generally produce more convincing arguments. His main arguments were three in number. He produced an argument from precedent. His first precedent was that of Germany. That argument naturally did not commend itself to me. I think we should examine all precedents coming from that portion of the world with the utmost care. He joined with that argument, however, the precedent of

the Old Country, and the same objection to following the precedent of Germany exists to following the precedent of the Old Country in this respect—which has just been pointed out by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards)—that the conditions in Canada, because of the magnitude of the country, and because of other reasons which have been mentioned, are totally different from those of Great Britain. You have in the countries of Europe one time. Greenwich time prevails all over the United Kingdom. As to the precedent of the United States, it does not apply, because it does not exist. As far as I know the history of the question, this matter is only now being introduced into the United States, and, therefore, it has not been experimented with there, so that they can give no precedent, either for or against. Consequently, the argument which the minister presented from precedent falls absolutely to the ground.

His second argument was that this Bill in some way or another would tend to greater production. I did not gather that he meant greater production on the farm. If he meant that, I think he was wrong. If he referred to the backyard production in the cities, I do not know really that it is a wise thing to depart from the customs coming to us from time immemorial in the arrangement of our time for the sake of temporary production of a few onions and cabbages in the backyard. But why should this Bill be needed to promote backyard production in itself? If I lived in the city, I should find gardening most pleasant, as I find it in the country, in the earliest hours of daylight, and there is nothing in the present condition of our practice or law that would prevent these energetic agriculturists in the city from cultivating their backyards as early as they like. In that connection, may I say, with regard to this very question of home production, I am one of those whom the minister seems inclined to talk at a little, who are inclined to get guidance from Providence in this matter, and I think that if we want to learn to produce wisely, well and abundantly we cannot beat the sun. After all, the alteration of our clocks and the practices of our agriculturists are very small affairs in production, compared to the magnificent efforts of the sun. Mr. Speaker, I stand with the sun. May I say at this point that I stand with the sun to this extent: that I am as dispassionate a man as there is in this House on this question, and my experience is that where farming has been carried on with some success everyone rose with the sun and went to bed with the sun, and worked during the hours of the day when the sun was shining. To these gentlemen who are interested in production within cities, let me repeat the remark I made a little while ago, that if they will repeat my experiment their efforts will be attended with success. I recommended to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who is a large landowner, if he is not a farmer, that if he would get up as early as the sun, and go to bed as late as the sun, he would find all the time he needed for production, if he had any time to spare from his journalistic and political work. With regard to some kinds of production on the farm, this innovation will produce very serious disadvantages. There is a great deal in the argument we have heard from farmers about making hay with the dew lying on the hay. There is a great deal of strength in that argument, and a great deal of strength in the argument we heard from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boyce) and hon. gentlemen from other constituencies.

The third argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think, was that this Bill afforded greater opportunity for leisure and open-air exercise. That is surely a very far-fetched argument. Every man in this House, whether he lives in the town or in the country, has twenty-four hours every day he lives. He has all the sunshine that is coming to him in the part of the world in which he lives. He has the whole of the forty miles of atmosphere that rises above us all, and all that he needs to do is to get up early enough, and stay up late enough, to take advantage of it. That is the speech of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I may say that that argument has not been upset. It has been well said, if any hon. gentleman did say it, but I am not aware that I made such an argument.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I took down the words in regard to open-air exercise, and so on, as the hon. Minister spoke, but my hearing may be bad and my writing may also be bad.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did not refute it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Then I am satisfied that my statement needs no further confirmation, because it is accepted by the hon. minister. I took down his words as he uttered them, and I was very close to him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It does not matter.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Having produced the condition in the mind of the Minister that at least some of his arguments are wrong, I think I will leave what has been said in support of the Bill, and offer a little more briefly my objections. My first objection has been hinted at on the other side of the House, although I do not understand why the objection should have come from my hon. friend who used it, because I understand he is supporting the Bill. I do not think it is wise unduly to increase the number of war measures. In other words, I do not think it is wise, I think it is unwise, to increase, without a very definite benefit in view, the number of laws that have to be enforced, even in war time, because if we pass a Bill we are going to enforce it. That, I think, will appeal to any citizen of a democratic country, and I am bound to repeat that the arguments by which this measure has been supported in this House this afternoon certainly did not seem to me to make the change so assuredly beneficial as that we should add it to the list of these war-time measures or measures partaking almost of the nature of autocracy. One can understand the ease with which such a measure can be introduced in Germany, but I do not think we should unwisely increase the number of such measures in this country.

My second objection is a moral objection. I believe that early rising is a virtue. There are differences of opinion about that. The most distinguished opponent of that view is the famous British literary essayist, the beautiful writer, Charles Lamb, who demonstrated, of course, with all his particular wit and ability, the follies of rising in the morning; but I believe early rising is a virtue, and if gentlemen differ on the subject, that is another argument against the passage of the Bill. Clearly, if there be acute difference of opinion in regard to early rising, then we should let people lie in bed if they want to do so—governments should, in any event. But if it is a virtue to get up early or to go to bed late, that is a question that on the whole men and women would do well to settle for themselves. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) does not have much use for the old proverb: "Early to bed, early to rise, makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise." I am pretty certain about the health; I am pretty certain about the wisdom, for many of the men who have got very wise have read much, and read early in the morning. And about the wealth, if early rising does not lead to a quantity of wealth, in the case of the farmer—and here I am sure my hon. friend from Frontenac will not disagree with me—it is well-gotten wealth anyway, and I would rather have one well-gotten dollar than ten badly-gotten dollars. Therefore, there is very much to be said for the statement that a dollar made in the early hours of the day is worth ten dollars made at a later hour. But my point is this: that unless there is some good and solid reason for this change, it is a matter that ought to be left to be settled by the individual, whether it be a moral practice to rise early in the morning or not.

My third objection is one that has not been taken any notice of, so far as I know, during the debate, and I have listened to the discussion with extreme care. In Great Britain and Ireland there is one time, Greenwich time, that applies to the whole country. You have the same thing in France and in Germany. In this country we have a great deal of difficulty, owing to the size of the country, to adapt ourselves to the operations of the sun. As every hon. gentleman in this House knows, we have to change our clocks to a certain extent now so as to get on reasonable terms with the sun. We have to divide our country into sections. The practical difficulties of that are great enough, but this Bill, so far as I can understand it, proposes to make the difficulty greater by altering the time still further an hour as between the clock and the sun. What will be the effect of that? I do not know whether this question has been argued in the House of Representatives where they seemed to carry the Bill so easily. At the eastern edge of each section, people are rising one hour before the sun's time now.

An hon. MEMBER: About half an hour.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Nearly an hour. I never like to err on the side of extreme statements, but if you alter the time an hour in each section, at the eastern edge the people are rising an hour before the sun's time. If this measure becomes law, you will increase by another hour those difficulties which have been spoken of. You will increase a difficulty which is already a real, practical difficulty in the life of the people in this country. That is why I said to begin with that the precedent of Great Britain carries me no distance whatever. Our conditions are different from those in Great Britain, and this particular condition introduces a very great practical difficulty into this question. As a matter of personal experience I may say that the making of

hay on my own farm, which happens to be near the western end of the section, has to be postponed every day, and in the case of the people who live in the eastern part of the section in which I live, they will have to postpone the commencement of their real day's work still further, and a very great difficulty will be placed in the way of hay-making and other matters. Mr. Speaker, I have practically nothing more to say, and I do not need to ask you to suppose it is six o'clock to make an expeditious change in the time, as this Bill is proposing to do. I hope the Government is not staking its fate on this measure. I am anxious, at least, to give the new Government a trial, and I should not like them to fall upon a question upon which they had a good deal of guidance as to public opinion last year. If they do stake their fate upon the measure, then I shall have to do what one vote will do to put them out of power.

At six o'clock, the House took recess

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

WESTERN POWER COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Westminster District) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10, to enable the Western Power Company of Canada, Limited, to own and operate the railway of the Western Canada Power Company, Limited. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I have only a very few words to offer. I understand that by previous legislation the Western Canada Power Company, Limited, reorganized under the name of the Western Power Company of Canada, Limited. The original company had power to operate a certain short railway, and in the reorganization, by some omission, this railway was not included. The object of this Bill is to grant the new company power to operate the railway that was operated by the previous company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the directors of the company?

Mr. STACEY: I cannot say offhand, but the manager's name is Mr. William McNeil.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Consideration of the motion of Sir George Foster for the second reading of Bill No. 4, to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the solar mean time during the summer months, resumed.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): In listening to the debate on this interesting Bill this afternoon, I was struck with one important fact. I had thought that when the Government brought down a Bill, that Bill crystallized the united wisdom of the party which the Government represented on that subject, and I was somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, to see that the heaviest attacks upon the Bill came from gentlemen sitting on your right hand. There were some remarks made about the Bill which I think require some consideration. There was that argument in favour of the Bill that by advancing the clocks of this country one hour, we should succeed in raising the moral tone of this country—"the moral uplift," I believe were the words employed by one of the speakers this afternoon. I am as anxious as any one to see the moral tone of this country raised, but I should imagine that if that could be obtained by any form of procedure such as this, moral reformers long ago would have set forward the clock many hours. I have the honour, although I practice law in Montreal, to represent an agricultural community. I wish to see production increased, and if this Bill in my opinion would increase production, I would lend whatever force my voice had in its support. But, not being a practical farmer, like a good lawyer I am governed by the opinions of those who know better than myself; I have reference to authority, which is what lawyers do when they have a difficult question to consider. Now I should take it that the informed agricultural authority of this House is expressed by the agriculturists who have spoken from the different provinces of this Dominion against the Bill this afternoon, and therefore I think it would be unwise at this time to pass it. If a vote is taken on this Bill, although I am as anxious as any one to have production increased, as the information which lies before me is that it will not increase but decrease production, I shall be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. P. R. Du TREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): I do not intend to make any lengthy remarks on this Bill, as I think the ground has been pretty well covered by hon. gentlemen this afternoon. I do not see how this Bill would affect the farmers.

The fact is, farmers rise early in the morning anyway; they begin work at five or six o'clock, so I do not see how this Bill would help or harm them. It would rather affect the people in the cities.

It would be a good improvement, especially for the labourers living in the cities, if this measure became law. It would give them an hour in the afternoon to get a rest, especially in the summer time. I understand that this principle has been accepted by the union men of the city of Quebec. I would have liked very much to have had some more information from the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) this afternoon as to whether the labour unions in Canada have been asked what they think about this question and what they say as to the wisdom of passing this Bill. For the reasons which I have stated, I shall support the Bill. It is an advanced movement on the part of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and not merely an advance of an hour in the time. It is certainly not in accordance with the ordinary policy of the right hon. gentleman. Probably this will be one of the few opportunities given to me to support one of his measures. However, on this question, I think I would well represent the interests of my people by giving my vote for this Bill.

Mr. J. ALFRED LEDUC (Westmount-St. Henry): Mr. Speaker, amongst my constituents there is a large number of people employed in industrial establishments and also in offices and banks. The adoption of this system would give them the advantage of rising a little earlier in the morning and would enable them to conclude the day's work an hour earlier in the evening. As probably some of you are aware, Westmount is called the little Ontario. The people of Westmount are cultivating all the land that is available for that purpose and the daylight saving scheme will give them an opportunity of devoting more time to the production of food. I think I am safe in saying that the working classes in the industrial part of my constituency are in favour of a system which would give them two or more hours of leisure in the evening. I am not disposed to say anything further on the matter because I think the features of this measure have been fairly well discussed and explained. I am of the opinion that the farmers should harvest their crops in the afternoon and work at something else in the earlier hours of the day. I am sure they will be able to do it just as well as the people in the cities are.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, the Daylight Saving Bill now before the House appears to have been made the occasion of something of a field day for the new members of the House. Being a new member myself I would ask your indulgence to discuss very briefly the merits of this proposition, which has engaged the interest and the attention of the people of the constituency from which I come. That has been the case from the time that, six or seven years ago, a former member of this House from the county of Huron now, I believe, a member of the judiciary, first introduced a Bill to this effect. I noticed that the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), during the course of his remarks this afternoon, addressed himself almost entirely to the members on his own side of the House. I took it as rather a compliment to this side of the House inasmuch as I quite appreciated, what he probably thought, that it perhaps required a little more effort to bring the light to members on the other side of the House than to members on this side.

I have always found it difficult in the last few years to appreciate the objections which have been raised to the principle of the Daylight Saving Bill. I listened this afternoon to some of the members of the House from rural constituencies, and while I admit the argument which they put forth made some impression upon my mind, I am still quite unconvinced that the disadvantages which they mentioned in any sense counterbalance the most decided advantages which are bound to result from the enactment of this Bill. It seems to me that Canada, which never lags behind in anything, ought to get into step with the other countries in the world in regard to this matter. The Daylight Saving Bill is based on one definite principle as I see it, a principle that everybody must recognize—that for our different working activities daylight is undeniably preferable to darkness. I believe every hon. member of the House will grant that. The question then arises as to the method by which the daylight which we now waste early in the day can best be made available in the interest of the people. This Bill proposes to transfer one hour of daylight, now wasted by most of us in bed, from the morning to the other end of the day. Some hon. members state that we can utilise the daylight, that we can remedy the evil, if there be an evil, just as well by each one of us

individually rising earlier in the morning if we so desire. But I contend that the advantage and usefulness of this Bill will be almost entirely negatived unless the change is brought forward in such a way that the principle is adopted by every one. The man who rises an hour earlier in the morning in the absence of the enactment of this Bill will find that he can do very little unless his neighbour is also up at the same time so that he may be enabled to do business with him; otherwise, he might as well remain in bed himself.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) raised the point that it would be quite possible for us to use the hours of daylight without the enactment of a Bill. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not care to put my opinion against that of some of the experienced members of this House, but I believe that the chief reason why this Bill should pass is based upon the fact that we are all creatures of habit. To-day, practically all our activities are confined to certain definite hours. We rise, retire, go to business, go to church and to the theatre at a certain fixed hour. Children go to school at a certain fixed hour. In fact, all our waking activities are based on a certain definite system based on the clock, and it has become a fixed habit with us to do that. Now, the waking activities of all of us are so inter-related that, in order to secure the greatest amount of efficiency, it is necessary that we also co-ordinate those activities, which is absolutely impossible, I contend, except by some such definite system as is fixed by the clock. Now, here is the point to my mind: this habit of working, or playing if you like, according to the hours of the clock is a constant one. The hours which we have for rising, retiring, playing, going to meals, or going to church, or for any other activity in which we may engage, are the same in winter as in summer, in fall as in spring. During the winter no object could be gained by changing the hands of the clock, because the hours of daylight in winter are so short that we already use in our daily activities all of the daylight which we have during the winter hours. But as the spring advances our habits remain the same; we still do everything according to the hours of the clock; but the balance otherwise is disturbed. The sun does not rise at the same hour; the balance is gradually disturbed; and as the sun advances we find that we are wasting in bed hours of daylight, and using at the conclusion of the day, for the purpose of pleasure or business, as the case may be, for at least our waking activities, the hours of darkness at the other end of the day.

Now, the practical effect of moving the hands of the clock forward one hour in the spring is, as my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) said of Joshua, that we actually make the sun, not to stand still, but to rise one hour later and to set one hour later, so that we find in the morning, instead of attempting to sleep during the hour of daylight, that we have the darkness during which to take our rest, which is the proper time, and at the conclusion of the day, we have until nine or nine-thirty for our daylight activities. The man who has formerly had to lay down his work, his spade or rake if engaged at production, will find that he can work until nine-thirty, and so on. It is unnecessary to dwell at any length on the advantages that will arise from this practice; they will occur to almost every man.

But I do believe this, that hon. members have, perhaps, allowed themselves to be influenced rather too much by the objections that have been raised to the Bill than by the many manifest advantages to be gained by its enactment. Practically the only objection that I think carries any weight is the one advanced first by the hon. member from the city of Chatham (Mr. McCoig), and that is on account of the farming interests. I have, of course, heard the objection that has been raised, that it was undignified to interfere with the clock. Well, to paraphrase a biblical saying, the clock was made for man and not man for the clock. About a year ago I read a report on the subject taken from an English publication, and practically the only objection that was made there, and which I think you will all fully appreciate, was made by a gentleman who stated that he could not see why anybody should want to do away with the beautiful electric light, and it turned out that he was a director of the electric light company. The one valid objection—I think it is not a very strong one—is on the part of the farming community. The statement is made that, if the hours of work conclude one hour earlier under this Bill the men who are hired for farm work will quit that much earlier, and the interests of production will suffer. Well, I am quite ready to take the word of the men who state that this is apt to occur; but so far as my experience of the farm goes—and I still think that it obtains—or, at least, I think it still obtains in the part of the province from which I come—the farmers do not govern them-

selves by the clock at all. They get up with the sun and they do not go to bed with the sun. They work in the fields until the sun sets and then they do the chores afterwards. So I do not think it will affect the farmer to the degree that, perhaps, we have been led to believe. In any case, Mr. Speaker, it is well worth while trying the experiment. I believe there is no doubt whatever that the advantages that will follow the enactment of this Bill will outweigh any of its disadvantages. And if we do find that, during the course of the year, the disadvantages are very serious, the House can repeal the Bill next year.

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (South Ontario): I do not desire to waste a great deal of time over this Bill, but it appears to me, as an old member of this House, and representing the interests that I do in the county of Ontario, that I should say a few words. And in my remarks to-night I may make some statements that may not have the sympathy altogether of the members of this Government. And allow me to say this at the outset; when I say that I am not asking from this Government or from anybody in this country any particular favours—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH: I stand by myself and by myself alone.

Some hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SMITH: When I say that it does appear to me that this Government, or the hon. minister who is introducing this question, has not consulted one of the great interests of this country, and that is the farmers of Canada. And when I say that, looking back over the past—not including the years when the Conservative party have been in power, but back of that—and trying to look into the future, I cannot see for the life of me where the farmers are going to get a great many favours from this Government. Now, looking back I cannot find where the farmers have been for a moment considered, and looking into the future I do not expect that they are going to be considered. And when I say that, I do it for two reasons. In the first place, I do not expect any consideration from this Government; and, in the next place, I do not want it. This Bill, as I understand it, affects in a general way the people of Canada. It has been considered outside of our country, in the country to the south of us, and in the Mother Country. In the United States they have taken it into their serious consideration and have adopted it. The Mother Country has done likewise. But there are conditions in both of these countries very different from what we find in Canada. Now, we have just as much daylight to-day as we had when I was a boy, and that is a good many years ago. We have just as much daylight to-day as we had a hundred years ago, and we are going to change our course out of consideration for this Government. I will repeat that we are enjoying as much daylight to-day as we ever did. I happen to be one of the few members of this House directly interested in agriculture. My life has been spent upon the farm, and if adequate reasons could be given why we should change our method of living I should be quite prepared to do so. But, in view of the experience of the past, I can see no reason why we should adopt the procedure recommended here. We are being told that we should be able to produce more. Take my own farm for example. In whose time are my men going to make this production? They will get this extra time, and the next morning they will return to duty after having done their best work for themselves. During the last ten years I have been a fairly close observer of agricultural matters. A comparison has been made to-day between the work done in the morning and that done in the evening. There can be no question but that there is a great difference. We have in the spring a certain amount of frost and a certain amount of rain. We cannot go on in the early morning with certain farm work, and yet we are being told that there must be greater production. How is it going to be done? The best hour in the whole 24 is that between five and six o'clock in the evening, which is going to be cut off. Do you mean to tell me that my farm employees living near towns of considerable size, are going to do as I tell them? Will you tell them, "You must continue your work," and expect them to obey implicitly? No, they are going to spend the hour at their disposal in the town, and yet this precious Government of ours is asking us for greater efforts towards increased production. I do not think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has taken the advice of the farmers of the country in respect to the introduction of this legislation. I know what their opinion is, and I say unhesitatingly and advisedly, that you cannot find a farmer in the whole country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, who desires this change to be made. You often hear the statement, "The greatest good for the greatest number." Is this legislation likely to

result in the realization of that idea? There have been times in the last ten years when it was quite impossible to turn a wheel upon the land in the morning. Rain had soaked the ground so thoroughly that machinery would not turn upon it, but later in the day, between five and six o'clock, that difficulty disappeared. With such a restriction as is proposed here, how will it be at all possible to carry out the enhanced production so strongly urged? I am just as strong an advocate that the farmers of Canada shall take their proper position and pay their fair proportion of taxation as anybody, but I say to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill, "For heaven's sake leave the farmers alone." I admit the farmers do not know everything, but they are thoroughly conversant with their own business, and no outsider can tell them what is best to do. If the hon. gentleman is determined to force this measure upon the House and upon the country, he may find out in the course of time that whilst the farmers of Canada have been hewers of wood and drawers of water, they are not going to continue in that humiliating position forever. I tell the Minister of Trade and Commerce that, great as he may deem this Bill to be and much as it may be in the interest of some people in this country, he may find later on that all those people who have been doing things for the Union Government may pull back the stake.

Mr. D. SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I have followed with a good deal of interest the debate which has so far taken place on this Bill, and more especially the arguments which the Minister of Trade and Commerce advanced in his usual masterly manner in its support. I had not intended to say anything on the question, although I have my own opinion with regard to it. I come from a constituency which is very evenly divided as to rural and urban population, and I have not received a request from anyone in that constituency, either last year or during the present year, to support or oppose such a measure. I have been very much impressed by the arguments made by those who favour the Bill. I cannot help but feel that there has been some deception practised, if I may use the term, in favour of the adoption of this Bill. Reference has been made to the statement of Mr. Gompers in the United States when he gave the true version as to why there was such a strong desire for a Bill of this nature, which was that the people would have greater opportunities for leisure and outdoor exercise. Any one who has closely observed the people who are agitating for the enactment of this measure realizes that their anxiety is not so much to increase the production of the country at the present time as it is for greater opportunity to enjoy themselves. The agitation is being waged by those who are anxious to have greater opportunities for bowling, tennis, motoring and things of that nature. These people speak about the desirability of daylight saving and the advantages of summer time. If you could increase the length of summer time I would heartily favour such a measure; that is to say, if a month could be taken off the winter and added to the summer, but I cannot see that the argument has any foundation whatever. I do not see that such an arrangement is going to effect the saving of daylight in any particular. But what I am alarmed about is: At this particular time when we ought to look at questions soberly and realize the seriousness of the conditions which confront us, when we hear about people in the Old Land having to draw in their belts,—and they are prepared to do it,—we must realize that production in this country is the most important problem that is facing our people to-day. Those who are not physically fit to take up arms and beat the enemy should devote their entire energies towards increasing production in this country, because, judging from what is taking place on the Western front, we must not be at all surprised if this conflict rages for years and years to come. Is it a time for leisure and sport? No. It is a time to look on the question soberly and consider what the effect will be. Why is it we have been agitating our minds for years past as to why there was a movement from the country to the city? People say that those in the country labour too long, and that advantages are lost, and, therefore, the people will not remain there. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) points out what will happen with regard to employees when they find the people of the neighbouring towns out playing tennis, bowling, and so forth. Can you expect these men to stay on the farms and increase the production of the country under these conditions? People say: "Look what we will grow in towns and cities if we have more time to ourselves after the day is over." That is all very well. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Hocken) says it is estimated they can raise a million dollars worth of food products there. I have lived in Toronto for several years, and my

observation was that the man who grew vegetables did most of the work early in the morning, and not in the evening. In the evening he was prepared to rest. You will find that is the case in the towns and cities throughout the country. The man who raises vegetables, to meet the requirements of the people, does it in the morning when it is cool. I do not believe there is any force in that argument at all. I believe the effect will not be good. I do not think that this is a time to introduce freakish legislation. It will be time enough, if it is demonstrated in other countries that this is a good measure, to introduce it at some future time; the Lord knows we have enough to do at the present time.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): When this question was before the House last year I felt it my duty, in the interest of those I represent, to oppose it. If I were asked the reason why I opposed it then, and the reason why I now oppose it, I would admit that, aside from the interest of the constituents whom I represent, I would find some difficulty in answering. But, Sir, I want to say that the hon. members of this House who have discussed the attitude of the farmers of this country have spoken in entire accord with the experience of the people of my own district. Every township council, every county organization, all the organizations of the district which are in session for the purpose of considering the interests of agriculturists, have expressed their opposition to this Bill. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member from Kitchener (Mr. Euler), and I was led to conclude, after hearing his remarks, and the remarks of other members who represent what might be called industrial constituencies, that there is a line of demarcation or division on this question, and that those who represent the interests of agriculture are opposed to the scheme, and those who represent sections of the country which have industrial concerns are in favour of it. But I also find that, so far as labour is concerned, there is by no means unanimity with reference to it, because only last week, in the city of London, one of the labour organizations placed on record its opposition to this Bill. The county council of Middlesex met last Saturday afternoon, the time fixed by the province of Ontario for all county councils throughout the province to meet, to take seriously into consideration the need of unusual effort to stimulate greater production this year, and advocated the very principles enunciated by my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith), that it simply meant, so far as they were concerned, that they could not possibly achieve the best results in production if the time were changed. I asked a farmer in my district, when I was last at home, "What is the objection of the farmers to this Bill," because I wanted to be enlightened, and he said, as the hon. gentleman from South Ontario also said, that the very best hours of the day for the farmer are those between five and seven at night, the very hours the measure proposes to cut out and for which they will substitute the hours in the morning. By cutting out those two hours you are taking away more than would be represented by three or four hours of the morning, because in the early morning hours, as has been stated, the ground is not fit for operation, the heavy dew preventing any work in harvesting at that early hour. He also said that farmers, have to look, to an extent, to assistance from industrial labour in order to give greater production, and the organized labour men who come out to the country to assist the farmers have certain regulated hours, and notwithstanding the fact that they are assisting in the production of the country, they make their hours of labour conform largely to the regulations that govern labour unions in cities and towns. I think we are taking away from the farmer a valuable space of time for which we give him no equivalent. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has pointed out the absurdity of "daylight saving." There is no saving of daylight whatever. This was tried in London two years ago. It was brought forth as a very desirable measure and had the support of the board of trade and the city council, and the citizens were unanimously behind the proposition and wished to try it out. They experimented with it for about two months, and they were so tired of it that every labour union and every organization which had asked to have this proposition introduced, with equal force opposed it and asked for its repeal, and it was repealed in midsummer. That is the condition that prevailed two years ago. I am ready to admit that in the United States, in industrial centres, there is a strong sentiment amongst labour unions and a class of labour men that this change is desirable. It only shows that there is a difference of opinion amongst that class as well as amongst the members of this House, but I think I am right in saying that there is absolutely no doubt about

the opposition to this Bill in all parts of the Dominion of Canada so far as the farming interests are concerned. I cannot support this measure in justice and in deference to the opinion of the people whom I represent here. Every organization in the district which I represent which is interested in agriculture has placed itself on record as opposed to this Bill, and I have more letters from all parts of my district expressing opposition to this measure than I have had in respect to any other measure presented in this House.

It is natural that we should have differences of opinion in this House. Personally, I cannot see how it is going to make a great deal of difference to the labouring man or to the agriculturist if this measure is passed. The farmer works from sunrise to sunset in any event. But there is this point which was made by the person to whom I referred. This farmer opposed this measure for the reason that under the changed conditions that exist at the present time a great deal of industrial labour is being forced out on to the farms and a great deal of industrial labour is also going voluntarily on to the farms, and an endeavour is being made to organize industrial labour so as to let as much as possible get out on the farms to help production. The farmer makes a strong point there, namely, that this labour, which has certain regulations governing the hours of toil in industrial centres, will want to be governed by the same regulations when it goes to the country. From that point of view the farmer naturally sees a very strong reason to oppose the Bill.

I regret very much that I was not in the House to listen to the remarks made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in favour of the Bill, but last year he introduced a similar Bill which was thoroughly discussed on that occasion, and I find that the nature of the opposition to it to-day is the same as it was a year ago. So far as the farm interests are concerned, there is a prejudice and an opposition to the Bill that cannot be overcome.

Mr. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon and evening. I feel that, representing a city constituency, I must support the measure. It will be of tremendous advantage to all workers in cities to have an extra hour of sunshine and fresh air in the evening. In the city of Ottawa alone it will affect thousands of people who have to put in the greater part of the day inside buildings where they do not get any sunshine. Under those conditions I think it will be very beneficial, particularly so when we find that such diseases as tuberculosis and others are prevalent in the country. As a farmer and stock man I can see no real objection to this measure from the farmer's standpoint. I am speaking now particularly of the Pacific Coast section. If the farmer will use a little judgment in handling his help, he will easily overcome any little arguments that to-day have been presented against this measure. I was very much interested in what was said by the hon. member who wished to have his summer extended. I can advise him if he will go to the city of Victoria he will have no difficulty in having it extended several months.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Having been born and brought up on a farm, and still having some knowledge of farming, because whilst not a farmer, I am connected with a concern that does a great deal of farming, stock raising and so on, being the representative of a city constituency and also being quite a large employer of help, I think I speak on this subject with some knowledge. After listening to the speeches this afternoon and evening, I am puzzled to know what special advantage is to be derived from this measure or what great good it is going to do to anybody. It is said that if the clock is moved forward an hour, a great benefit will accrue to the labouring classes, the people of the cities in particular. Listening to the addresses which have been delivered on this subject to-day, I have noticed that practically every man who represents a city district is in favour of the Bill, whilst those representing the rural districts and farming communities are opposed to it. Evidently, the city people are in favour of the Bill. It would be well for the residents of the cities to utilise the time they have now as the clock stands, and instead of getting to their business at nine or ten o'clock in the morning, to get up a little earlier and make use of the time between seven and nine o'clock. In many of the large cities you cannot find a man to do business with practically before ten o'clock in the morning. If the saving of daylight is going to be of so much benefit to the residents of the cities, let them show their good faith by using the daylight as it now exists and the clock as it now stands. Whether the clock is moved forward an hour or backward an hour, I do not think it will make any material difference to the farmer, his wife, sons or daughters, because the farmer gen-

9 p.m.

erally gets up as soon as the sun rises and his family get up with him, and they are busy from that time until the sun sets. It will, however, make a very material difference to the help employed by the farmer. This matter has been very thoroughly explained, and I think every man who has any knowledge of farming understands that in the early morning you cannot do to advantage the greater part of the work on the farm. The dew is then on the ground, so that the ground is wet, and weeding or anything of that kind cannot be done to such great advantage as in the heat of the day when, if you cut weeds, they will be immediately killed off by the heat of the sun's rays instead of sprouting again. The farmer's help, if the clock is moved forward one hour and six o'clock is called seven, will in the majority of cases not be found on the job at what is supposed to be seven o'clock. When five o'clock comes, or six o'clock according to the new time, that will be quitting time with him, and the farmer will find it very difficult to have him continue his work, especially if he sees his comrades and friends, who are labouring in the cities or on other jobs outside of farming, leaving their work, putting on their ball clothes and going to the ball field or bowling alley or some other place of amusement. Thus, the men on the farms and the farmers' sons will begin to be restless. At this particular time when the farmer and every other man who produces is being admonished, advised, coaxed, persuaded to produce more, if we want the farmer to produce, we must give him the best part of the day for the work of production, and in harvesting or haying or practically any other work on the farm, the hour from five to six o'clock in the evening is worth more than the two hours from six to eight o'clock in the morning. Under any circumstances, the legislation passed by this Parliament should, at all times, have a tendency to attract men to the farms. We have heard the admonition given to the young men to go back to the land. If we are to get them back to the land, the best way to get them there is to make the land attractive, and if by legislation you make the hours of labour from six o'clock in the morning to five o'clock in the evening, you will find it will be very difficult to keep help on the farm. It is said that by his method of putting the clock forward one hour, there is going to be a great deal of cultivation in the backyard; that the citizens are going to flood this country with their production. I did a little of that myself last year, and I did not have great success.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are a poor farmer.

Mr. McCREA: The ground was well cultivated, but the season was against us and we did not succeed. It is a fact that some men in the cities who have ground to cultivate will cultivate it, but for one man in the city who uses his spare time after five o'clock in the production of food you will find nine men going to some place of amusement, and I doubt very much if this extra spare time will be conducive to their physical, intellectual or moral welfare. I can see no advantage in this measure, and if it is the joint production of the best brains and ability of the Union Government I have not much hope of what will follow. If this measure becomes law, I believe it will be detrimental in a very great degree to the farming community, and it will be of no benefit to the city people except to give them a little more time in which to do less work. For instance, I, as an employer of labour, know this: that if a man who works from six in the morning till five in the afternoon spends the evening from five to eight o'clock working for himself, no doubt harder than he works for me, he will come back to-morrow not as good a man as if he had not done that, and the consequence is that he is not giving value to his employer; but only a very few of them do employ their evenings that way. I am safe in saying that 90 per cent of the working class in the cities will not be engaged in backyard cultivation. I believe the Government are sincere and anxious to have production increased, but I think they would make a serious mistake if by any legislation they hampered the efforts of the farming community to increase the production of supplies that are so urgently needed.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS: I had not intended to say anything on this Bill, but the observations of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. McCrea) lead me to say a few words. He states that one of the main reasons why he is opposing this Bill is that if it is passed the labouring men of this country may be guilty of the crime of going home and enjoying themselves working in their garden, and perhaps coming back the next day less able to carry out the arduous day's work which their employer is demanding. If a good reason were wanted in support of the Bill, that one of my hon. friend is an excellent one, namely, that it would give the labouring men of the industrial centres a little more daylight

which they could spend with their families or enjoying themselves in their gardens.

There are just three phases of this question which appeal to me. First, in considering the arguments put forward against the Bill I find that they are restricted almost entirely to the farming community, and I find that the opinion of the farmers' representatives in this House is divided about equally, about as many supporting the Bill as are opposed to it. On the other hand, you will find supporting the Bill representatives of the following classes: first, the artisan class, and while I fully appreciate that the farming community deserve every consideration, I do not think they deserve any more consideration than the artisans, who also have a perfect right to be represented here, and their representatives say that this Bill will benefit the artisan class. Then there is the clerical class, which class, I think, has less representation than any other in the public bodies of this country; I mean the claims of the great army of persons working in offices, in large departmental and smaller stores in the cities, who are confined very often in air that is not too good. This class is certainly entitled to as much of God's sunlight as any other class, and this Bill will benefit that class to a very large extent. Then there is the business man, who will go out and play his game of golf or bowls—a comparatively small class, but deserving of representation. Then there is the domestic class—the women who have to stay at home and do the cooking for the artisans and the clerks and the business men. Surely they are entitled to consideration. We have, therefore, the representatives of these various classes supporting the Bill, and opposed to it a divided class, namely, the farmers. Another argument, advanced by my hon. friend from South Oxford, I think, was that this was freakish legislation; it was quite time for Parliament to consider such legislation, he said, when it had proved a success elsewhere. Accepting that challenge, I would direct his attention to France, Great Britain, and the United States, our leading Allies, in all of which countries daylight saving has been adopted, not to mention other countries. That is a reason in itself why we should adopt this measure. It will undoubtedly benefit a very large section of the community; it may, granting that the arguments are correct, work some disadvantage to another class, but it seems to me that the advantages of the Bill outweigh the disadvantages, and I therefore intend to support it.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (St. Denis): I have heard the arguments pro and con given in this House this afternoon, and I have seen that the two big factors in the country are really divided in their opinion. We have heard a good deal about farmers and production, but we must also bear in mind that the large industries of the country must also produce. The farmers are doing their utmost to increase production. Whenever there has been a change in the hours of labour for the artisans in the city or the workers on the farm, the same old question always came up. It arose when farm labourers were working from sunrise to sundown, and it came up again when the hours on the farm and in industries were changed from twelve to eleven and then again when the hours were changed to ten. But in spite of this reduction of working hours, production did not diminish. This is largely due to the labour-saving devices that have been introduced; it now takes less labour to produce a given amount on the farm or in the factory, and also less time to produce that amount. Daylight saving means much more to a large section of the community than simply saving daylight. Economy has been preached in this House by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce as well as the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). This Daylight Saving Bill will be the means, perhaps, of effecting a great saving. In the matter of lighting alone this would mean a saving, taking the number of families we have in Canada, of over $5,000,000. Figure it up in any other way you like and you will find that it is going to save a large amount of money not only to the artisans in the cities but also to the farming community. I do not want to look at this question from the artisan's standpoint alone. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon defended the farmer and showed to the House that farmers were placed at a disadvantage because of the manner in which they have to sell their goods. He forgot, perhaps, that it is not the farmer, and that it is not the consumer in the city, who is responsible. The farmer, I know, is not getting enough for the goods he is producing, and I know also that the consumer in the city is paying very much more than he should for the goods he consumes. Stop, if you can, the middlemen, the men who are living on the work of the producers, the parasites who are using other people's labour and thriving on other people's industry. Stop them if you can. Let us deal

as directly as possible with the farmer, and if we do he will get higher prices. Then he can afford to accept this daylight saving proposal. You can only extract a certain amount of work from any man whether he works on the farm or anywhere else. There is a certain amount of productive power in each man, and you can extract so much of that productive power and no more. Be it from six in the morning until five at night, or from seven in the morning until six at night, you are going to extract from him the same productive power exactly.

It has been stated this afternoon that there are times of the day when you cannot take the crop in. That may only last four or five weeks in the Fall, and if that is so it is not an objection to this change. You may call this proposal radical if you like. We will perhaps, before the end of the present session, have introduced some measures that will be considered radical by hon. members on the other side of the House; and some of these hon. gentlemen shrink from anything that appears radical. I hope we shall. As far as I am concerned, these measures will never be too radical for me. I am here to support any measure that may come before this House to alleviate, to as large an extent as possible, many of the sorrows which oppress people in the cities and in the country, and which many hon. members in this House may know of, but which, unfortunately, some of them ignore. Perhaps hon. members from the larger cities do not ignore them, although no doubt some of them do. I am satisfied that this Daylight Saving Bill will be of advantage to the labouring classes. I want to make it possible for a workman, when he goes home, to at least know what colour his children are as a result of being able to see them by daylight, and I want him to have an opportunity of taking a little stroll around the streets with his family. There are some industries to-day operated in such a way, even in the summertime, that the fathers of families, being obliged to travel long distances in order to reach their work and to return to their homes, are only able to see their children on holidays and Sundays. I believe this Bill is a good measure and that it should be approved by this House. Let us try it.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker, in the city of Calgary they experimented with daylight saving for a certain time and, judging from the results, it was not a success. The failure of the plan in the city of Calgary was due to various causes rather than to any inherent disadvantage in connection with the principle of daylight saving. There is a large surrounding country doing business with the city, and there was no similar Act in these outlying districts. Therefore, daylight saving cannot be said to have had a fair trial in that city.

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are constantly calling "louder" in the House, but I would point out that half of the noise in the House is due to the cumulative effect of conversations of various groups throughout the House and adjoining portions of the chamber. If hon. members will show a little more consideration we would have far better order in the House and we could hear much better.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I believe that on the whole this would be a popular measure in the city of Calgary and throughout the towns and rural parts of the province of Alberta. It seems to me that this discussion has taken a turn as if we were dealing with legislation which was placing a restriction on a certain class of the people. I cannot observe in the Bill anything which will place any restriction upon agricultural industry. But I can observe something which has been referred to in many of the speeches that have been delivered tonight, that it will work out very greatly to the benefit of the industrial parts of Canada. I believe, as many hon. members have said, that we should encourage the industrial classes in the cities and do everything in our power to promote their happiness, their health and their welfare. I believe that by the enactment of this Bill we will be contributing to those measures. It has been argued by some who have been speaking on behalf of the agricultural interests of this country that if men who are employed in city stores, offices and factories are allowed to leave their work one hour earlier than they do at the present it will set a very bad example to the men who are employed upon the farms and production will be reduced to that extent. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen who advance this view to the fact that there have been enacted in many provinces in Canada regulations relating to the employment of labour, regulations which have for their object the reduction of the hours of labour, regulations which have for their object the giving of a half holiday——

An hon. MEMBER: Where?

Mr. TWEEDIE. In Alberta where I come from and which is one of the greatest agricultural provinces in Canada. We have in force in Alberta a factory act which, I think, is more stringent than similar laws in any province in Canada. We have in force in the city of Calgary by-laws which give to the employees in that city a half holiday but I have never heard one single argument that because these employees receive a half holiday, and because the merchants are compelled to close their stores at a certain hour, this has gone out into the country and consequently the farm labourers are asking that they shall have a half holiday every week or that they shall have an equal number of hours of labour with the men in the city. We must realize that we are passing through an era in the history of our country in which there are more economic and social changes than in any other period. I was very sorry to hear one hon. gentleman say to-night that he did not expect anything for agriculture from this Government, because I do not agree with him. I expect great things for the farmers from this Union Government. But when we are considering that question we must bear in mind this fact, that the agricultural industry in Canada is rapidly becoming divided into two classes. We have the small holder, the individual farmer who tills his own soil with the help of his wife and family, and who produces his crop and markets it. On the other hand, we have what we may term the capitalistic agriculturist, the man who is not satisfied with the quarter section or the half section, but who is acquiring great holdings which he cannot reasonably till himself, and for the purpose of producing it is necessary for him to go out into the labour markets of the world and find the necessary help. And I wish to call to the attention of the farmers of the East, if they do not realize it as the farmers of the West do, that when they are making such great demands on the labour market of this country they are coming to the stage in their productive history when they will have to deal with organized labour on the farms, just as the manufacturer in the city has to deal with organized labour in his business.

Now, so far as this Bill is concerned, it seems to me, as I pointed out at the start, that it is not legislating against any class of people, but it is legislating in favour of a great number of people in the Dominion. So far as the employment of farm labour in the agricultural districts is concerned, if they are farming such large areas that they require additional help, it is a matter of contract. The farmers make their bargain with the men when they take them out from the city or elsewhere to work on their farms; they determine their hours in their contract, and there is nothing in this Bill that would interfere in the slightest degree with the farmers making those arrangements. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that by the adoption of this Bill production will be retarded in the slightest degree; on the other hand, I believe that we will have greater production than we have ever had in the past.

Mr. FRANÇOIS J. PELLETIER (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this question, but it is so interesting that I cannot withstand the temptation. Coming from a farming country, it is my duty to speak in the interest of those whom I represent. Most of my constituents are farmers. In my part of the country, in the late spring, even in the month of May, we still have frost, and even around the 15th of May we are only beginning to do the spring ploughing Last fall, we were unable in our part of the country, to do any fall ploughing, because frost came so early. Furthermore, many of our young men were trying to go to the appeal tribunals in order to remain on the farms, and quite a number of them have been conscripted. Therefore, if we take our young men away to-day, how can we do our work on the farm? And if we take an hour of time away in the fall, we cannot do any ploughing on account of the frost. We have no tractors; we have to use horses. If there is a couple of inches of frost in the ground, even two or three horses can do hardly any ploughing, and if you do plough when there is frost two or three inches deep you will certainly turn ground that will not give you any production, as an hon. member said a while ago; and he is a farmer and knows that what I say is right. We have to leave farming to the farmers, and we have to give them the best advantage possible. Now, at a season when you cannot plough early in the morning, in the evening, between five and six o'clock, or six and seven, the ground is in such condition that you can plough very easily. Furthermore, the noon hour, between one and two, during the summer season, in haying time, is about the hottest of the day, and if this change is made the work will have to be done during that hour, and it will be that much harder on the farmer. It was said this afternoon that it would be against the interests of those who were

cultivating their yards in the city to oppose this Bill. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if we must look to the interests of those who are raising wheat, or of those who are raising a small patch of vegetables? It seems to me that first of all we must have bread, which is what we are all looking for, and to do that we must give the farmers all the chance possible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly opposed to the Bill, and shall take pleasure in voting against it.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, representing an agricultural county as I do, I cannot see where this Bill is going to do any good. If the hon. minister who introduced the Bill had lengthened the time out one hour, then I could see where we might get a little benefit out of it. If the hon. members who spoke this afternoon are sincere in the statement that they want to have greater production, I cannot see why they cannot work an hour longer in the morning as well as at night.

Now, the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) said that in Alberta they have legislation whereby they take a half-holiday once a week. I presume he means that that applies to the cities and towns. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that with all the talk that there is about greater production and the scarcity of food at the present time, I believe the Government is misled in the cause. It is not in the last two or three years that it has occurred, but it is just such legislation as the hon. member for Calgary said has been in force for from five to fifteen years that is taking the young men away from the farms. They want to go to the cities where the hours of labour are short, and where they can have pleasure in the evening. This has been going on until, at the present time, the farms are almost depleted. The county I have the honour to represent at one time had a population of 24,000, and I think the population now is about 17,500.

I believe that this Bill will affect production and affect it seriously, because there is not the slightest doubt in the world that if men in the towns and cities quit work at five o'clock and the hired men on the farms are compelled to work until six o'clock the latter will become dissatisfied. I want to say that during the last two years a farmer dare hardly tell his hired man how he wished anything done; if he did that man would tell him to go where there was no winter and do it himself. I have seen the statement in the papers, I think it was by an employee of the Government, that it was expected there would be about a million acres more under cultivation in the province of Ontario. Now, if you ask the farmers of Dufferin and Simcoe counties and the adjoining constituencies as to that, they will tell you that that man ought to be in the asylum. I agree very largely with the remarks of my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Smith) as to the Bill, except that I do not concur in what he said of the Government. I believe the Government is trying to do what is best for the interests of Canada as a whole, but I do say that in this matter their information as to the sentiment behind this Bill must have been obtained from towns and cities, and not from the farmers. I do not know of one farmers' organization in Canada to-day that is asking for this measure. I remember quite well the feeling that was expressed about it last year when county and township councils, as well as many farmers' organizations, passed resolutions in opposition to it. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country are just as loyal to the Empire as any other class, and they are just as willing to do what they can to advance production. I think production is the greatest issue there is to-day in Canada, but the farmers do not want legislation put on the statute book that will affect their labour, and there is no doubt at all that this legislation will do so. Having farmed all my life, I know that if some of my neighbours allowed their men to quit work at five o'clock the rest of the hired men would clamour to be allowed off at that hour also. There is not a farmer within my hearing who will not agree with me that from the time when haying starts until the harvest is all in the barns no man can take a binder in the field before seven or eight o'clock. If he does so, his grain is wet with the dew, and must be kept out until it is dry. He cannot put his hay in the barn or it will spoil. Therefore, he must wait until about eight o'clock to commence operations. Now if on the average he cannot get to work before eight o'clock and his men quit work at five o'clock, how is he going to get his work done? Some hon. gentlemen from cities have been urging shorter hours for the working men. All I want to say is that if the farmers in the province of Ontario with whom I am acquainted had not worked longer hours than the men in cities their farms would not be half cleared to-day and they would not be producing such crops as they are producing. As a matter

of fact they generally work from twelve to sixteen hours, and if this legislation is enacted it will surely restrict the labour for which they are willing to pay, and pay good wages at that. I think it is time the farmers of the country were consulted before legislation such as this, in which they are so greatly interested, is introduced.

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton): After listening to the remarks of hon. gentlemen from both sides of the House, I deem it my duty to enter my protest against this legislation. This is beyond question a time when greater production is needed on the farm. But the Bill will have a tendency to lessen production rather than increase it. I do not wish to take up time unnecessarily. The measure has been pretty well discussed by hon. gentlemen on both sides, and therefore I merely enter my protest against the Bill and state that I shall register my vote against it.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): A fellow-member has called my attention to what he regards as an important fact; that in this flood of interesting debate no representative from the best province of the Dominion has yet uttered a word. If the debate were to conclude without a single word being uttered from Nova Scotia there might be some doubt as to the legality of the Bill after it had gone into operation.

However that may be I find that there is a conflict here between representatives from the cities and towns and those members coming from the country districts. It is very useful in such a case to be able to get the dispassionate opinion of some absolutely unbiased person. I do not happen to have any large city within my own constituency. I am sorry for that, I should be very glad if there were. We have a couple of pretty little towns, but no very large farming population. I do not believe my people are going to be affected by this Bill one way or the other to any considerable extent. I know that our people go to bed earlier down there. Just at this hour when we are discussing this Bill, in my constituency all respectable people are going to bed. Whatever you may do with this measure—and I may say that I am in favour of it—I do not think it is going to be a matter of serious consequence to my constituency. In any event the fishermen, the lumbermen and the shipbuilders there are going to start in and work just the same no matter whether this Bill passes or not; but I do feel that, strong as the argument is from the point of view of the farmers on this question, and there is much force in it, there is a very strong argument in the appeal made on behalf of the workmen in the cities. I do not for a moment say that their claims are equal to those of the farmers, but the conditions of the workmen in our cities and towns surely entitle them to much consideration. It is admitted, I think, on all hands, that so far as the workmen in the cities and towns are concerned this will be a useful measure, and to that extent it is certainly deserving of our most serious consideration. If I believed that the Bill was going to prove an injury to the farmers of the country I would not for a moment support it. Although there is no very great farming vote in my constituency I realize that, looking at this question broadly, the farming interest is the great and paramount interest at all times, and never more so than at this moment. But the farmers, most of us know, are conservative—with a small "c" remember. They are not ready as a rule to make changes, they look with suspicion upon everything of the kind. I am not surprised that in this case they have been in doubt, and that that doubt has crystallized in some cases into strong opposition to this Bill. The history of this legislation everywhere shows that in its early stages it was received with doubt. Over in England that very strong workingmen's advocate, Mr. Willett, drew the attention of Parliament to this matter some years ago. He was laughed at and jeered at, but, nevertheless, although poor Willett did not live to see it, his proposition now forms a very important part of the legislation of the Mother Country. After it has been adopted there, and also adopted in the United States, surely our farming friends will admit that this legislation must have some considerable merit. I think the farming interest is needlessly alarmed. The condition of the farmer is such that he is not going to be governed by the clock but by his own convenience.

There is something in the argument that the farm labourer, the hired man, will be unwilling to work after the hour when he thinks that his fellow workman in the city has ceased to work; but I think, taking it all in all, the farmer is in a better position to act independently. In the cities and towns the various classes of labour are more or less inter-dependent, one branch of business cannot go on unless the business across the street is going on at the same time. It is not so with the farmer; he can arrange his own business, and he need not care what his neighbour is doing.

I appreciate the force of the argument about the farm labourers, but I think that the arguments in favour of the Bill are so strong, and the experience of other countries so greatly in favour of it, that it is reasonable to ask our farming friends to allow the Bill to be passed and give it a trial. If the measure does not prove to be as good as we hope it to be, as good as it seems to be in other countries where it has been tried, we shall have time to repeal it before much harm is done.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must direct the attention of the House to the fact that if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce exercises his right to reply, he will close the debate.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton and Victoria): Before the minister speaks, I wish to state I have no decided views on this Bill, and for that reason I would like to have more information in regard to it than we have so far received. It would appear to the outsider that this Bill did not receive the consideration in the Cabinet, or in the Government, that it should have received before being introduced in this House. There are certain gentlemen with certain portfolios in the Cabinet who should enlighten us to some extent, or give us their views upon this subject, which is one of very great importance. We have in this Cabinet a Minister of Labour who is supposed to be in close touch with the views of labour all over this country. Labour in all its phases has the right to look for guidance and help to the Minister of Labour, and I am sure that hon. gentleman is disposed to be as useful to the great body of people he represents as he can be, and if the Minister of Trade and Commerce applied to him for the views of labour on this subject, I presume he would be in position to put himself in touch with the proper avenues of information in connection with the various associations which represent labour and give the Minister of Trade and Commerce the consensus of opinion among that very important class. We have not heard from the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Crothers) and I am afraid that, if he were asked for the views of the bodies he is supposed to represent in this House, he would have no very live or fresh information from them. In this I may be mistaken, but the hour is not too late, and if the Minister of Labour has any well defined views upon this subject, and if he has gathered proper information from the different bodies that he is supposed to represent, we would like to hear from him on this very important question. We have another gentleman representing another department in this House, the Minister of Agriculture. He is a farmer, I understand, and in the widest possible way and in the most concrete manner represents the farming interest and communities, and is in touch with the farmers of this country. As an outsider who has been brought up on a farm, and in close sympathy with the farmer, although a lawyer by profession, I would expect the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) to tell those of us who are not so well versed in the requirements of the farm as we ought to be, what his views are. We would not be going too far if we expected the Minister of Agriculture to be in his seat, closely watching what was being said by hon. members who are here. He is here to represent the views of the farmers and to impress them upon this House, and the Cabinet, and he should give this House the conclusions which he has reached and the advice which he gave his brother ministers in the Cabinet before this Bill was introduced. We have no such information and no such light from men whose business it is to be well informed upon questions of this kind. For that reason it is somewhat puzzling to a person like myself to know whether I am serving well my constituency by voting for or against this Bill. I represent a large body of labouring men, perhaps about as large as in any other rural constituency, as I may call my constituency. I represent also a large body of farmers, a mixed community. I am honest in stating that I cannot say now, with all the study this Bill has received, which way I could really vote on it in the best interests of my constituents, and if I had any advice to give the Government it would be to withhold this Bill for a while, and get in touch with the different interests of the country and ascertain positively by the best means what is the real sentiment of the country upon this question. I can assure the hon. minister that there is no well-matured or well-defined public opinion upon the question, and that, so far as the province from which I come is concerned, the question has never been carefully considered. I venture to say that Nova Scotia is in much the same position as the other provinces of Canada as far as due deliberation on this question is concerned. I desire to say to the Government, and to the hon. gentlemen in charge of this Bill, that there is at least danger, by forc-

ing this Bill upon farming communities, that he is going to create dissatisfaction and dissension in the country, and this is a time when no friction of any kind should be created which can possibly be avoided. We want to have the farmers, labourers and everybody in this country with their minds on the one thing, and one thing only, namely, that every ounce of strength and everything we have, without any disruption or disturbance, should be guided and directed to the one object of winning the war. In the community from which I come, where there is a great deal of steel and coal producing, they are in fixed grooves about the divisions of the day. I never in my life spoke to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce with more sincerity than I do at present. Everybody knows me in this House to be a hard-shell partisan, and there is no mistaking what I am, but I talk earnestly and deliberately to the minister, because this is not a party question. Nobody is taking a party view of it, and I am not. In the coal mines and steel works the day is fixed in certain divisions. Certain classes of men have to get up at four o'clock in the morning, and some at three o'clock in the morning, go down in the mines and operate, and prepare the way for workmen to come on later in the day. I am afraid that, with the tension that is upon our people now in the production of steel and coal, with every man at his post at certain divisions of the day, and at certain hours, if this Bill is passed it will be throwing them largely out of joint, and creating a condition of things that might cause friction and dissatisfaction. Things are going along in a first-class way, and I would, in all sincerity say to the minister and to the Government that it is only a year ago since we had this Bill before us, and there was nobody in the House who would stand as godfather for the Bill. It had to go unbaptized without receiving any ceremony or sacrificial blessing at all. I am surprised that a man of the hon. minister's experience and caution, unless there was a great cry or demand for it, should force it upon this Parliament again within such a short time, without having satisfied himself that he was on a much safer ground than he was on before. I was in this House when the Bill was introduced last year and said something about it. I remember the complexion of the House, and I see very little difference. There are more people in favour of it now than there were then, but I see that the men who were against it then are against it now, and there are no converts to the cause of this Bill of those who were in the House when it was introduced before. The minister is going to force this Bill to a division; he is going to make a serious division in this House, and he is forcing upon the farmers and other classes of the community legislation for which they are not asking and which many of them are opposing. If this is an experiment, as the minister himself and the best friends of the Bill say, I venture to tell the Prime Minister and the Government and our friends in this House that this is no time for experiments; it is a time for the best use of such machinery as we have and for the putting forth of every power we have along the old lines looking to the best possible results.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): As a farmer and as an employer of labour, I desire to say a word in opposition to this Bill. In Western Canada to-day employers of labour are paying a higher rate of wages for farm labour than they ever did before. They are paying from fifty, sixty, seventy to eighty dollars a month and more, depending upon the locality. The board, figure it as cheaply as you can, runs from seventy-five cents to a dollar a day. In Manitoba, in the rush of seeding and more particularly in harvesting time, if you apply to a labour bureau for men, they may say: We can get you a certain number of men. If you are not there with an automobile, if you have one or, if not, if you do not hire one to take the men out to the farm, they will not go with you but will go with the man who is willing to furnish that convenience. The labour people in the West have the farmer pretty nearly by the throat at the present time. If you are going to legislate and put it on the statute book of this country and publish it broadcast that a farm labourer will start work at a certain hour in the morning and will finish his day's work at a certain time in the evening, according to law, you are putting impediments in the way of the greater production which is needed in this country more than anything else at this time.

So far as gardening in the cities is concerned, many intimate friends of mine had gardens and they did not raise enough in their back yards to pay for the hoeing. Gardening is not a profitable business except when it is carried on by very experienced men.

As a farmer and as an employer of labour I am opposed to this Bill. It is not in the interest of the farmer. I have no complaint so far as labour is concerned itself.

The men on the farm that I operate, from the day seeding commences until the day fall ploughing closes, have never been in bed after half past four in the morning, and have never left work until half past six at night. If you set the clock forward an hour, those same men, following the law, and the custom, as custom it will become, will get up at half past three o'clock. That will not benefit the farmer because, in the early days of spring and in the late days of fall, it is black darkness at that hour in the morning. Men cannot work at half past three in the morning, in the latter part of August, September and October, nor can they do it in the month of April. They can do it in the months of June, July and the first part of August.

Another point of view of the western farmer is this: In eastern and southern Manitoba we have to summerfallow largely to produce the crops we are producing, and the work of destroying the weeds must be done in the months of July and August in the very hot weather. If you quit work at five o'clock in the evening, your summerfallow will not receive the same benefit because you do not spend the same time on it as if you worked until six o'clock in the evening. No farmer from Manitoba will contradict my statement that the sow thistle must be destroyed in the heat of the day in July and August. If you are going to start a sort of Sunday school farming operation, letting the hired man quit when he chooses, that is not going to be in the interest of the people at all. Who have asked for this legislation? The people in the cities. Then let the people in the cities have all the daylight saving they wish. We say: Do not interfere with us. This is not the day of baseball, as an hon. member said. We are not looking for ball players according to the Act which was passed here at the last session, and which I opposed. I refer to the Conscription Act. We are not looking for baseball players by any means.

10 p.m.

Another hon. gentleman stated to-day that the passing of this Bill would aid transportation. Daylight saving will not aid transportation, so far as the output of the western farmers is concerned, one-hundred thousandth part as much as the lowering of the freight rate. On that ground I am opposed to the passing of this Bill. Personally, I do not think it will make any difference to me, but, as the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) has said, it has come before the public; but it is doubtful if it has the sanction of the Government; the Minister of Agriculture, who is a western member and citizen, and the Minister of Labour, have neither said a word in regard to it. Why then, should we accept this Bill simply because the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other member of this House has brought it forward on the weak grounds on which he has introduced it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not intend to make very many remarks in closing this debate. I think I am voicing the feeling of this House when I say that the debate we have had this afternoon and evening has been a very interesting and very frank one. It is exactly that kind of frankness which makes a debate interesting. My hon. friend who sits opposite to me (Mr. McKenzie), and whom I must congratulate at this particular moment upon his advancement in the councils of my hon. friends on the other side, declared that this was not a party question. I quite agree with him on that. I think he designated that properly. The Government must bring in the Bill and become responsible for it, but it is not in any narrow sense a party measure. This is a national measure, and it appeals to both sides of the House, and so far as I know neither at the inception of the Bill, and certainly not during the debate to-day, have any party issues been raised. We have had a frank expression of opinion by gentlemen from the different provinces, and we have not all agreed with one another.

Someone has said that this is not a time for thoughtless legislation; I think someone used the word "freakish." No, it is not; I absolutely agree with that. If there ever was a time when fads and freaks of legislation were at a discount, it is during this year and last year and the year before, in the great parliaments of the world. These have been war years when men's souls were tried, when fads and freaks had little chance for lodgment in the legislatures of the world. Daylight saving in one form or another has approved itself to every great country at war during the last three years. It has approved itself to France repeatedly, it has approved itself to Great Britain repeatedly, it has approved itself to Italy, it has approved itself to the United States of America, and to some ten or twelve of the chief and foremost countries of the world. During the last three or four years every important country in Europe with the exception of Russia has put such a measure upon its statute book. Whatever may be said about geographical differences from European

countries, we have to the south of us the great United States, which spreads over zones and takes in conditions as nearly parallel with our own as it is possible to find between two countries. It is a country which has democratic institutions probably as well based as any country in the world; it is a country where there is a complete facility of representation of every interest in the legislative bodies before a Bill becomes law. That country has given two years of examination to the question of daylight saving, and has come to the conclusions which I have stated here this afternoon. They were not seeking to enthrone fad or freakish legislation. What impelled the United States and Great Britain and France to put this legislation upon their statute books was not to appeal to fads or freaks or anything of that kind; it was to aid in production and to strengthen the hands of the country for the war which it was carrying on. Taking the United States as an example, let me speak again of what I mentioned a little earlier in the day. Who were the two men who stood for this legislation in the House of Representatives, who urged its speedy enactment, and who appealed for two months more of it rather than the five months provided by the legislation which had passed the Senate? They are two men who are not airing fads, men at the head of the two great agencies for the conservation of fuel and the production of food in the United States of America, agencies not merely for the purpose of conserving fuel and producing food for commercial purposes, but conserving fuel and producing food in order to strengthen the hands of those who are carrying on the war. There was no question of thoughtless legislation. This is too serious a time in every country engaged in the war to have their legislatures spend a single moment passing faddish or freakish legislation.

The great purpose underlying this legislation is to strengthen the hands of those who are carrying on the fight for freedom and for liberty. Now I think that ought to appeal to us, and I think it does appeal to us. Take the farming population of the United States, take all the active interests of the United States with their complete representation in both their legislative Houses, and with two years in which to make their opinions known—a country which, like our own, is very largely made up of farmers, and extends over zones quite as liberal as our own, over latitudes and longitudes which are quite as extensive as ours—it hardly needs more than the presentation of the fact to lead one to conclude that there must be something important, something strong and powerful in the thing itself to appeal in that way to such a people, and to bring about the result shown in the two legislative bodies at Washington. I think that should remove from us the fear that this legislation is an unknown thing which may have involved in it the perils or difficulties and inconveniences which some men fear. Similar fears were expressed in England. If you will read the report of the Commission that enquired into this matter, and which I mentioned this afternoon, you will find that the same fears were voiced, and honestly voiced, as have been expressed around these benches to-day. Those fears were expressed by agriculturists in Great Britain, and it was almost solely from them that opposition came at the inception of the scheme. What does the report of that Commission say which was appointed to make that investigation? It says that these fears have been proved to be largely unfounded; that many of those who voiced those fears against this legislation in 1916 were in favour of it being renewed in 1917. Then came a period of actual and practical working out of the legislation, and in a country which is more interested in the extended production of food than any other country engaged in the war, the working out of that legislation in its second year proved so satisfactory that this year not only was it again put into operation without a dissenting voice, but the period during which it remains in force has been extended. Surely, that must tend to allay our fears. Surely, it is not an unknown step we are taking, not an unknown sea into which we are steering our bark. This legislation is proposed in the light of one of the most signal examples of the stepping up of an idea into practical legislation that the world has ever seen, and in a period of the world's history which has been the most strenuous and the most serious that the world has ever known. I think that ought to weigh with us; it weighed with this Government.

Something has been said with reference to all the members of the Government not having spoken on this Bill. I was surprised at the modesty of my hon. friend who sits opposite me (Mr. McKenzie). He, who has been a farmer, who has lived in the very centre of an industrial district, who has been a lawyer and is yet, who has been a judge and who has had the greatest of all opportunities for knowing everything—a member of Parliament—comes here and says that he does not quite

know how he should vote because he has not heard from the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Agriculture. What modesty my hon. friend has cultivated in this last year since we met him before! Before that I could not have credited him with such intense modesty as that. I did not believe that my hon. friend was bending forward in intense anxiety, to know what my hon. friend the Minister of Labour should tell him to do or what my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture should advise him to do, before he could vote intelligently on this question.

Let us look at another phase of the question. As my hon. friend from Queens-Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) and others have said, there is just one point in the argument against this Bill that appeals to me, and it is the position of the farmer who is contiguous to the city or town and who has to hire help upon his farm. He says that there is a possibility in that case of his farm labourer knocking off work at the hour, getting away and having a good time. He fears it. He is suspicious that that will be what will happen.

Mr. SMITH: Is not that true?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: How can we tell whether it is true or not unless it is tried? Yet, it has been tried and that is the way we tell whether it is true or not. It has been tried exactly in the same way in Great Britain. Where we have one town in close proximity to the acres that the farmers are tilling, they have half a dozen. They are in the midst of towns and cities. The very same fear that my good old friend has voiced here to-night was in the hearts of the farmers, and was expressed. It has been put to the test of three years of actual, practical working and it has not proved to be the trouble that it was supposed it would be. My hon. friend, I think, will find that it will work out in the same way here. But let us give it a little analysis. Here, are all the farmers in Canada. Amongst all the farmers of Canada there are a large number who do not hire any help at all. How many are there of those in this country? Are they one-half? Are they two-thirds? Whether they are one-half or two-thirds, you must eliminate those entirely; this Bill cannot affect them on the labour question one bit. The father, the sons, the daughters, the mother—all can keep pegging away at the farming business from the time they get up in the morning until they leave it at night, and no labour difficulty comes to them, because this Bill does not make it obligatory upon them to rise at any hour, to eat at any hour or to go to bed at any hour. They go to work as they please and there is no prohibition or penalty in that respect. Therefore, you have the larger part of the producing people of the country outside of any deleterious influence from a bill of this kind.

Coming down to the others, there are those who do employ labour. But they are not all next-door neighbours to the city or the town; consequently, it will not have that direct influence upon them which is feared if it were shown that the labourers upon the farms would be drawn away from their work and would work like hours to those in the cities. Making a division of those then who do employ hired labour, you find that a large proportion is outside of the direct influence of the city, town or village. Then you come to those who are closer to those places and may be somewhat affected by that fact. But you have to take the average in this sort of thing. It would not do for a man who happens to live on a farm close by a city to make opposition to a thing that does not affect three-quarters of the farming and producing community because it might possibly affect him. I just wanted to make that simple analysis to help us to think as broadly as possible in coming to a conclusion in reference to this question.

Without this legislation, we should be, within a few days, in regard to the United States of America, through our commercial transactions with that country in the way of transport, in a position in which we never have been before. On the first day of April their time changes, their clocks go ahead. All their operations in the way of exchanges, commission houses, banks—all the different associations of business and enterprise works along an hour in advance of ours. That might make an important difference in reference to ourselves, and it has to be taken into account. All our prejudices, or all our arguments, will not affect that in the least. It is going to come into operation on the first day of April and it will remain in operation until the 31st day of October. We must have some regard, when we give our votes upon this measure, to the relations which must take place between them and us during this very long period of the year.

Mr. SMITH: What about 1911?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What about 1911? It is a characteristic of political warfare that wherever one can get the blade of the

sabre in the flesh of an opponent, there is a great temptation to give it a little turn. But what under heaven has a thing that took place in 1911, or did not take place in 1911, to do with the matter of our making a decision upon a Daylight Saving Bill? Surely, whilst we may take the fun of a joke and of a jab in good fashion, we must as sensible people—and I appeal to my hon. friend directly opposite me—cut that out from our consideration when we come to the analysis of the Bill which is in hand.

My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Denis (Mr. Verville), stated the position of labour. I think he stated it fairly well, but I want to add one thing. I am not at all of the opinion that under these circumstances, and in these days, if you give to the great labouring classes of this country, to the clerical classes and to the people who are engaged in sedentary employment, an extra hour, they will all throw up their hats, shout at the top of their voices and go on spending that hour in a scene of jollification or in a lazy pleasure-seeking way. I think there is a spirit abroad in this country which leads every thinking man and every thinking woman to feel that this is the day and this is the year during which they should employ every hour that they have in the production of the food that is so necessary to this country and to the world. You talk about putting people back on the land. Here is one of the most excellent opportunities of giving people a taste for going back on the land. High prices are prevalent and the pressure of living is strong. Every labouring man who has a bit of a plot of land has the incentive in him to get to work on that land and do something to ease the burden which is upon him and to aid in acquiring what is necessary for his existence at least. To my mind, if you give an hour a day six days in the week to the labouring men of this country from ocean to ocean, you will put an exceedingly large number of hours into productive work which in the end will total an immense addition to the food products raised in Canada.

You will instil into the hearts and implant in the tastes of these people a desire for repeating next year what they do this year. That is, you will instil a taste for the soil, and that will instil itself into their children, and there is no better school, to my mind, in which to bring back the people to some participation in the cultivation of the land than lies in the facilities which a Bill of this kind will give in Canada, which it has given in Great Britain, and which it will give this year in the United States.

Now, I have kept the House too long, but I want to state this one thing further. An hon. member asked me when I came into the House to-night if this Bill could not be made just for one year, and not permanently. He had the impression that it was a permanency. In no country has daylight saving been made a permanency although in every country in which it has been tried temporarily for a year, it has gone on into the next year, and into the following year again; and the general impression to-day is that it has come to stay in those countries where it first came as a temporary expedient. This Bill is for this season only. My hon. friend from Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) will not need to come back next year, if the Bill does not work well, to have it repealed. Its effect ceases at the end of the season, and the duration that is given to it is in the choice of the Governor in Council; it will be proclaimed in and for the length of time that is necessary.

One word more, and it is with reference to the railroad traffic. Some hon. gentleman enquired as to whether or not railroad traffic would be helped by it. The universal testimony in Great Britain, and the sentiment in the United States, is that railroad accidents and casualties will be lessened, and that the transport of freight will be greatly extended.

I do not want to conclude my remarks without saying one word as to the saving, economical qualities in the Bill. In the United States the careful estimate is that the lighting bill alone of American families will be eased by the sum of $40,000,000. In war time that is a wonderfully economical saving to make. In Canada it will effect a somewhat equal saving in proportion to our population.

An hon. MEMBER: How can it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just in this way: that from April until the end of September or October there are certain hours of darkness or semi-darkness in which people use light. Now, it has been said in this House that you may make all the daylight saving legislation you like, and you may set the clock ahead, but the people will not go to bed by the clock. That was said in Great Britain, in France and in every country in which this legislation has been introduced; but the working out of it was exactly the reverse. People do go to bed by the clock. And if they save an hour of lighting in all those months, that is where the saving

comes in in their light bill. Mr. Garfield makes the calculation that in the United States at least 1,000,000 tons of coal in the manufacture of light will be saved, and one million tons of coal is a large item in these days when coal needs so greatly to be conserved. The calculation made out of the actual year's experiment in Great Britain was that a large saving was made in coal, in gas, in oil for lighting, and in the electrical and other lighting in the homes of the people. What has taken place there will take place with us. I am sorry to have imposed so long on the House in my second series of remarks, and facing you at this time, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Labour—Salaries $58,287.50—Contingencies $15,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any increase in this amount?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a decrease.

Mr. MURPHY: How does that happen?

Mr. CROTHERS: There are fewer civil servants employed in the department than there were last year.

Mr. MURPHY: I draw the minister's attention to the fact that the estimates give the same number this year as last, although the total shows a decrease in the amount. Has somebody's status been reduced?

Mr. CROTHERS: Nine of the items represent vacancies that have not been filled. My hon. friend knows the practice. For example, where a clerk dies, or is promoted, the position that was previously held by him still appears in the estimates year after year until the vacancy is filled.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has Mr. Gerald Brown, who was assistant deputy minister but was relieved of his duties, been given employment in another department of the Government?

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want to make a nuisance of myself about the matter of speaking louder, but really if it is desired that the private members, or back benchers, should take an intelligent interest in what is going on, we must ask the gentlemen who are leading on both sides of the House to speak in an audible voice. They should follow the example of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, who enunciate clearly and distinctly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: I understand the gentleman to whom the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) referred is employed in another branch, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps the Prime Minister can inform the House as to what Mr. Brown is now doing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Gerald Brown is now acting as secretary of the Reconstruction and Development Committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is his salary there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not recollect at this moment; I will ascertain and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister state if the report is true that a strike is in progress in one of the large coal mines in Nova Scotia, and if so, what means he is taking to prevent that strike?

Mr. CROTHERS: My latest information is that at a meeting next month the miners will take a vote as to whether they shall strike or not. In the meantime they are at work.

Mr. BUREAU: Do these items cover the salaries of those officers in the department who have charge of collecting the statistics upon which are based, or ascertained, the current prices of different commodities?

Mr. CROTHERS: They include the officers of that description, headed by Mr. Bryce Stewart.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister give a short statement as to how many of these officers he has now, and what information they are gathering? Is the information obtained by inquiry of the retail or wholesale dealers as to what prices they are asking for the various commodities?

Mr. CROTHERS: This information is obtained in different ways. We have, as my hon. friend probably knows, an officer in every town and city in Canada having a population of ten thousand or over. This officer also acts as a correspondent of the Labour Gazette and reports as to prices generally once a month, although he has been required to report twice a month. We

get reports from these officers, also reports from the markets, and from wholesale and retail dealers.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand that part of the staff is to be transferred to the new Food Control Board. Is that correct?

Mr. CROTHERS: No part of the staff has been transferred.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will there be a transfer of a portion of the staff in future?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is not correct, as far as I am aware.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then do I understand that Mr. O'Connor will carry on his operations under the Department of Labour in the future, as he has in the past?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not able to inform my hon. friend as to what may occur in the future.

Mr. DEVLIN: Well, in the immediate future?

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. O'Connor is still occupying the place he has occupied since a year ago last November, and there is no intention of removing him at the present time as far as I am aware.

Mr. DEVLIN: With the creation of the new Food Control Board, will operations as respects the prices of commodities in Canada be continued under the Department of Labour, or will they be tranferred to the new Board?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Regulations in regard to the control of food prices are embodied in the Orders in Council recently placed on the Table. One, I think, has been passed recently which has been published in the press.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) stated that the statistics taken in the department have reference only to the current prices. Reading the report of his department issued in 1917, but covering the year 1916, I read on the first page that we have made progress in that line. I forget the name of the gentleman who signs the report; I think it is Mr. Acland, if I am not mistaken, but what struck me is this: He says ,in effect, that for some years, and as far back as 1907, they have been trying to follow the changes in the prices, but that for 1915 and 1916—the period covered by the report issued last year—they have also statistics as to production in the various parts of the country. Now, I want to ascertain from the minister if those statistics are obtained from the same source on which are based the retail and wholesale prices of commodities, or from another source altogether? In the city of Three Rivers the gentleman who reports to the Labour Department—and I have occasion to meet him sometimes—makes inquiries more as to labour conditions than he does with respect to prices of commodities which are considered the necessaries of life. I should think that this man, living in the city of Three Rivers, and inquiring mostly from mills, manufacturing establishments and shipyards, would not be the proper authority to afford information to the minister as to the production of foodstuffs in and around Three Rivers as far as the necessaries of life are concerned.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not before me the report to which my hon .friend refers, and which is prepared by the Deputy Minister of Labour, but in addition to the sources that I mentioned to him a moment ago, we issue questionnaires monthly, I think to wholesale dealers and leading retail dealers, concerning food, clothing and fuel. We get monthly reports from these people, in fact they set forth a great many items as to the quantities they purchase and the prices that were paid for them, the quantities they have sold and the prices at which they were sold. That is a very important source of information that we have in addition to the one I mentioned to my hon. friend a moment ago.

Mr. BUREAU: With reference to production, I might tell my hon. friend that if I had sold 100 tons of coal, or 100 bushels of potatoes, that would not give him any idea or any information as to the production of coal or potatoes in that particular district. I understood from the report that the figures as to production were being ascertained in the department now. I want to know on what information they were obtained.

Mr. CROTHERS: I rather think the hon. member for Three Rivers is wrong in his interpretation of the words used by the deputy minister in that report. We do not get any report from the farmers as to the quantity produced, so that if he used the word "production," he did not use it in the sense of the quantity produced by the farmers.

Mr. VERVILLE: Who is the Fair Wage officer in the eastern part of Canada? Has he an office in Montreal? How much salary is he receiving? By whom was he recommended for the position, and what is his territory?

Mr. CROTHERS: The gentleman who represents the Labour Department in the province of Quebec is Théofile Bertrand. He was appointed about a year ago, at a salary of $1,500. I cannot recall who recommended him, but he was appointed on my own judgment. Several gentlemen spoke favourably of him. I sent for him, talked the matter over with him, and satisfied myself that he was a suitable man for the position, before making the appointment.

Mr. VERVILLE: He must have been recommended by some one, whether by an organized labour body or an individual. Can the hon. minister tell me whether he was recommended by any labour body in Montreal?

Mr. CROTHERS: I rather think not. My impression is he was not recommended by any labour organization, but was recommended by several leading labour men.

Mr. VERVILLE: Was anybody recommended by an organized labour body for the position?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think not. There were other names mentioned, but I think they were not recommended by organized labour.

Mr. JACOBS: I should like to have some information in regard to the item of "Packer and Sorter, $762.50". What are the duties of that officer?

Mr. CROTHERS: Various duties. I do not know that the words "packer and sorter" clearly define what those duties are.

Mr. JACOBS: Not a pork packer?

Mr. CROTHERS: No. You will see these officers are mentioned in each one of the departments. They perform different kinds of labour—messenger work principally.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I may say that I hold no brief for Mr. O'Connor; I have met him occasionally, but there have been rumours of late that he might be transferred to another department, or that his services might be dispensed with. I have seen this assertion in some of the newspapers. I hope this is not true, because I can assure my hon. friend that Mr. O'Connor enjoys the fullest confidence of the Canadian public, and especially of the Canadian consumer. The revelations he made in the investigations which he held during the last year have brought his name very prominently before the public. I refer particularly to the revelations which he made concerning the bacon inquiry and the egg inquiry. Generally speaking, the cold storage conditions in the country have aroused public opinion to such a pitch that I am inclined to believe that Mr. O'Connor is very much needed in the position he now occupies. I hope my hon. friend will disprove those rumours, and state to the House and to the country that Mr. O'Connor is going to remain where he is. During the war, when we are facing a very serious condition in regard to the high price of commodities, this gentleman has shown so much ability and so much regard for the public and for the consumer that I hope he will continue in his good work. I would not mention the matter but for the fact that I have read statements in the press that Mr. O'Connor might perhaps be shifted elsewhere. I know there are many interests that would be anxious to see Mr. O'Connor out of the way, but it so happens that Mr. O'Connor has struck a note which brought from the public the response that he was needed. He is possibly to-day the most fearless official in the general public service, on account of his honesty of purpose, ability and keenness. I have read his various reports, as my hon. friend has read them; they cannot be discounted. Mr. O'Connor has aroused public opinion, and it would be a sorry day indeed if his services were dispensed with, particularly at the present moment, under the pressure of some of the firms which were investigated by him during the course of last year. I do not think it is the intention of my hon. friend to dispense with Mr. O'Connor's services, but I would like him to assure us that Mr. O'Connor is there to stay, where he is without fear or favor doing such splendid work for the consumer.

Mr. CROTHERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend. Mr. O'Connor is a very capable and exceedingly industrious man. He works all night very often, and he is a fearless gentleman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And honest.

Mr. CROTHERS: He has made a number of very valuable reports. Any one who has read the reports he made on sugar, will observe that he followed the sugar from the field where it is grown in Cuba to your table, and the report was so thorough and satisfactory that there have been no complaints concerning sugar since.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the bacon report was the best.

Mr. CROTHERS: He made a very valuable report in regard to the coal. He has

the means of ascertaining monthly by sworn statement the quantity of coal that comes, for instance, into the city of Ottawa. He is in communication with all the leading coal dealers in Canada and he gets a sworn statement from each one monthly of the quantities of coal they receive, the prices they pay for it, the quantities they sell, and the prices they sell it for. He keeps track of the cost of the manufacture of bread. He can tell you what it costs to make bread in Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal or any other town in Canada. His report on the question of bacon, as my hon. friend said, was confirmed by a very capable commission that was afterwards appointed, and in substance everything that Mr. O'Connor had said in his report was confirmed by that commission. The report is a very valuable one, and the people of Canada, in more ways than one, are receiving and will receive benefits by reason of the report Mr. O'Connor has made on bacon.

Mr. CANNON: Has the Government taken any action on the bacon report?

Mr. CROTHERS: A very important action was taken by Order in Council fixing the taxation of the profits of packers. That was probably the result of the work done by Mr. O'Connor and his very able assistant. He has had assisting him a young lady, Miss McKenna, who took a special course in economics at Toronto University, who had a fellowship in the University for several years, and who did a great deal of practical work. She has rendered Mr. O'Connor very great assistance. I am sorry to say that we shall probably lose her services very soon because she got married a short time ago. It will be a misfortune if Mr. O'Connor ceases to work as he has been working for some time, and I think I can assure my hon. friend that he will continue in the position in which he now is.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not want to delay the minister in passing his estimates, but we are now at a very important item. The minister has already spoken of the action which Mr. O'Connor has taken in inquiring into the prices which prevail for different commodities. I have not the Order in Council before me, but I think I am right in saying that in the Order in Council creating the Food Commission power was given to take action to remedy any excessive price that was charged by dealers in commodities. The minister says that the only action which was taken was to tax the profits of packers such as Sir Joseph Flavelle, who was referred to by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House. This is a matter which concerns the whole people of Canada and the Allies. This evening I find that an organ in this city, which supported former Government and which offers very strong support to the present Government, has an editorial to which I wish to call the minister's attention. It runs as follows:

> At the inquiry being conducted by Commissioner Tustin in Winnipeg into the destruction of several thousand pounds of chicken taken from the storage of the William Davies Company—

I presume that is Sir Joseph Flavelle's company.

> —after it had spoiled, it has been stated in evidence that during the time the chicken was in storage the company refused to sell chicken to the Winnipeg General Hospital at the market price.

I do not always rely upon what I read in the newspapers. I am sorry to say I place extremely little faith at times in what I read in this paper, the Ottawa Evening Journal, but I will give Mr. Ross credit for this fact: that when he publishes in his editorial column an instance such as that, he must have ascertained the veracity of it. I call the minister's attention to this particular fact. There has been too much of this going on, and certain of the people of Canada are suffering from it. If the minister will allow me to remind him, without unduly speaking of myself, before the war started I called his attention by way of question in this House to the increasing cost of living, and I asked him to take some action to remedy, or at least to meet, the situation confronting Canada. From that day to this no action has apparently been taken. I may not be right in stating, but I think I am, that by the original Order in Council the minister has the power to take some action other than taxing the companies by way of a tax on profits. Sir Joseph Flavelle will pay his war tax the same as every other individual in this country. Everybody at the present moment is trying to do his utmost to help the Allies. We have had examples in this city quite recently in the collection for the Patriotic Fund. I know of an incident of one poor woman a widow with ten children giving ten cents, wishing to give her mite towards the Patriotic Fund and thus help the soldiers who are battling for the cause of liberty. Whilst the people are making these sacrifices, should not the Minister of Labour, if he has the power—and if he has not he should get it—take some action to keep down undue profits? I represent a rural constituency, and I thoroughly

understand from the discussion to-day the difficulty of getting farm labour. I understand that what is produced on the farm to-day must, of necessity, cost more than it did a few years ago. I take all that into account. Farm labour is high. That has been stated upon the floor of the House to-day. Everything the farmer buys to-day he has to pay dearer for. Therefore, he must sell his goods dearer. I do not think any exception is taken by the people of this country as to what they have to pay the farmer by way of legitimate profit. Exception is taken by the people to what they have to pay by way of excessive profit to the speculator. If any action on the part of the Government becomes imperative at the present moment, it is some action to save the country from the speculator in commodities. I would like to ask the minister, if he has the power under that Order in Council, if he is going to do anything to remedy the conditions in this country with reference to excessive profits, and if he has not that power, whether he proposes to get it.

11 p.m.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend refers to the original order of November, 1916?

Mr. DEVLIN: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: That order provided, amongst other things, that no prosecution can be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General of the province.

Mr. DEVLIN: But it gives power to the Government?

Mr. CROTHERS: Not to the Government in particular, but to my hon. friend in his riding, just as he has the power to institute a prosecution in any other case.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Has he the power to fix the price?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, to prosecute.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand that the price of paper has been fixed.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not quite see what relevancy that has to this Order in Council which deals with food.

Mr. CANNON: Why not fix the price of food if you fix the price of paper? Paper is less important than food.

Mr. CROTHERS: This Order in Council does not empower this Government to make any prosecutions. Speaking generally, when we pass a criminal law or quasi-criminal law, it is not part of the duty of the Dominion Government to enforce that law, except perhaps as concerns the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments. If, for instance, a horse is stolen, the man who has lost that horse does not come to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, but to the County Crown Attorney, or to the Attorney-General of the province. This Order in Council provides that no prosecution shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney-General of the province in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, and it is up to any individual to secure the consent of the Attorney-General and proceed with the prosecution.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand that thoroughly well, but when the Dominion Government enacts particular legislation carrying with it a penalty, as in the instance just cited by my hon. friend, who is an exceptionally good lawyer, the Dominion Government initiates proceedings. I thoroughly understand that the Dominion Government did not wish to take proceedings without the consent of the Attorney-General of the respective provinces. I am not so particular as to the form by which the Dominion Government proceeds, or as to the technicalities of the law. What I want to get at is prosecution in the case of excessive profits. I do not think there will be entire satisfaction among the people of Canada at the present moment, when the minister says the member for Wright has the power to prosecute. I will tell the minister this, right away, that whatever case of excessive profits comes into my hands for prosecution, will be prosecuted to the utmost limit. What the people expect is for the Government to initiate proceedings against those making excessive profits. We have a Solicitor-General for that purpose. He could very well undertake that work, but to think that absolutely no action is taken during war time, at a moment when we require to conserve all our resources, and when all our money is required to carry on the war and the affairs of this country—why, it is really tantamount to criminal, and I think the Minister of Labour, if charged with this work, ought at once to proceed to get power to prosecute.

Mr. CROTHERS: There would not be many complaints, because my hon. friend says he has not received one in eighteen months.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am not going to let the minister run away with these little niceties.

I said that if a case comes into my hands to prosecute I will prosecute it. I do happen to be a crown prosecutor, and I try to exercise all possible leniency consistent with doing my duty towards the public, but if the minister comes before a court where I act and gives into my hand or to the local authorities a case of excessive profits, I do not care who the man is, whether it is Sir Joseph Flavelle, his agent, or any one else, he will be prosecuted.

Mr. CROTHERS: Do I infer that no such complaint has been made to my hon. friend as crown attorny during the last eighteen months? Because he has said he would prosecute if a case did come into his hands.

Mr. DEVLIN: The minister may not be as familiar with the system of law in the province where I practise as in his own province. But if he is as familiar with the system, then his duty is to see the officers charged with the administration of the law in that province and to place in their hands cases such as the one which I have read to-night. The minister knows as well as any one that such cases are happening every day. In this case at Winnipeg, where the General Hospital was deprived not only of a commodity, but of what is a necessity in the case of sick people, the minister immediately on receiving his report should take steps to place the case in the hands of the provincial authorities for prosecution, and not wait until an individual or until a member here or there takes action. He should see that action is taken himself.

Mr. CROTHERS:: My hon. friend must know that we have no jurisdiction over the officers of the province of Manitoba. It is the duty of the attorney general of that province to give direction, if any one is to give direction, to the several county crown attorneys, if they have them there. I have no jurisdiction over them.

Mr. DEVLIN: You have a right to lay a complaint.

Mr. CROTHERS: So has my hon. friend.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is your duty, but it is not mine.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is not my duty any more than my hon. friend's, and I think I am busier than he. He might take a little time to lay some of these complaints, and not trouble us with them. As soon as I heard of the chicken that had spoiled in cold storage in Winnipeg. I wired the manager of that concern, and he referred my wire to the head office in Toronto, who wrote me at once concerning the matter. A few days later I got an explanation from the manager of the concern in Winnipeg, which satisfied me there was no intention of wrong-doing, and I think the explanation would be perfectly satisfactory to my hon. friend; I shall be very glad to show him the letter. I am satisfied that the chickens were not kept in storage for a very long time for any improper purpose, because they were bought very much cheaper than they are now, and there was no sense in keeping them and buying others at a higher rate. Upon the information I got from Toronto and Winnipeg I am satisfied there was no intention of wrong-doing.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister states he has no jurisdiction over the officers in Manitoba. I should like to instance a case in connection with La Banque Ville Marie when Sir Charles Fitzpatrick came down from Ottawa, as solicitor general, to prosecute the people who were responsible for wrecking the bank. Under this Government, however, we have the surprising spectacle of a representative of the Justice Department coming to Montreal not to prosecute but to give bail for offenders, the first time in the history of this country that that kind of thing has ever happened, and it would be worthy of an opera by Gilbert and Sullivan if they were alive to-day. King George, through the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, prosecutes, and King George, through the Attorney General of the Dominion of Canada, gives bail.

Mr. CROTHERS: I would ask my hon. friend to bring that matter up when my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is present, as he is more familiar with it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps it would be well to know from the minister if the abolition of patronage applies to his department as well as to other departments. Here is a paper which has been sent to me from the town of Elgin which my hon. friend knows. The Westport Mirror was sent to me with a marked announcement in it and which I read with surprise in view of the fact that there was to be no patronage in this country in the future. This is the notice:

NOTICE.

A meeting of the executive of the Liberal-Conservative Association of the village of Westport will be held at the office of W. M. Ewart on Wednesday evening, March 27 next at eight o'clock p.m. All persons who wish to apply for work on the Government Stone

Quarry will kindly notify the Secretary before that date.

W. W. Russell,
Secretary.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the stone quarry for the local Government, not for this Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am told it is for the canal out here.

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Railways is always on hand with excuses, but I am told by the person who sent me this paper that the stone is for the Welland canal.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Welland canal has been shut down.

Mr. McKENZIE: I mean for the Rideau canal. I would like the minister to make inquiry and to ascertain if there is any truth in the statement that the secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association is so blaspheming the holy doctrine of no patronage as to be calling people together so that he may exercise the patronage that is in his hands.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know whether my hon. friend refers to the provincial Government or the Dominion Government. If it is the Dominion Government, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will know something about it. I do not employ these labourers. But he asked me about patronage. Let me just tell the committee what I have done during the last six years. I am not going to tell the whole thing. During these years I have never recommended a man for a position who asked for it. I think that, prima facie, the man who asks for a position in the Government is not qualified to fill it. It is a public declaration of his inability to make his way in the open field of competition. I have never in six years recommended for a position any man who asked for it because I have assumed that he was not fit for it.

An hon. MEMBER. But some of his friends asked for it.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, his friends did not. I can give case after case. Such men were not recommended by me nor were they appointed. While I have been a member of this Government for six years, I have never recommended a relative to a position; neither has a relative ever been appointed to a position either in my department or in any other department of the Government.

Mr. VERVILLE: The minister says that he has never recommended or appointed anybody who asked for a position. Coming back to the fair wage officer I mentioned, he said that he did not know about him, but I hope he will know next time.

Mr. McKENZIE: At the opening of this discussion some person asked about a labour difficulty down in Nova Scotia. I understand that there has been difficulty in the steel works at Sydney Mines. I think the minister is using his influence in mediation between these two bodies as much as possible. His influence, or the influence of some capable officer in his department might bring these two bodies together when they would not come together themselves. It has been found that when an entirely disinterested person, a person of influence, or an officer from the department, goes to the place he is able to do work in the way of conciliation that these men will listen to, when they would not pay much attention to the efforts of others. I hope the minister will use his best endeavours to bring these men together because it would be a very serious matter to have a strike in the steel or coal works in that place or anywhere else in Canada. If it can be avoided, I hope the minister will try to do so.

Mr. CROTHERS: Efforts have been made for several weeks, and a gentleman was sent from here to Sydney Mines, with that object in view? We thought we had the matter thoroughly settled but it seems that the employers did not carry out the understanding that we thought had been definitely reached. Efforts are still being made and we hope a strike may be averted.

Mr. BUREAU: When I made the remark to the minister that I found by the report that the inquiry as to prices had been extended to production, I was not sure as to what the report actually contained and the minister thought I was mistaken. I would like to read to him from the seventh annual report on wholesale prices in 1916-17, published by the Department of Labour. This is a letter from Mr. Ackland to the minister and it says:

The earlier reports dealt exclusively with the course of wholesale prices, but the later volumes include statements of the situation as to retail prices and prices in other countries with information as to production and market bearing directly on current prices.

"As to production and market." My inquiry was: What is the source of the information or from what statistician does he get this information as to production?

Mr. CROTHERS: I thought when the hon. gentleman, in referring to the matter a few moments ago, was speaking of the report I put on the Table to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I have not seen that.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is not the one. It is the other one that was issued a year or two before. Mr. Stewart is the man who provides the statistics of both wholesale and retail prices.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend again states that Mr. Stewart compiles the statistics in reference to prices. That is all right; I am satisfied as to that, but what I want to know is: Who is gathering the statistics and from what source is that statement as to "production and market" conditions obtained?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think that refers to the production of the land.

Mr. BUREAU: "Bearing directly on current prices"—what production would that be?

Mr. CROTHERS: We have factories producing. I do not think he refers to farm products.

Mr. BUREAU: The prices that are current are wholesale prices in Canada. That covers every commodity required in ordinary life, all the necessaries of life, everything that is consumed by the ordinary man. So far as potatoes are concerned, I do not know what factory has been producing, or how he can get his information as to the production of potatoes.

Mr. CROTHERS: He gives the prices of potatoes, not the prices the farmer gets. However, I will be glad to make special inquiry from Mr. Stewart, and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year the hon. minister laid on the Table, and there was distributed amongst the members, a summary of some amendments proposed to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, which were not proceeded with. Does the minister intend to proceed with these amendments this session?

Mr. CROTHERS: I have already prepared a Bill, I may tell my hon. friend to make certain amendments to that Act.

Mr. CANNON: The minister has mentioned Mr. O'Connor. Mr. O'Connor has had several investigations, the reports of which I have read in the papers. I would like to know from the minister if Mr. O'Connor is only going to make reports, or if the Government intends to take any action as to the fixing of prices of food stuffs. That is what the people of our province, and not only of Quebec, but of all Canada, cannot understand, how this Government, which is supposed to take all kinds of measures to promote our share in this war—and we are all in favour of the war; we are all in favour of helping the Empire—does not fix prices on foodstuffs. How can people help when they are starving, and people are commencing to starve in our cities. Has the hon. gentleman taken any steps towards definitely fixing prices of foodstuffs, as is being done in other countries?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend is probably aware that there is no provision in this Order in Council that we have been administering for the last eighteen months authorizing us to fix prices. There is what is known as a Food Board in Canada to-day, and anything that is done by way of fixing prices is done by that board.

Mr. CANNON: Could not another Order in Council be passed giving power to this new board to fix prices? I understand that Orders in Council can easily be passed in these days.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think they have power already.

An hon. MEMBER: Does Mr. O'Connor suggest minimum prices on foods when he makes his reports?

Civil Government—Department of Immigration and Colonization—Salaries $129,292.50—Contingencies $25,000.

Mr. BUREAU: There should be some understanding arrived at if we are to take up further estimates to-night.

Hon. Mr. REID: I understood from the Prime Minister that whenever the request was made to adjourn we would do so. The only object in passing some of the Civil Government estimates is that when we go into Committee on certain days we would have some of the estimates already introduced to go ahead with.

Mr. BUREAU: The item now before us is for a new department, which we know very little about, and I think this is not a proper hour to take it up.

Mr. REID: Then there is another department here.

Mr. BUREAU: I would suggest that we had better adjourn now.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hour has arrived at which the Prime Minister mentioned we should adjourn.

Mr. CALDER: I would like to say, before we adjourn, that in the printing of the estimates for this department, a mistake was made. The original estimates as prepared by the department were afterwards corrected, and these corrections were sent to the Finance Department, but for some reason or other they were not included in the printed estimates; so that before the committee rises, I would like to send some typewritten copies across to hon. gentlemen opposite so that they and other hon. gentlemen will have the correct estimates before them. I might explain that the error occurred in this way; that certain promotions have been made in the department and as a result of those promotions there were certain vacancies created. Instead of there being 85 officers in the department, there are only some 83, the two increases being the deputy minister and my own private secretary.

Mr. BUREAU: As the corrections are in typewritten form, there will be time to have them printed and distributed through the post office.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.36 p.m.

Wednesday, March 27, 1918.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 22, respecting the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers and to change its name to "The Engineering Institute of Canada."—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No 23, to incorporate Merchants Casualty Company.—Mr. Andrews.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Fripp.

REPORTS.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Report of the Postmaster General, for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Doherty.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Report of Hon. W. J. Hanna, Food Controller, covering the period in which he discharged the duties of that office.—Sir Robert Borden.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir Robert Borden moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the Members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.:—Messieurs: Bowman, Brouillard, Buchanan, Burnham, Cardin, Charters, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Crowe, Currie, Fontaine, Hocken, Hughes (Sir Sam), Keefer, Maclean (Halifax), Michaud, Murphy, Prevost, Reid (Mackenzie), Richardson, Shaw, Verville, White (Victoria), and Wilson (Wentworth), will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George-Etienne Cartier), moved for leave to introduce Bill No 25 respecting Bankruptey.

Mr. SPEAKER: When I first saw this notice on the Order Paper, I had some doubt, in view of Rule 50, as to whether it was competent for the hon. member to introduce such a Bill without its having previously been passed upon in Committee of the Whole. But, apparently, the uniform practice of this House has been that Bills in respect of bankruptcy have not been deemed to be trade Bills as such, and therefore it may be introduced in the manner in which the hon. member proposes to introduce it.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a somewhat elaborate and comprehensive document, and if I were to give to it the time which it deserves, my explanation would probably keep the House here over the Easter recess. As hon. members are aware, there is no Bankruptcy Act in Canada. In that respect, Canada differs from practically every other civilized country; and it is proposed by this Bill to put Canada in line with other countries. As the House is aware, bankruptcy is within the purview of the Federal authority. No province can legislate with regard to bankruptcy, because of the fact that that subject is particularly declared in the British North America Act to be—like banking, railways, and so on—within the purview of the Federal authority. Of course, in the absence of any Bankruptcy Act, provided by

the Federal authority, the provincial authority has done what it could to correct the anomaly which now exists.

The main purpose of a Bankruptcy Act, as I understand it, is to see to it that a debtor in certain cases obtains a discharge from his creditors. Now, we have not since 1880 had anything of the kind in this country, and it is high time that a measure of this kind should be passed. It is usual in these days for hon. gentlemen in introducing Bills to state that they are merely introduced as war measures. That seems to cover a multitude of sins—anything which you can declare to be a war measure receives the attention of this House. I think I can claim for this Bill that it is essentially a war measure at this particular time. We must be prepared, when the war comes to a close, to be able to handle the situation which is bound to arise in this country as a result of the long-continued struggle and of the readjustments that will have to be made. Our legislation will have to be sufficiently elastic to take care of the situation. Many people will find at the end of the war that it will be necessary for them to reconsider their position; and it is only right, I submit, that the necessary legislation should be provided for that purpose.

At present no distinction whatever is made as between the honest and the dishonest debtor in the matter of obtaining a discharge; they are all thrown into the discard. By this measure it is proposed that the courts shall carefully scrutinize the business dealings and the business relations of traders, and shall make a distinction—shall separate the sheep from the goats. When the court is of the opinion that a debtor has been obliged to assign through misfortune, he should be given the necessary relief. If, on the other hand, it should be found, in scrutinizing his affairs, that he wrecked his own business wilfully, then, of course, he should receive no relief whatever. That is the crux of every bankruptcy law, and it is for that reason that I have introduced this Bill for the consideration of hon. members.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

HON. MR. SEVIGNY'S STATUS.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Is Honourable Albert Sévigny occupying a post or fulfilling a function under the control of the Crown, or is he a member of any Commission appointed by the Government?

2. If so, what is that post, function or commission, and what is the remuneration thereof?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): This question was sufficiently answered by the announcement I made yesterday.

EMPLOYEES ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many employees of every description were on the pay-rolls of the Government Railways on the 31st day of December last, including any and all railways in Canada owned or controlled by His Majesty?

2. How many men were employed in Canada on ships owned by His Majesty on same date?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. 20,917, were on the pay rolls of the Canadian Government railways, on December 31st, last, of whom 1,901 were employed on steamers and car ferries and 480 were on military service in receipt of full military pay.

2. Agriculture.—Men employed on ships in the Quarantine Service: On S.S. Minoca, Halifax, N.S., 8; on board Madge, William Head, B.C., 10; on launch Evelyn, Prince Rupert, B.C., 1. At Grosse Isle, Quebec, two boats of this service were laid up for the winter in Louise Basin, Quebec, with one watchman in charge. At the other stations hired boats are used.

Marine and Fisheries.—427.

Naval Service.—It is not considered advisable in the public interest to give the number of men borne on the books of ships under the control of the Naval Service Department.

MILL FEED, BRAN AND SHORTS.

Mr. KAY:

1. Has any order been passed by Mr. McGregor prohibiting or restricting the shipment of mill feed, bran or shorts from any place in Western Canada to the Eastern Provinces?

2. If so, (a) what is the order, (b) and how long will it remain in force?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. An arrangement has been made with the mills west of and including Kenora that they will not ship bran or shorts east of Kenora without a written consent from Mr. McGregor.

2. (a) Answered by No. 1. (b) The arrangement is expected to continue as long as it will facilitate the distribution of feed at a minimum cost and tend to reduce transportation difficulties.

Mr. KAY:

1. Has any effort been made to enforce the regulations of the Food Controller, regulating the price of bran and shorts?
2. Have any actions been taken for contravention of this regulation against dealers in the Provinces of Quebec or Ontario?
3. If so, give names and penalties enforced?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. It is the duty of the local officials charged with the administration of justice through the departments of the respective Provincial Attorneys General to deal with the breach of the laws, Orders in Council and regulations thereunder, (including any relating to bran and shorts) in the same manner that any other breach of the law is punished by the local judicial authorities. In addition it is the public duty of all citizens and local provincial and municipal police officials to lay complaint and have the laws obeyed. The Canada Food Board, whenever any breach of the regulations relating to food is specifically brought to its attention, will take and have taken the necessary and proper steps to prevent such infraction, even, if necessary, by the cancellation of license to do business.

2. Yes.

3. As the Canada Food Board does not, of itself, prosecute, it is not able to state what prosecutions have taken place in the different provinces, and information should be sought from the departments of the respective Provincial Attorneys General. But the Canada Food Board has been advised by the Crown Attorney for the county of Lambton in the province of Ontario, that he had prosecuted, upon the information of Mr. H. A. Gilroy, President of the Lambton County Co-operative Association, a miller, by the name of John Wheeler, of Alvinston, before the local magistrate, for overcharge on bran and shorts, who pleaded guilty and was fined $10 and costs. As appears from the following letter from Mr. Gilroy, of Alvinston, the complainant therein, it is expected that this prosecution will cause the millers to obey the law, viz:

The Lambton County Co-Operative Asociation.

Alvinston, March 19th, 1918.

E. R. McDonald, Esq.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:

Replying to yours of 16th inst. I have no later receipts. None since March 11th, and thanks to your efforts I have every reason to believe that the mills are obeying the law, not only Wheeler but some of the larger concerns who were formerly quoting shorts $40 per ton car lots F. O. B. Toronto. I would respectfully suggest that you take action to have papers stop carrying ads. for Low Grade Flour and in fact all illegal products of milled wheat. They are quoted every day in daily papers. Now sir, as head of this (above) Association permit me to convey to you our thanks for your prompt efforts in this matter, also to have you convey same attitude to Mr. W. P. McDonald, Dist. Representative for Lambton County at Petrolia, Ont., who was of material benefit in bringing the issue to a successful conclusion.

Respectfully yours,
H. A. Gilroy.

Mr. KAY:

1. Is the exportation of bran, shorts, and mill feed from Canada prohibited?
2. Is the exportation of said feeds allowed by license?
3. If so, how many licenses have been issued between August 1, 1917, and February 28, 1918?
4. To whom, and for what amounts were said licenses issued?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes.

2. Yes, in special cases.

3 and 4. At their special request licenses were granted to the Governors of various West India Islands and Newfoundland, as follows: Bermuda, 12,500 pounds; Trinidad, 17,000 pounds; British West Indies, 50 bags; Trinidad, 100 bags; Bermuda, 600 bags; Newfoundland, 700 bags; Turks Island, 100 bags; British West Indies, 5,000 pounds; Newfoundland, 500 bags; Bermuda, 600 bags.

INTERNMENT OF SIEFRIED H. MINDHEIM.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is Siefried H. Mindheim at the present time interned at Fort Henry, Kingston, or elsewhere, as a war prisoner?
2. If so, since what date, and for what reason?
3. If not, when was he discharged?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes, at Kapuskasing.

2. Since May 29, 1915, being a Prussian reservist, and from his actions, intelligence and education deemed to be a danger to the State.

3. Answered by No. 1.

APPOINTMENT OF FRENCH CANADIAN MINISTERS.

*Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to a statement which appeared in the Globe, Toronto, of March 21, to the effect, that in regard to the Quebec representation in the Cabinet, while no definite developments are expected in the near future, it is understood that tentative proposals have been made to several prominent French Canadians on both sides of politics, that these pourparlers are still in a tentative stage and that it is ex-

pected that if arangements cannot be carried out during the present session for the entry of two French Canadians into the Government and for securing seats for them, the matter will be arranged, at any rate, before the beginning of next session?

2. Have any negotiations been entered into by the Government to secure seats now held by members of the Opposition in the province of Quebec for supporters of the Government to enable that province to secure French representation in the Cabinet?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations for that purpose?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reply to the first and second questions is, No. In reply to the third question, I may say that the subject has not been under consideration.

POSITION OF CHARLES HARMAN.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the following letter published in the Toronto Globe on January 12, 1918:—

"Porter, Butler & Payne,
"Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries Public, Etc.
"Belleville, Ont., December 22, 1917.

"Chas. Harman, Esq.,
"Frankford, Ont.

"Dear Sir,—Notwithstanding I had you appointed to your present position upon the recommendation of your friends at Frankford, I am now informed by them that you have entirely forfeited their confidence and right to maintain the position which you now hold. You will therefore let me have your resignation at once, otherwise I shall have to take it up with the Department and have you dismissed.

"If I do not hear from you within the next week I shall take it up with the Department.

"Yours truly,
"E. GUSS PORTER."

2. Was Charles Harman employed by the Government as an axeman on the Trent Valley Canal?

3. If so, was he dismissed from such position?

4. What was the reason for his dismissal, and the date thereof?

5. Is the Government aware that Ross Harman, the son of the said Charles Harman, volunteered for service with the Canadian Expeditionary Force and was killed at the front prior to the general election of December last?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. The Government have no information.

ADVANCES TO PROVINCES.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. To which of the Provinces of Canada has the Government loaned or advanced sums of money as stated by the Acting Minister of Finance in the House of Commons on the 25th of March, 1918?

2. What sums have been so loaned or advanced to each province, respectively?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 & 2. Ontario, $2,000,000; Saskatchewan, $2,500,000.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. Verville:

1. What sums, if any, have been paid since the first day of August, 1917, to the Canadian Northern railway or to any persons, firm, corporation, bank or company in trust for and on behalf of the Canadian Northern?

2. Under what authority have these sums been paid?

3. If by virtue of Orders in Council, what is the date of each of said Orders in Council, and what is the amount authorized by each of said Orders, and so paid?

CANADA FOOD BOARD.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of the Orders in Council creating the Canada Food Board, and all correspondence antecedent or posterior to the Order in Council with respect to the same as well as of all regulations not already brought down.

He said: The statements which were read yesterday and the day before by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) with regard to the battle which is now going on in France make it very plain that the conflict in which we are engaged will be a very prolonged one. However the present battle may terminate, it will not be the end of the war, although it may mean the end of a chapter. Should the battle end disastrously for the Allies, and should the Germans, as contemplated in the announcement of General von Hindenburg, made some few weeks ago, reach Paris, I think we know enough of the disposition of the French people to-day to realize that, even if Paris were to be bombarded and destroyed, the plough pass over its ruins, and salt to be strewn over the soil, the French people would not, under any circumstances, surrender nor abandon the fight. As to Britain's share of the struggle, we know very well from the character of its people that once they have entered into a fight they will continue to the bitter end, whatever that end may be.

It has been a singular characteristic of this war that up to the present time there has been no decisive victory, unless it be perhaps the victory of the Marne River, which put an end forever to the plans of the German staff to reach Paris in six weeks, then force France to surrender and sign a peace, and next turn upon Russia. There has been no decisive victory on either side, and after the battle of the Marne the plan adopted by the military staffs of

the Allies seems to have been to resort to a war of attrition—that is to say, to a war of exhaustion of the enemy's forces and resources, supplies and munitions. The plan undoubtedly was well conceived; it was to encircle the central empires of Germany and Austria by an iron wall, having France to the West, Italy on the South, and Russia on the East, and to enforce a blockade of the Northern Seas. Undoubtedly if the plan had succeeded as it was conceived it might well be supposed that at the present time Germany would have been defeated, if not by an overwhelming, certainly by a decisive victory. But the collapse of Russia has shattered all these hopes. The other day the Prime Minister, speaking on the Address, expressed the hope and the possibility that Russia will find herself again and become once more an effective factor in the war. That Russia will come back again to its former strength, I believe can be hoped for, but that that country will be a factor during the balance of the present war seems to me absolutely beyond possibility. If the leaders of the Russian revolution had not been simple idealists, if they had been practical men, they would have realized that the attempt to create a republic, or any kind of constitutional government, out of the uneducated masses of the Russian people would fatally end in disaster, failure and anarchy; and though, for my part, I entertain the hope that there, as elsewhere, democracy will triumph, it is beyond the possibility of belief, it seems to me, to suppose that out of these uneducated masses you can have for many years to come a regular government. The battle, therefore, is to be fought and won quite independent of Russia, and it is to be fought and won on the lines adopted after the battle of the Marne: that is to say, through a war of attrition and exhaustion of the enemy. Unfortunately, after the collapse of Russia, and the introduction of a new feature into the war by the employment, in violation of all international laws, of the submarine against neutral as well Allied merchant vessels, the exhaustion is on the one side as on the other; and it is impossible to carry on the war with all the strength and vigour necessary, unless we have adequate production of food. This fact has been made very evident by the report made by Mr. Hanna on the 24th of January last, and which has been laid on the table of the House by the Prime Minister. In that report Mr. Hanna says:

> The dire necessity of saving wheat for the Allies is illustrated by the fact that of the 450,000,000 bushels required until the next crop is harvested, Canada and the United States can only supply, from supplies in sight, 150,000,000 bushels. Comparing the supply of wheat from America for the period from August 1st, 1917, to December 15th, 1917, with the same period of 1916, the former is only 13-23rds of the latter.

These figures are simply appalling, and evidently all possible efforts must be directed towards increasing the production of food.

But we have only to look at our own domestic condition to see another aspect of the case. The price of food products of all kinds has been soaring steadily until there is not a housewife in the land, even among those of ordinary or average income, who does not spend anxious moments every day in devising ways and means to supply the family table. If the cause of these soaring prices were simply the law of supply and demand, the Government would, perhaps, have been powerless—at all events largely so—to remedy the situation. But it is admitted on all sides that the cause of these soaring prices is to be found not in the inexorable law of supply and demand, but largely in the hoardings of food by heartless speculators who are attempting to build up fortunes out of the hunger of the masses. This situation is patent to everybody. That the Government themselves could not ignore it is evidenced by the fact that some few months ago they decided to take steps to control, so far as they could, the prices by the appointment of a Food Controller. Certain departmental and governmental orders have been brought down on this subject, and the first to which I wish to refer is that which establishes the food controllership. On 16 June last the following Order in Council was passed:

> 1. The Governor General in Council may appoint an officer to be known as Food Controller for Canada, who shall hold office during His Majesty's pleasure.
>
> 2. It shall be within the power of and it shall be the duty of the Food Controller,
>
> (a) To make such inquiry and investigation as he deems necessary for the purposes hereinafter set forth, into the quantities, location and ownership, and into the sources of supply of any article of food used by the people of Canada and into the prices at which same is sold or held for sale and the causes of such prices.
>
> (b) To ascertain the food requirements of Canada and to facilitate the export of the surplus to Great Britain and her Allies.
>
> (c) To make regulations where he deems it in the public interest and subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council.
>
> (1) Governing the prices of any article of food and the storage, distribution, sale and delivery thereof.
>
> (2) Providing for the conservation of food and the prevention of waste thereof and governing

the consumption of food in hotels, restaurants, cafés, private houses, clubs and other places.

(3) Respecting the manufacture, preparation, storage and transport of foods.

(4) Authorizing the Food Controller to purchase, requisition, store, sell and deliver food.

3. For all the purposes of these orders, the Food Controller shall have the powers of a Commissioner appointed under the provisions of Part One of the Inquiries Act.

So far as this Order in Council goes, no fault is to be found with it. It is comprehensive, but while it provides for the conservation and distribution of food, it makes no attempt whatever to take hold of the question of the production of food.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not quite understand my right hon. friend's last observation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My last observation was that in the Order in Council there is nothing that I can see which tends to stimulate the production of food. The regulation is simply for the preservation and control of the food supplies already existing; no attempt is made to encourage production. The observation which I have to make regarding this Order in Council providing for the conservation of food and the controlling of prices is simply this: nothing has been done of a drastic character to bring down prices and to preserve effectively the food supplies. As I have said, this Order in Council was passed on 16th June. On 21st June Mr. Hanna was appointed Food Controller. On 9th August the first Order was passed under the authority conferred upon Mr. Hanna, in which he defines 'restaurant," "public eating place," and "bacon." On 18th August another regulation is passed prohibiting the exportation of flour without a license. On 24th August the sale of all canned vegetables is prohibited, while fresh vegetables are available. On 11th August a regulation is made to compel producers and manufacturers to give to the Government all information respecting purchases, sales and production. On 19th October a regulation is passed forbidding the sale of all cereals known as breakfast foods except under license. On 21st October, just two days afterward, that Order is suspended to become effective on 1st January. On 23rd October the importation of oleomargarine is allowed. On 2nd November a regulation is passed that no grain which can be used for food shall be used for the distillation of potable liquors. On 15th November a regulation is made prohibiting the exportation, except under license, of a large list of commodities. On the same date manufacturers and dealers are prohibited to manufacture or sell, without license, any kinds of food which the Food Controller may from time to time designate. On the same day a regulation is made that flour mills of certain capacity are not to manufacture except under license. On 27th November a regulation is passed concerning the manufacture of malt, and on 3rd December the export of certain commodities except under license is prohibited. On 24th December a regulation is passed concerning transportation by rail. On 21st January a regulation is passed prohibiting flour mills, without regard to capacity, to manufacture except under license. On 12th February a further regulation is passed concerning public eating places. On 9th March an Order in Council of some importance was passed, from which I quote the following:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:—

1. No person, firm, association or incorporated company shall engage in the slaughtering of live stock, or the manufacture of products therefrom, the gross value of whose sales from such business shall exceed seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars during any one year, without a written license from the Canada Food Board under provisions made by them in that behalf.

2. A licensee shall, so far as practicable, so fix the prices on his sales that the profit thereon or on that part thereof not expressly excluded from this limitation, shall not exceed two per cent. of the gross value of his sales during any one year.

Then again there is an Order in Council of 12th March, 1918. This is the last Order which has been brought down, giving power to the Board to prevent the hoarding of food. This is a summary of all the regulations, of all the action taken by the Government in order to regulate the prices of food and, if possible, to keep them within reasonable and legitimate limits. I say, without fear of contradiction, that the action of the Board has been a great disappointment. We had a right to expect much more than has been done by the Board. Nothing effective has been done to bring down the prices of food, the high cost of which is weighing so heavily upon the people.

But if the Board has been slow to move with regard to taking effective action, the Board has not been slow with regard to organizing itself, its staff, and paying very high salaries. Mr. Hanna, to his credit be it said, would not take any salary for his services, but Mr. Hanna, who had been appointed on 21st of June, 1917, obtained, on 3rd July 1917, an Order in Council ap-

pointing a pretty large staff of highly paid officials. On that date the appointment was made of Samuel Elsworth Todd, as chief of the Food Controller's staff, at a salary of $4,500 per annum, of Walter Abraham Willison, as chief of the educational branch, at a salary of $4,500, and of Frederick William French, as chief of the organization branch, at a salary of $250 per month and living expenses not to exceed $100 per month, or a total salary of $4,200 per annum. What is peculiar is that I have not found stated anywhere in the regulations the powers and the duties attributed to the several officers who are paid these high salaries. I would have supposed that an Order in Council would be passed to designate the powers and duties of the Chief of the Food Controller's staff, Mr. Samuel Elsworth Todd, and the same with regard to Mr. Walter Abraham Willison, who was appointed chief of the educational branch at a salary of $4,500. Nothing, however, is shown in the regulations as to what are to be the duties and powers of the chief of the educational branch. Education is a very broad word. Who are to be educated? What is the education to be in, and what is intended by that? As to this, we are left altogether in the dark. Then you have the appointment of Mr. Frederick William French, as chief of the organization branch. What does the organization branch consist of? As to that we are also in the dark. Later on the staff was much enlarged. On 23rd August, 1917, the following Order in Council was passed, approving a recommendation of the Food Controller:

The Food Controller recommends, in order to obviate the necessity of having an Order in Council passed to confirm each and every appointment, and as a number of the said appointments will be for short periods, that authority be given for the appointment of persons to fill the following positions when required at not more than the salary set forth:

Stenographer and secretary, $1,000; stenographer and secretary, $1,000; Assistant to Chief of Educational Bureau, $3,000; Special clerk, $2,000; clerk, $700; clerk, $700; stenographer and secretary, $1,000; French stenographer and secretary, $1,000; stenographer and secretary, $1,000; clerk, $1,000; Domestic Science expert, $1,200; Domestic Science expert, living allowance $50 per month, $600; stenographer and secretary, $1,000; Abattoir expert, $2,500; Assistant to Chief Food Industries Bureau, $2,000; stenographer, $900; clerk, $1,000; stenographer, $900; clerk, $1,000; clerk, $1,000; stenographer, $1,000; stenographer, $900; accountant, $1,800; assistant accountant and clerk, $1,500; Chief files clerk, $1,200; files clerk, $800; files clerk, $700; clerk, $600; messenger, $500; messenger, $500; Press reader, $1,500; secretaries for special committees, $3,000.

The total is $38,000. These figures are large enough, but they are nothing in comparison with the organization which was made later on after the resignation of Mr. Hanna. Mr. Hanna resigned on January 24 last, and two days afterwards the following Order in Council was passed:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a memorandum dated January 24, 1918, from the President of the Privy Council, submitting that the Food Controller, under the authority of the Order in Council of June 16, 1917, has recommended that the appointments authorized by the Order in Council of July 3, 1917; August 23, 1917 and October 8, 1917, be cancelled, and that authority be given for the appointment by the Food Controller of persons to fill the following positions at salaries not to exceed in any case the amounts specified for the several positions.

I commend to the attention of the House the staff which is here provided for:

Chairman of Executive Council, $5,000;

What is the Executive Council of the Food Control Board? I do not know; it has been impossible for me to find in the correspondence that has been brought down what is the Executive Council, what are its duties and powers. At all events, the Chairman of the Executive Council is to receive a salary of $5,000.

Chief of Staff, $4,500;

What is the Chief of Staff? What are his duties? There is nothing to show in the papers brought down.

Assistant Chief of Staff, $4,000; three administrative heads, each $4,200; nine department heads, each, $3,500; Secretary Executive Council, $3,500; Clerk to Chairman Executive Council, $3,500; Chief Files Clerk, $1,200; Private Secretary to Dominion Chairman National Committee on Food Rersources, living expenses, $2,000; Private Stenographer to Dominion Chairman, living expenses, $500; Accountant, $2,800; Acountant, $2,600; Accountant, $2,500; nine special clerks, each $2,000; Domestic Science Expert, $2,000; French Writer for Educational Department, $2,800; Special Writer for Women's Publications, $2,000; Press Reader for Educational Department, $1,600; Clerk for Roneo machines, $800; Hotel Inspector, $2,000; Traffic Manager, $2,500; thirty stenographers each, $1,200; four stenographers each, $1,000; Clerk for Inquiry Office, $1,500; fifteen clerks for Export and Import Registration and licensing each, $900; four messengers, each, $700.

These appointments number ninety-two, and the amount involved is something like $165,000. In addition, there is provided for stenographers and secretaries for the provincial committees the sum of $9,000; for organizers for food conservation in provinces, $16,000; and to provide secretaries for special committees, $4,000. The Food Controller himself is paid a salary of $7,000, which brings the expenditure for this branch

up to something like $200,000 a year. Now, I submit in all conscience these figures are simply extravagant in view of the work that has been done by the Food Board. On the 4th of February last Mr. Thomson, of Victoria, B.C., was appointed Food Controller in the place of Mr. Hanna. Of Mr. Thomson, I, for my part, know nothing. Although I have been a pretty long time in public life, I must say that until I saw his name mentioned I had never heard of him. That is not to his discredit, I admit; he may be a very good man; but I do submit that it was not sound policy to appoint to this position a man who was absolutely unknown. Mr. Hanna, on the contrary, was a man well known and well tried in public life, and of great ability. I think his appointment was a judicious one, but I cannot say the same with reference to Mr. Thomson's appointment. Two days afterwards the Food Controller's office was completely reorganized. Up to that time we had had a Food Controller. Now we have a Food Board. It was on the 11th of February the Order in Council was passed creating the Canada Food Board, "the said Board to consist of a Director of Food Conservation, a Director of Food Production, and a Director of Agricultural Labour; that the Board shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall report to the Governor in Council through the Minister of Agriculture." A few days afterwards Mr. Thomson was appointed Director of Food Conservation and Chairman of the Board; Mr. Charles A. Dunning, well known as a member of the Government of Saskatchewan, was made Director of Food Production, and Mr. James D. McGregor, well known also in the business world, was made Director of Agricultural Labour. I would call the attention of the House to this: three different positions were thus created, the Director of Food Conservation, the Director of Food Production, and the Director of Agricultural Labour—but here again there is no inkling of the powers or of the duties imposed under any of these heads. Perhaps I may be told that the powers and duties are sufficiently indicated by the titles, "Director of Food Conservation," "Director of Food Production," and so on. Well, I imagine that the duties imposed on the Director of Food Conservation are similar to those imposed on Mr. Hanna—that all the duties delegated to Mr. Hanna on June 16 last by the Order in Council which I have read are now delegated to Mr. Thomson. Then there is the Director of Food Production; what are his duties and powers? I alluded some time ago to a newspaper article which I read in the House to the effect that Mr. Dunning had been directed by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) to buy one thousand tractors with a view to helping in food production. So far so good; that is something done at all events, but not very much, for, after all, what it amounts to is simply the removal of the customs duty on tractors. That is better than nothing at all, I admit, and I express my satisfaction at that. Then what are the duties and powers of the Director of Agricultural Labour? How is he to be employed? I know that several schemes of a more or less extended nature have been put before the Government with a view to increasing food production in this country, by bringing under cultivation a larger acreage than has been tilled in the last few years. That may be a step in the right direction, but what I complain of is that in this respect the action taken by the Government seems to have been very slipshod, to say the least; there is no complete or definite information, unless it be contained in some Orders in Council or regulations which have not been brought before the House. One would suppose that when this Government brought down the Orders in Council on the opening day of Parliament they would bring down everything which would instruct the public as to the character of the actions which they have taken to improve the food situation, which admittedly is painful. But this information is not given in the Orders in Council brought down. Therefore, I beg to move the motion which is now in your hands, Mr. Speaker.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have a general idea, gained by virtue of being a member of the Council, of the duties of the Food Controller and of his operations, but that department was really in the hands and under the direction of the President of the Privy Council, who unfortunately, by reason of illness, is not able to be present in the House. I shall therefore simply advert in a general way to some of the remarks made by my right hon. friend. There are two phases which he has passed under review; one was his resume of the work of the Food Controller as Food Controller, and the other, about which he seems to have the least information, had reference to the second stage, when the Food Controller's work was merged into the larger organization known as the Canada Food Board. With reference to the latter my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture has more knowledge than I, and will probably say something when I shall have finished.

I am not going to follow my right hon. friend in his prefatory remarks as to the urgency of the food situation consequent upon the general war situation as it has developed. I have no objection to take to his remarks in that respect as a fair review of the situation.

I have stronger hopes that the duration of the war will be less than my hon. friend seems to think. However, that is a mere matter of opinion, and no one can tell with certainty. I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman when he says that it is not the operation of the law of supply and demand that causes the high and advancing prices in this country. Prices have advanced throughout the world, and prices in Canada have probably been less than in most, if not all, of the other countries. I think the main reason for the increasing prices is in the relation of supply to demand, taken in conjunction with the necessary means for getting the supply to the place of demand, that is, the general transportation question—and how that question comes in will be evident if we take the cases of Australia and New Zealand into consideration. In Australia there are millions of bushels of wheat lying stacked, the result of two years' crop, the larger part of which surplus remains to this day, simply because it is impossible economically to ship it to the centre of demand, on account of the great distance to be traversed and the scant supply of ships. The same condition prevails with regard to New Zealand. Their warehouses and wharves are stacked up to the brim with food supplies. If the transport problem had not been so difficult, that grain and food supply in Australia and New Zealand would have been brought to the centres of demand, and would have largely prevented the increase in prices. It being found impossible, on account of transport difficulties, to move those great supplies, the nearer sources of supply have been drawn upon; that is the North American continent, and partly the South American continent. True, the question of distance is a factor, in connection with Argentina, though only in a secondary degree as compared with New Zealand and Australia. Thus the weight of the burden of furnishing supplies has to be borne by the United States and Canada, the distance being short, in comparison with other countries. These problems, combined with the awful waste of food which takes place in war time, bring about the high cost. The abstraction of productive power from the harvest fields of the world, turned as it has been to active warfare and the subsidiary supports of active warfare, has caused an insufficiency of supply, and, therefore, a tightening of prices. I do not think any person can dispassionately review the conditions and come to any other conclusion than that these conditions have been the main and the basic reason why the prices of food products have gone up continuously and uniformly, and why, therefore, we are under this burden of the high cost of living. There are subsidiary local reasons that may accentuate this condition. But I make the statement, and I challenge contradiction in this House, that hoarding or speculative holding has been a comparatively trivial factor in increasing the cost of food to the consumers of this country. That is borne out by investigations which have been made in both the United States and Canada. Bear in mind that, under modern systems of food supply, the refrigerating storehouse and the warehouse are necessities in times of peace, and in times of war they become still more necessary, because transport is uncertain and the food supply must be gathered in central places and kept there so that when vessels are available the supply may be ready for them and they may not have to wait in port. Meat and dairy products have to be stored, to be kept in edible condition, and that can only be done by means of cold storage. I remember being West and going through the immense storage houses in Calgary and other places. There was at that time a very large amount of meat products in storage, and why was it there? Every pound of the million dollars' worth of produce stored there was under contract to be supplied to Great Britain or the other Allies. It was there, Sir, at their order, ready for immediate transport, whenever they should send for it. We must take into account that storage and warehousing, and their consequent cost, are absolutely necessary in the modern ways of doing business, and that the necessity for these is accentuated when transport conditions as they exist are present. But when you speak of hoarding for gain or speculation in this country, it is a negligible factor in increasing prices. As a local influence it does not enter largely into the general increase in commodity prices.

I submit these observations in reply to what I think is not only a false but a mischievous doctrine to be preached at the present time. Everybody knows that there is trouble enough in the country with the burdens that we are bearing, and with the

3 p.m.

cost that we have to bear, without giving currency to an opinion that this increased cost is largely due to the fact that there are soulless speculators and hoarders doing their work of holding back the necessary supplies. To a certain extent, that does take place, and under the best system you can have, there will be something of that kind; but I make the assertion that this has not been a large factor by any means in the cost of food in Canada. I have had occasion to make investigation lately with reference to the wheat supply, the statement having been made that the wheat has not been coming out from the West from the farmers' hands, that the farmers are hoarding wheat with the idea that they may obtain a greater price another year. Very careful consideration has been given to that question, and the answer has been received—and I think a satisfactory answer—that after as complete an investigation as could be made, it is not a fact to-day that the farmers in the West are hoarding their surplus of wheat but rather their wheat is going out; compared with other years and considering the means of transport at their disposal, there has been an outpouring of the wheat, rather than a hoarding of it. There are gentlemen in this House who have a great deal to do with the production and transport of wheat, and I leave it to them to say whether I am within bounds in making that statement.

I come now to the next point with which my right hon. friend finds fault in the papers that I brought down with reference to the Food Controller—and I hope he will keep that word "controller" in his mind. He has been talking about the Food Controller. The Food Controller was appointed to control, he was not appointed to produce, and consequently the criticism of my right hon. friend that in those duties assigned to the Food Controller there did not seem to be anything which took hold of the greater question of the production of food falls to the ground. The Food Controller here, as in other countries, has been appointed for the purpose of controlling food. I know that a very general notion was held that when the Food Controller was appointed the first thing that would be done would be the establishment of a scale of prices beyond which nobody should charge for that which they sold, that pork would be so much, beef so much, bacon so much, and so on all through the list, and so the consumer would be protected. I think my right hon. friend's own good sense, devoted to consideration of a proposition of that kind for fifteen minutes, would show him that such a thing was impossible. The experience of all countries, during the last four years, has gone to show that that is not the way to arrive at a wise and economic solution of the problem. The Food Controller was appointed to control food; to see, in the first place, that no food was wasted; to take hold of the question of the handling of food, after its primary production, in its several stages, and so to regulate it that the best methods of providing the most economical foods should be carried out. The long series of Orders in Council read by my right hon. friend and the powers given one after another in these Orders in Council, show the graduation of the work. When Mr. Hanna was appointed Food Controller many people in this country expected that on the next day he would come out with a schedule of prices, and with restrictive measures which would be productive of a fall in prices. Mr. Hanna had before him a problem greater than had been presented to any man in the Dominion of Canada. He had to study that problem. A step in the way of executive control without a thorough study of the bases on which it would be founded, might have landed him in error after error, of a costly nature, and probably every step would have to be retracted. Therefore, in the early period of his term of office the Controller made a careful examination in order to obtain reliable information to enable him to take the secondary steps. That took time. It also took brains. It also took muscle, and organization was necessary. Organization is impossible without men who are fitted to organize, and if my right hon. friend will just pay a moment's attention to the designations of the officers that were appointed, from time to time, he will see what their general trend of work was, and will realize that it would have been nothing less than stupid inefficiency to put low paid clerks in those positions which required the very best brains and the very best organizing capacity and experience that could be obtained.

I think the House will go with me in that opinion. You cannot get this definite, though, well-digested information except through very careful organization; and for this you must have captains of organization, men of experience and organizing ability, fitted to get the facts and to marshal them; and to these men you have to pay commensurate salaries. Now, I am not going into the particulars of these officers and

these salaries; I am just going to leave my remarks with that general statement which I think will approve itself to the House.

As my right hon. friend read on, he came to gradation after gradation in this service. It crept up through the general regulation and restriction of the public eating houses, which were not difficult to get at. It crept up through the general organization to keep expensive foods from being used where healthy and less expensive foods would take their place. It went along the lines of the border between ourselves and the United States for three thousand miles in a regulation coterminus with the regulations in the United States, as to imports and exports from one country to the other. The whole of the food imports and exports of the Dominion of Canada had to be placed under the Food Controller, because on the other side of the line, Mr. Hoover, the Food Controller in the United States, had that power put in his hands by the President's proclamation. Mr. Hoover had to collaborate with Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Hanna had to collaborate with Mr. Hoover, and in the interdependence of the two countries for food supplies the closest work between the two controllers—team work so to say—had to be carried on. That required organization, and it required organization of good brain power and of good experience, in order that it might be effectively carried on. If my right hon. friend could have spent a week, as I have spent some hours, in meetings and consultations with the different committees of experts in these different lines who came here to Ottawa and stayed for a week, for ten days, for two weeks when necessary—collaborating with the Food Control Department's officers as to the regulations which could be put in force, how they could best effect their purpose, exchanging advice and translating it into practical activity—he would not be surprised at the time that had to be taken, and at the amount of work in organization that had to be put through. For a country like Canada, that cannot be done without a great deal of labour and organizing power, and a great deal of consequent cost.

Then we come to the point where the Food Controller brought the mills of the country under license. For what purpose? Two purposes. In order, in the first place, to regulate their production of flour so that the least expensive flour of edible quality could be produced and the greatest good, therefore, extracted from the grains of the country, and in the second place, that we might use these powers coterminously with the United States, in order that what went on in the one country should not be balked of its purpose by something which took place in the other. So that that system extended itself until in the production of food the system of licensing has extended over the whole Dominion.

Then came the live stock regulation about which my hon. friend read. It was with reference to the killing and the dressing of stock—such and such were not to be disposed of within certain limits of age, and so on, through the different gradations, looking to the conserving of the supply of meats. Now, in reference to cost, the basis of action is decided upon as in the case of the packers. Instead of fixing prices, it was thought better, by a thorough cost system, to get at what it cost the packers to produce, and then to limit them strictly to a reasonable profit. I think you get the most economical and effective solution of the business in that way. Instead of placing prices on this, that and every other product that goes into consumption, you get at it at the place of manufacture as in the case of flour, bran and shorts, and you prevent inordinate profits by fixing the maximum beyond which they cannot go. Then, by careful co-ordination and supervision, you make sure that the people get the products at those reduced figures, so far as supervision can make that possible.

Now, I think I have come pretty nearly to the end of the remarks which I propose to make on the Food Controller, and I am going to hand this business over now to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) for his remarks with reference to the Food Control Board. Before I leave the subject entirely, however, I would make this further observation. My right hon. friend read a list of 92 employees and of salaries and expenses therewith which would total up to about $200,000 in the year, and, without any analysis at all as to either the necessity or caliber of those appointed, the requisite qualities that they should have and the fair remuneration that should be paid, he came to the conclusion that this was an example of wanton waste and prodigality. I do not think he proved his conclusion. I think that, in order to show that his conclusion is right, he would have to go into the amount of the work done and the quality of the help that is needed to do the work, and deduction would then follow according to the facts. I am certain of this, that in Mr. Hanna's work in the capacity of Food Controller, and so far as I know in Mr. Thomson's work in his capacity as Chair-

man of the Food Board, they have done most excellently. They have done as good work as any other two men could have done. My right hon. friend approved of the appointment of Mr. Hanna because he knew Mr. Hanna, and because Mr. Hanna had been a political figure, and therefore he was well known and had responsibility. If a politician had ben put into this position, I can conceive of the criticism that it was for a political purpose and to serve some political or party end. Mr. Thomson did not come before the Government or the country in that way. My right hon. friend said that he had not heard of Mr. Thomson before. That is nothing against Mr. Thomson. I think my right hon. friend would agree with me in that. Mr. Thomson was in Mr. Hanna's office almost from its inception. He was chosen by Mr. Hanna; he gave his services; his services approved themselves absolutely to Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Thomson naturally, in the way of promotion, worked through that gradation; and that, added to his own well-known business abilities, signalized Mr. Thomson as the successor of Mr. Hanna, and in that way he came to be appointed.

That is all that I have to say on this subject. I am sorry that I have not such an intimate knowledge of the details of the question as to enable me to go into the matter more in detail, but my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will have the report of the Food Controller and that probably will give him a good deal of information. When he receives the additional information called for by the resolution which he has submitted to the House he will have much more data with reference to the broader field of the Food Board.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) began his remarks by saying that the question offered to the House by the leader of the Opposition contained two phases: the one respecting the merging of the Food Control Office into the Food Board, and the other respecting transportation. As to the first phase he very frankly said that although a minister of the Crown, and supposed to be familiar with everything that goes on in the Cabinet Council, especially relative to questions which closely affect this country and the Allies during the present war, he knew nothing or little, and we are to hear from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) later upon that aspect of the question. In respect to transportation, the other phase, the minister did not enlighten the House.

[Sir George Foster.]

Nevertheless there were still three salient points about his remarks. The first dealt with the increase of prices which he put down to the usual doctrine of the operation of the law of supply and demand. The second that it was a mischievous doctrine to preach to this country that there was hoarding going on in Canada, when there was really little or no hoarding; and thirdly, the credit that ought to be given to the Government for the very long list of Orders in Council, as the minister put it, giving powers to the Food Controller to act. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce immediately to the statement which was made in this House last evening by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) dealing with exactly the same subject, when the latter was not altogether in accord with my right hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in stating that the increases in prices were due to the operation of the law of supply and demand. In fact the Minister of Labour did not know why the prices should be increased, but he said that the Government had taken action by taxing excessive profits. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he does not think that a more solid reason than that of the operation of the law of supply and demand is the one given by those who have studied political economy, especially during the present phases of our history, and who find that the great producing class, the farmers of Canada, are receiving absolutely no protection from the Government, whilst every other class of the community is being looked after. Let me draw the Government's attention at once to the fact that since the inception of the war they have been urging the farmers of Canada to produce more and more, and still more. But whilst they have been so preaching they do not seem to have been concerned with any action to aid the farmers in greater production. Their sole concern has been to aid other classes of the community in making excessive profits in what they have to offer to the public. To be just in my criticism, however, I should give the Government credit for the action which they took in removing the duty on tractors. The farmers —and I speak now on behalf of a great many of them—are truly grateful to the Government for having removed that duty. They feel that the Government have realized that this is truly a war measure, and the only effective war measure dealing with food production which they have undertaken since they assumed office. The removal of the duty on tractors must immediately

show to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that there were other influences regulating the price of commodities as that removal tends to help the farmers towards cheaper production. The only surprise our farmers seem to have, Sir, is that whilst the Government removed the duty on tractors, thereby reducing the price upon certain tractors to the extent of from $250 to $400, they did not go a step further, and abolish the duty upon harrows, seeders, mowers, rakes, binders and threshing machines. There is in this country a certain class of farmers who are not great users of tractors; but I think every kind of agriculturist in Canada operates a harrow, a seeder, and a plough.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but it seems to me that he is getting a long way from the resolution before the House. I cannot see that there is any connection between this resolution and the tariff.

Mr. DEVLIN: Before you give a ruling upon the point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this to my right hon. friend: He spoke of the hoarding by the farmers; of matters affecting transportation; of the law of supply and demand. Following my right hon. friend upon those lines, I thought it would be in order to point out, as relating to the influence of supply and demand the enhanced cost of farm production as one of the possible reasons for the increased price of commodities. Does my right hon. friend persist in my not going on?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, I simply called my hon. friend's attention to it, that is all. I thought that he would come back to the subject himself, but that he might come back a little more quickly if I brought the matter to his attention.

Mr. DEVLIN: Perhaps my right hon. friend thought that by interrupting at this point he might cause me to forget the farmers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no; a Devlin never forgets.

Mr. DEVLIN: If there was a reason for removing the duty upon tractors as a means of reducing the cost of commodities, there were three reasons for removing the duties on ploughs and harrows also. Of course, that is a matter which my right hon. friend and the Government will deal with. But I desire to emphasize the fact that the increased cost of production increases the cost of commodities coming from the farmers. A slight concession has been made to the farmers—a concession to which my right hon. friend has taken exception. It was natural, Mr. Speaker, that my right hon. friend—the great protectionist, who would build the tariff wall higher and higher—should be startled to find that one stone or one brick had fallen out of the tariff wall. I submit that he should go a step farther as a war measure—for I believe that this removal of duties is only for a certain time; it is a tentative war measure. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Crerar) must, of course, have certain tendencies along the line of lower tariff, and I suggest that he keep prodding the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) with a view to getting him to remove the duties on farm implements and other things which the farmer requires. He knows, does he not, that if you keep down the cost to the farmer of the tools of production the farmer will be able to charge lower prices for the commodities which he has to offer?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us that we would very shortly have, if we have not now, the report of Mr. Hanna. I happen to have it in my hands, and as the minister was speaking my eye glanced at certain lines in that report which bear upon the very question under discussion. They are as follows:

> What that supreme consideration was is the winning of the war, and the requirements for that purpose are summed up in a statement made by me:
>
> "Far greater than the necessity of production for home supplies is that for the supply of Great Britain and our Allies. Great Britain is producing more of foodstuffs than for many years, but the supply is, of course, wholly inadequate for her population and her armies. Belgium is practically all in the hands of Germany; so also is a considerable portion of France, Serbia, Rumania, and Russian Poland and now a portion of Italy is in the hands of the enemy. The productive power of our Allies is lessened by the number of inhabitants in arms. The situation in France and Italy from a food point of view is serious and that is what makes the demand in Canada and the United States for conservation of resources and increased production so imperative. To feed the Allies is the paramount duty of North America. It is far greater than the necessity of production for home supply or the cost of living. Unless the war is won, nothing matters."

Yesterday we listened to gentlemen in this House speak about production in the back gardens in the cities. I think that every man who lives in the city has a bit of a fad about gardening. We all go out in the spring time, if it is only to get the air, taking with us a hoe, a rake and possibly a spade. We go out around our grounds; we rake, and we use the hoe and the spade.

We plant seeds, and sometimes plant others on top of them, forgetting that the first row had been planted. We forget the distances between the rows; we do all kinds of things. Mr. Speaker, I should like you to see the crops that annually grow in the garden that I attempt to cultivate in the city. I think that that is the experience of most city people. If we are to depend entirely upon the production from the back yards or gardens in the cities to help win the war, then God help Great Britain and her Allies. But, Sir, the question is serious; it is of greatest moment; it is the vital question of the day.

I should like to state to the House and to the country what the Government is urging us to do. On Saturday February 9, 1918, the Government publication known as the Canada Food Bulletin published news that a statement had been made by Baron Rhondda in his address to the farmers of England that unless the extreme limit of production is reached, the countries of Europe faced "that starvation which is followed by disease and death." The article goes on to say:

> A statement of this kind made by a man of Baron Rhondda's position and reputation surely should bring home the necessities of the case. Added to this, the people of Canada must realize the seriousness of the situation when the Ministry of Food in France announced that, on the 23rd day of December, after a complete survey of the country had been taken, there remained only enough wheat and flour in the land of France to sustain her civilian population for three days.

The people of Canada, and the people of Europe who are fighting with us, will not be satisfied with the statement coming from the Government of Canada that we would get more food over to them if it were not for the importance of doing what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, namely, taking considerable time appointing captains of teams, taking considerable time increasing staffs in the Government, taking considerable time passing Orders in Council giving powers here, there and everywhere, and preaching doctrines that do not interest the people of this country or the Allies in general. What is demanded at this moment by the people of this country who have faith in the Union Government, who are awaiting action by the Union Government, is not a lot of Orders in Council, not doctrines to be preached, not officers to be appointed; they want action and they want the action performed at once. Imagine the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce being cabled abroad: "We cannot supply more, because the question of transportation is to be considered." What has been the action of the Government in taking over the railways in Canada if not as a war measure, to prevent all difficulties in the way of transportation? What England is waiting for at the present moment is action, and we have at the present moment, I am sorry to say, if we judge by the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, the most inactive Government that we have had in this country since Confederation was formed. The provinces of this Dominion are doing a great deal. We find a campaign of education going on in the province of Ontario. We are handed pamphlets with headlines such as this:

> Hunger, famine, disease and death. The food wanted by mankind does not exist. The word "shortage" is not strong enough. The whole world is up against a nasty thing familiar to the people of India, called "famine."

My right hon. friend answers the appeal by saying: We are appointing captains of teams; we are organizing; we are preparing a staff now that is going to cost this country over $200,000 in civil government alone. What will the people of Canada say to that? When we were yesterday considering the estimates for civil government in this country, we found that a whole department would cost this country about $118,000, in some cases less than $100,000, but we find to-day one branch of one department is going to cost the country over $200,000. Is this action on the part of the Government? Is this what my hon. friends opposite were elected for? Is this what the Union Government was formed for? Is this what hon. gentlemen, running as Union candidates, represented to their constituents they were coming to Parliament to support? We on this side of the House were put down as disloyal citizens of this country. I want to say in this House to-day, and I want my words to go out into the country, that if there is real patriotic sentiment wishing action to be taken in the way of winning the war, it is to be found upon this side, through the words and efforts of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the Opposition, and of the small band of followers who sit around him. He has stated that in all war measures he and we would give the Government our support. But what are we here in Parliament for? What have we seen the Union Government doing? Considering whether the clock should be put one hour ahead or one hour back, considering communications which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has had with the moon and the sun. And now

because we venture upon a subject which is of paramount importance as a war measure, the Minister of Trade and Commerce says: Tread slowly for fear you may not be perfectly in order. He tells us that transportation is the cause of our not being able to get our supplies over to the other side. I am afraid that there is not such cohesion amongst the members seated upon the treasury benches as those sitting upon this side of the House as the people in the country who support them would hope to see.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) will speak on this subject. He met a delegation in the city of Ottawa a short time ago. He listened to statements that were made, and he did not hold out to the farmers of Canada, who came to consult with him upon the question of greater production, the difficulties of transportation. His one idea, the idea that was paramount in his mind was: Labour in this country required for the farms. He said that we must get labour; we absolutely require labour, and without labour we cannot produce more.

Mr. CRERAR: I think, if the hon. member will permit me to say so, he has been misinformed.

Mr. DEVLIN: I accept, of course, according to the rule of debate, my hon. friend's statement, but before I get through with my remarks I hope to be able to point out to him the exact words as we find them in the Canadian Food Bulletin. The Canadian Food Bulletin must be wrong, or my hon. friend is wrong, or we are all wrong. This is the Canadian Food Bulletin issued by the Dominion Government. I understand it is now the official organ of the Minister of Agriculture. Am I right?

Mr. CRERAR: That is not correct.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is this department not under my hon. friend now?

Mr. CRERAR: The publication to which my hon. friend refers is issued by the Canada Food Board. It was issued by the Food Controller prior to the formation of the Canada Food Board, and it is for the purpose of keeping the public informed as to the work being done by the Board. It is not the official organ or publication of the Minister of Agriculture, nor of the Government.

Mr. DEVLIN: I must again accept the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. I am altogether at sea if I am to believe the Government publications and disbelieve the Minister of Agriculture, or believe the Minister of Agriculture and disbelieve the Government publications. I have in my hand an extract from the Canada Gazette, dated February 15, 1918, which informs us that:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture, and under and by virtue of the powers in that behalf conferred on the Governor in Council by the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered:—
>
> That a Board be created to be called the Canada Food Board; that the said Board consist of a Director of Food Conservation, a Director of Food Production, and a Director of Agricultural Labour;
>
> That the Board shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall report to the Governor General in Council through the Minister of Agriculture.

The Food Board, therefore, is a branch under the direct jurisdiction of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. Am I wrong? If I am right, the Minister of Agriculture must of necessity be wrong. I do not wish to make any misstatements in the House, and I know my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture does not either. I wish to put him right again, if I may, through the publication of which I spoke a moment ago, this very Canadian Food Bulletin, which is published by the Food Board, which is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture. On page 16 of the issue of January 26th, 1918, I find the following:

> The problem was discussed at a meeting of the Provincial Ministers of Agriculture, Deputy Ministers and other representatives in Ottawa on January 16th and 17th, under the Chairmanship of Hon. T. A. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture in the Dominion Cabinet. A number of suggestions were made by the various representatives of the Provincial Governments attending, to be considered and discussed.
>
> Mr. Crerar referred to the fact that the Allies looked to Canada in 1918, for an increase of 250,000,000 bushels of wheat over the amount supplied in 1917. United States winter wheat, he pointed out, had amounted in 1917 to only 420,000,000 bushels as compared to an average for six previous years of 600,000,000 bushels. The prospect of the Spring wheat crop of 1918 was not bright. Labour was the essential factor and the chief problem.

Therefore, I am right, if this report is correct; but if the report is incorrect, I am wrong. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has another publication, the eternal verity of which he will not deny; it is known as the Agricultural Gazette of Canada, a Government publication sanctioned by the Minister of Agriculture. In the issue of January, 1918, a reason is given for the lack of supplies, especially of wheat going to the United States; and I find that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was again astray in his explanation of why we

were not able to feed the Allies as we had hoped. At page 111, in a very able article by Mr. T. K. Doherty, LL.B., upon "Agricultural Statistics, the wheat situation, present and prospective," I find this statement:

> The estimates for the coming year are based upon only such quantities as shipping facilities will probably allow.

Upon only such quantities as shipping facilities will allow; mark that. Mr. Doherty estimates the prospective export from the United States for 1917-1918 at 140,000,000 bushels, from Canada 185,000,000 bushels, from Argentina 100,000,000 bushels, Australia 85,000,000 and from India 65,000,000 bushels, and then goes on to say:

> Owing to shortage of shipping and comparative distances, it may not be safe to count on Australia and India doing much better than the past year.

The minister also made that statement. The article continues:

> During August, September, October and November, with an exceptionally large shipment in the latter month, Canada shipped nearly 71 million bushels compared with 71 millions shipped last year. For the first three months, however, the United States are over 30 milions short of the shipments in the same months last year. Since our last report on the situation the United States official estimate of production has been reduced by nearly 10 millions. It will therefore be all the more difficult to realize the export of 140 millions credited to the United States.

I think that sums up pretty well the situation respecting the possible supply and transportation of wheat and other commodities to the Motherland.

Before I resume my seat, I am going to suggest to the Government a second means by which food production may be had at a cheaper rate. My first suggestion was for some protection for the agricultural classes of Canada by reducing the tariff. My second suggestion would be to lessen the debt upon the people of Canada, and especially upon the farmers who contribute two-thirds of the basic wealth of this country, by curtailing the extravagance of the Government. The expenditure caused by this unduly increasing of staffs without very good reason is difficult for the people to bear. The Government ought to take a leaf out of the book of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in the determination he has shown he possesses in lessening the expenditure of his department as much as possible. There are other ministers, unfortunately, who are not so careful of the people's money. I would remind the Government—a new Government—that they must not act as the beggar on horseback who drove to the devil. The people of Canada are at the present moment overburdened with taxation.

I do not want to suggest that we have not in this country great wealth. I will admit that there is a great deal

4 p.m.

of money in Canada; there are classes of extremely wealthy people. But although we can call Canada a wealthy country, the people must not be overburdened by taxation. I will take for comparison the item of civil government, which is perhaps the smallest item of the Government's expenditure. When my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) left office, civil government cost $4,198,000. That expenditure went on increasing every year, until we find this year there is an increase of one million some hundred thousand over last year. My hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has given a very sound reason for this, namely the appointment of captains of teams and so forth. Nevertheless, important as the captains of teams may be to the country, we must see to it that their operations do not cover too extensive a field, because each increase in civil government of necessity means a great increase in public expenditure. My right hon. friend has stated this afternoon that the appointment of the new Food Board, will involve an expenditure of over $202,000 for salaries alone. That will mean, by the end of the year, a large amount for travelling and living expenses, stationery and every other class of expenditure that goes to form the general expenditure of the department. I want my hon. friends opposite, who apparently show a tendency not to let this Government run away with the money of this country, to keep tabs on the Government and see that they do not go too deeply into expenditure. Hon. gentlemen must remember that I make an exception in the case of money directly expended for the purpose of winning the war. I do not think there is a man on this side of the House who will not sanction such an expenditure. If we are able to keep down the expenditures and prevent extravagance, and help the farmers to produce more, then we shall be able to offer, not only to the Allies but to the people of this country, cheaper commodities. I am very glad my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) brought up this question this afternoon, as it is one of the most vital problems in war time, and, as a great many authorities put it, the most vital question as affecting this country.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will state quite frankly that I rise with a little diffidence to address the House for the first time. It is somewhat of an ordeal for a new member; it is particularly an ordeal for a man who has had no political experience, and who has launched his bark upon the stormy sea of politics under rather exceptional and unique circumstances.

I am not going to attempt to follow my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin), who has just spoken, in all the rambling remarks that he has addressed to this assembly. As Minister of Agriculture, as a member of this Government, I wish to assure this House that I shall at all times welcome criticism of my department. I would have welcomed the address of my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat a great deal more if he had offered some constructive criticism in his remarks. He has failed, however, to do so. His address, if I may say so—and I desire to say it courteously—was rather one of fault-finding than one where any criticism was offered that would be of assistance.

Now, in surveying this whole matter of food conservation and food control, it is quite obvious that we are faced with serious difficulties. It is true my hon. friend would get over difficulties by cutting out all expenditure in connection with this matter, and the logical outcome of his remarks would be to abolish the Food Control administration entirely. In organizing the Department of Food Control, the Government of the day were faced with serious difficulties. Those difficulties were not incidental to Canada alone. They faced the Food Control administration in Great Britain and also the same administration in the United States. And they have faced the Food Control administration in Canada. It is a new experience for a people such as we are to be regulated in these little every-day matters of life in which we have claimed the right to exercise the greatest freedom; and, consequently, anything that aims at restriction or control is new; the people have to become adjusted to it; they have to get their ideas adapted to it. As a result, our difficulties in Canada were no less in that respect, Mr. Speaker, than they have been in the other countries to which I have alluded.

Now, my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) and the Right Hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) offered considerable criticism of the cost of the food administration. I am told, and I believe the fact can be verified, that the United States Congress has appropriated over five millions of dollars to bear the expense of the food administration in that country for one year. When my right hon. friend criticises the expenditure of a couple of hundreds of thousands of dollars in Canada, I think he is rather wide of the mark unless his criticism can be directed to the point that the money is not properly expended.

Mr. BUREAU: That amount is for salaries alone.

Mr. CRERAR. My hon. friend refers to salaries alone. How does he expect to run a food administration department without payment of salaries? I was in the office of the Food Board the other evening, and on the desk of one clerk there were copies of forty telegrams that had been sent out issuing special licenses for the export of food from Canada in that one day alone. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite: Is it possible to carry on that work without expenditure? It cannot be done. If criticism can be directed against the character of the expenditure, if the money is wasted, if there are no results coming from it, then criticism is justified. But to say that we must not spend money for food administration simply means that we throw the whole thing by the board and let it go.

I desire to deal more particularly with the administration of the Board for the past few weeks. The hon. member for Wright made a statement which is quite correct, that only for a few weeks has the administration, or rather the direction, of the Food Board been under the Minister of Agriculture. Consequently, I am not very familiar with the administration, prior to that time. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has dealt with that, and I do not need to allude to it. Coming however to the present case, what is the fundamental principle that underlies the operation of the Food Department's administration? It is not the exercise of compulsion in respect to the people as to what they shall or shall not eat. The aim is to secure the desired result by inviting and securing the co-operation of the people in the policy that is desired. Criticism has been directed against the Food Administration inasmuch as it has failed to regulate prices. Sir, the regulation of prices, the fixing of arbitrary prices that interfere with the ordinary working of those laws that are as old as history itself, is sometimes a very dangerous proceeding. After the food administration was formed in the United States, if my

memory serves me right, I think within two months after its formation, steps were taken to control the milk supply of the City of New York. In their zeal and anxiety to meet the public demand and the public need, a price was arbitrarily fixed for milk. What was the result? In less than three months that set price had to be removed. And tens of thousands of dairy cows had to be slaughtered, simply because the producers of milk could not operate under the price that had been fixed. In that case the fixing of a price tended directly to defeat the very object that was desired. Consequently, the fixing of prices of any commodity must be very carefully investigated, and closely analysed, in order to see that the delicate balance is not upset, and that we do not land in a worse position than that we seek to escape from.

Having overlooked the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion might come up this afternoon, I have not at my hand some information that I should have had if I had known it was coming up. But I can say this, that the fundamental principle underlying the food administration is to exercise control by way of license over the various lines of business. We have brought the bakers of Canada, the millers, the fish dealers, and several other lines my memory does not recall, under license. To-day the wholesale grocers of Canada are being brought under license, and the retail grocers will be brought under license as well. Now, coming from western Canada, I speak with some knowledge of the benefits that come from the licensing system. That has been one of the great protections in our grain industry. In western Canada especially, years ago, I believe, when the Government of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in power, the system was introduced. To-day no dealer in grain in western Canada can do business under the law of the land unless he first secures a license. That license sets out certain conditions on which he must do business, and not only that, the forfeiture of that license, or its withdrawal, deprives him of the right to do business. In that way a salutary influence can be exercised over the dealer. It is practically the same principle that we are endeavouring to work out in respect to the food administration in Canada; and I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when it gets in full operation it will have the same beneficial results. To-day we are bringing under license, speaking from memory, over 40,000 retail grocers. License fees are being charged, and I want to tell my hon. friend from Wright, who is disturbed as to where this expenditure is leading us, that we expect in the food administration to receive in license fees alone this year over $250,000, and in that way the expense that is incidental to the control will be met from the business itself. That is perfectly proper. Every grain dealer in western Canada today, depending upon the volume of the business he does, has to pay a license fee in order to secure his privilege to do business.

But I am going to be very frank with the House and say that you cannot organize an immense organization of this kind without a great deal of difficulty. You have got to get the men. And I want here to bear testimony to the zeal and earnestness of the men who are to-day working in the food administration. It is true they are getting salaries that may look large. These men, Mr. Speaker, are getting no higher salaries —in some cases not nearly as high—than they could get if they went out into the commercial world and sold their services in the usual way. I think they are rather to be commended for their willingness to serve in this way. There are men working in the food administration who have worked there for months without any remuneration at all excepting their living expenses. I think men are to be commended for that.

The question, however, of production is one of the vital questions that face us in Canada at the present time. There is no doubt that the food situation in the world to-day is serious, very serious, and we in Canada, the people in North America, must bend our energies and use every ounce of strength we possess to raise to the very highest maximum possible our production of foodstuffs in the present year. The inability of Europe to feed herself arises from two causes. First, from the withdrawal of millions of men in Italy, France and Great Britain from the ordinary avocations of agriculture to the pursuits of war, and second in certain cases, from the absence of the fertilizer that is essential to maintaining the productivity of the soil. It is true that the withdrawal of men from agricultural labour in the countries in question has been met to a certain extent by the work of the women available there. To-day I am told that in Great Britain over six hundred thousand women are engaged in manual labour of some kind or another in agriculture. In France hundreds of thousands of women are working in the fields who knew nothing of this work before the war broke out. I sometimes feel, Mr. Speaker, that we in Canada have not quite realized yet in many respects that we

are at war; that is, the reality of it has not come home as closely to us as it has to the people who have lived under the very shadow of it for years. But we must bend our efforts and our energies, we must increase our efforts in Canada to meet this situation. The need for men we know is great. The need for food is great also, and we must set about meeting these needs with as great energy, as great care, and as much ability as we possess, in order to organize our country in these respects so as to stand up under the mighty burden that we have to carry. I am hopeful, nay, I am certain, that good results will come from the effort that is being made at the present time to stimulate production in this country.

Criticism has been directed against the creation of the Food Board, inasmuch as it provides for a Director of Production and a Director of Agricultural Labour Now one of the difficulties we are meeting is that of securing labour. The purpose in creating a Director of Agricultural Labour, was to have a man in charge of that work who would make it a special study, and already good results are coming from it. In consequence of that effort, and the work of the Food Administration, there are being enrolled in Canada over 25,000 boys from the age of fifteen to nineteen, to work on the farms, boys from the towns and cities who otherwise, unless this organization had taken place, would not have been available for farm work. I have spoken to several farmers in Ontario who had this class of help last year, and they stated that it was the most effective help they have had. Again, an effort will be made to secure by voluntary enlistment, men from the towns and cities.

Mr. J. READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Why do you not conscript them?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend asks, "Why do we not conscript them?" You can conscript men and apply discipline to them when you have them in the mass; but to conscript an individual and send him out to farm work is rather a doubtful experiment.

Commencing with the provinces by the sea, Nova Scotia has set itself a fine objective this year. It is going to produce enough wheat and coarse grain to supply its demands, whereas every other year it has imported. The province of New Brunswick is in the same position. In the province of Quebec, where ordinarily they produce about a million bushels of wheat and consume about twelve million bushels, they are aiming this year—and the provincial authorities tell me they expect to realize that aim—to produce enough wheat to feed themselves, which will release ten or eleven million bushels of wheat to go overseas. Ontario will also increase its wheat production. In the western provinces we will have, I venture to say, the largest acreage that we have ever had in respect to grain production, and if we are only favoured with a good season we will probably have the largest crop of wheat that the West has ever had. But I want to impress this fact upon our people: In order to get these results in the different provinces, in order to supply the help that is necessary to make up the deficiency in labour, we must have recourse to organization, and you cannot do that unless you get men and if you get the men you have got to pay them.

I want to make one other observation before I close, and it is this The people of Canada have not been as economical as they should have been in the past; I think we have been rather an extravagant people. To-day we are driving home to the people of the Dominion, through the educational work carried on under the auspices of the Food Board, the great need of thrift and of saving. I hope, in fact I am sure, the effort will bear fruit in the future. There is no disguising the fact that we have to face very heavy burdens after this war is over. We can only successfully meet those burdens by encouraging in every way possible the principles of thrift among our people. We have got to produce, but above everything we must save; and to-day the educational work that is being carried on by the bulletins that my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) alluded to, and carried on through the medium of addresses, through moving picture shows and pictures thrown on the screen, and meetings held throughout the country, and utilizing every agency that can be utilized, is driving home to our whole people this principle of thrift, this need of saving, and they are realizing to-day as they have never realized in the past what can be done by a little effort in the way of saving, the conserving of food supplies, and the conserving of everything. I venture the statement that the money that is expended upon the Food Administration will be justified in the years to come by the results that will flow from the efforts being made to-day; I am as confident of that as I am that I am standing here now.

The Department of Agriculture is not perrect, neither is the food administration. I, for one, will welcome criticism at any time, that is helpful, constructive criticism. I desire as much of it as I can get; but,

if my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) will permit me to say so, not very much good will come from the sort of criticism in which he indulged this afternoon. The task ahead of Canada is a great one. We have the task of providing foodstuffs, of concentrating Canada's effort and energies in the prosecution of the war. No one can read the news that comes from the front these days without some feeling of concern as to what the outcome will be. I am inclined to agree with the leader of the Opposition that the war may be greatly prolonged before the principles for which we are fighting, and the liberty of the countries whose freedom is threatened, are made safe and secure. We can meet the task before us, but we must organize and throw every effort whole-heartedly into it. If we do that I have no doubt whatever as to the result nor as to the great part that Canada will have played in this struggle.

Mr. JAMES A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, with very great pleasure and interest we have all listened this afternoon to the maiden speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar). It did occur to me, and it may have occurred to other members of the House, that in his somewhat rambling address the minister felt that he was obliged to offer an apology for a foundling which he and some of his friends had adopted. We in Canada are so closely associated with the United States that gentlemen on both sides of the House are now united in the belief that any legislation enacted in the United States necessarily affects Canada. We had evidence of that yesterday afternoon in the discussion which took place on the Daylight Saving Bill, the whole argument in support of which, as presented by the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster) who introduced it, being that it had become necessary in Canada because a similar measure had been adopted in the United States. The whole argument offered this afternoon in favour of the organization of a food controllership in Canada was that the United States had appointed a food controller. We are reminded that when the United States in May last decided that they should have a food controller, and appropriated for the purposes of that official's office $5,000,000 for one year, immediately there was started throughout Canada a newspaper campaign in favour of the appointment of a food controller in Canada. Friends of the inner circle could see in the appointment of a food controller in the United States another opportunity to secure place and profit for their friends if a similar office was established in this country. The case as presented this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition proves that in that respect the gentlemen who urged upon the Government the organization of a food controller's office were not mistaken—and the figures given have not been denied by the Minister of Trade and Commerce or by the Minister of Agriculture. In the six months during which we have had the luxury of a food controller, the cost of the administration of that official's office has run up to $200,000, exclusive of travelling and office expenses, rents, stationery, telephones, etc. If the cost was $200,000 in six months, in one year the cost would be $400,000; so we find that already the expenditure in Canada is per capita the same as it is in the United States, and that in these figures travelling expenses and the cost of heat, stationery, etc., are not included.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not wish to interrupt, but I desire to correct my hon. friend on one point. The total expenditure to the end of February for salaries in the Food Controller's office from the time of its inception was $49,758.

Mr. ROBB: I accept the statement of the minister, but he must not forget that the figures I gave are in the statement presented by Mr. Hanna in the report which I hold in my hand.

Mr. CRERAR: Estimated.

Mr. ROBB: The Order in Council goes to show that since Mr. Hanna left the office the expense has been very largely increased. I am credibly informed that the Food Control office in Canada, organized in the month of June, has already moved three times in order to provide increased accommodation for its ever-growing staff. First they were established on Bank street, in a building three or four stories—I remember visiting it. Then they moved to this building, and now they are on Rideau street—ever moving to secure a larger building. The newspapers tell us that the Government purpose during this session to introduce legislation to provide for a much larger building in Ottawa in order to accommodate their ever-increasing staff of civil servants.

I now come to a point on which I agree with the Minister of Agriculture: that price-fixing leaves much to be desired in the way of increased production. Food control is a new feature of warfare; this is the first time in history, according to Mr.

Hanna's statement, that food control has played any part in war. In Germany, where the food control movement started, price-fixing was a mistake. Price-fixing in France was a mistake, for France has removed the maximum prices upon potatoes, milk, butter and cheese. Price-fixing in England was a mistake. We have the statement, published in the London Times in the month of January, that because of the limitation fixed upon the price of bacon in England the supply of bacon gradually dropped away; the people of Great Britain found themselves short of that commodity because it was being sold to another country where more money was being paid for it. The fixing of the price of butter in England was a mistake. The people there, according to this letter in the London Times, fixed a price for butter which was lower than the cost of production, and the result was that the people of Denmark and Holland found a better market for their butter, and the commodity itself went to enemy countries. That has been the experience in the matter of price fixing in the old land, and same applies to Canada. Price-fixing in this country has not encouraged our people to greater production, and after all it is greater production that we require.

In the statement which Mr. Hanna filed upon leaving office, he practical'y admits, after an experience of six months, that price-fixing in this country has been a mistake; that it has not brought the results expected of it, and that wherever profit ceases, production ceases. As the leader of the Opposition pointed out this afternoon, in the organization of this Food Control Bureau, involving an additional expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, no attempt was made to provide greater production. Every step taken by the Food Control Bureau resulted in a restriction of production. I think the Minister of Agriculture agreed with that in his address this afternoon. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was very frank; he told us that the food controller had not been appointed to encourage production. Well, if that is true; if the Food Control Bureau was not appointed to encourage production, surely they should stand out of the way and not hinder increased production. I should like to prove to the Minister of Agriculture—who, I believe, is sincerely desirous of increasing production—that the action of the Food Control Bureau has very materially hindered additional production, at least in eastern Canada. Last fall, at a time when corn could be moved freely, the food control offices of Canada and the United States placed certain restrictions on the importation of corn into this country. It is no secret that a deputation from the Montreal board of trade, representing very large interests, came to the Government and asked for a blanket license to import certain quantities of corn before the close of navigation, and that this request was flatly refused by the Food Control Bureau. The deputation discovered, while visiting here, however, that a certain distillery in eastern Canada had a blanket license to import 100,000 bushels of corn, and the Government had a very bad half hour with those gentlemen, who were supporters of the Administration. Those were the conditions that prevented the starch men and the dairy men of eastern Canada from getting in their supply of corn at a time when conditions were favourable to their getting it in. Time passed. We were told that the United States had the largest corn crop in its history. We are now told that corn is rotting in the fields of the United States because people have not been able to move it, and why? Because the Food Control Bureau and the Railroad Control Bureau in the United States, working with the Food Control Bureau in Canada, have so manipulated and interfered with the doing of business by men who are accustomed to doing business that they have been unable to move this corn. What is the result? The result is that in eastern Canada dairymen have been keeping less stock and are not providing for the enlargement of their herds, as the minister would wish them to do.

But the Food Control Bureau has been interfering not only with international trade, but with interprovincial trade. A member of the minister's Food Control Bureau has absolutely prohibited flour mills of western Canada from shipping bran and shorts to eastern Canada. Does the Minister of Agriculture deny that statement? I wish to repeat it. A representative of the Food Control Bureau in western Canada has ordered the flour mills there not to ship straight carloads of bran or shorts or mixed carloads of bran and shorts to eastern Canada. What is the result of that? In any farm paper published in Quebec or the Maritime Provinces the minister will find announcements of dispersion sales, farmers being disposed to sell their herds because they cannot get bran and shorts to feed them. The result will be a decreased production of butter and cheese in eastern Canada. I believe the Minister of

Agriculture is desirous of remedying these conditions. He has asked this afternoon for some constructive criticism. I would suggest to him that he recall the order of this gentleman who interfered with interprovincial trade and allow trade to be done as it was done in the past, by men who know how business should be handled.

I have no desire to prolong my remarks because I know there are others who wish to speak on this subject; but the minister in his defence of, or rather apology, for the Food Control Bureau told us that the Food Control Bureau were now arranging to license all the bakeshops, all the retail grocery stores and all the wholesale grocery stores throughout Canada, and that we were to get a revenue of not less than a quarter of a million dollars. I think the minister was very modest in his estimate of the revenue we shall receive if that scheme is carried out, but who is going to pay the license? It will be passed back to the consumer, and so the action of this Food Control Bureau will be helping, not to reduce the cost of living in this country, but to increase it. Here is another opportunity for the minister to step in and correct a policy that, I am sure, is not meeting with the favour of the consuming public of Canada.

With these few observations I leave this subject, in the hope that we shall have a statement from some member of the Government that the Food Control Bureau is at least to be taken in hand, so that not only the expense of that bureau will be reduced, but its attempts to interfere with business throughout the country shall not tend to increase the cost of living to our people.

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) made reference to the fact that the profits on packing products would be kept down to the amount of two per cent on the turnover. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) suggested that he would like constructive criticism, but he could not see any in the remarks made by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). He said that it is not the intention nor the wish of the Government to interfere with or to set prices. As the representative of a farming constituency, I would like to point out to the minister that the farmer finds that the packer is allowed to make a profit not to exceed two per cent, which, as any hon. member knows, is a greater percentage than he made during the last three years. If the minister will refer to the profits made by the packers he will find that they do not amount to two per cent of the turnover. A packer will turn over his product, perhaps, once a month, or oftener, and if you multiply his profit by twelve it amounts to much more than two per cent. The greatest packer of Chicago, Mr. Ogden Armour, states that their profits never exceed one per cent of the turnover. If this is not correct the minister will be able to give the information to the House and to the country, but it is one of the things in which the country people are interested when the Government is asking them to produce more.

I would like, at this point, to make a distinction between the agriculturist and the farmer. My constituency is composed entirely of farmers. I once asked one of my constituents what was the difference between an agriculturist and a farmer. He said: The farmer works with his hands, and the agriculturist works with his mouth. We heard a good deal of that yesterday in this House in connection with production. A great deal of advice is being handed out in regard to greater production. If you are going to regulate the price of wheat, and you say you do not believe prices should be regulated—wheat is the only article I know of, the price of which has been regulated by the Food Board or by the Government—that naturally brings to the farmer's mind the idea that the price of his product in the raw state is being regulated, but that there is no regulation of the profits of the man who handles the manufactured article. The farmer has been told of great packing companies in this country who have made wonderful profits, and he is led to believe that that is allowed to go on after the commodity gets out of his hands. If this Food Board could do something to convince the farmer and the producer that he is being taken care of equally with the packer, that would be some help towards production.

We were glad to notice one of the few things of a constructive nature done by the Board. Their first action was to remove the duty from some farm implements. The Minister of Agriculture stated that the hon. member for Wright did not offer any constructive criticism. Will the minister advise this House that he thinks a reduction in the tariff on implements would be against the interest of production in this country? Does he not think that a cheaper implement to the farmer would be an aid to production? Would it not be an encouragement? It is my firm conviction that if we had free trade in implements with the United States it would be the means of get-

ting us a large number of immigrants from that country who would become producers on our western prairies. The fact that they have to pay so much more for implements in Canada than in the western States is more or less of a barrier to their coming to western Canada. At this time when we are looking for producers and increased production I was glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that he does not agree that the war is over. I think we have all insisted too much on the war being over to-morrow, and not making preparations for its continuing a year or two longer. I think we should bend every effort towards production and the winning of the war, let it end as soon as it will; it cannot end too soon for us. If we make our plans on the basis of its ending to-morrow, and it should continue a year or two longer, we are undoubtedly handicapped, whereas if we make our preparations on the basis of the war continuing some time, it will be a gain to us even if it should end to-morrow. As far as constructive criticism is concerned, if we would seriously consider the question of cheaper implements for the farmer and cheaper production, it would be very much more beneficial to him than his added hour of daylight. We have a Bill before us to enable us to bid our neighbours to the south the time of day on equal terms; I think we might go a little further and allow our farmers to procure their implements on equal terms with the farmers to the south of us.

Mr. L. T. PACAUD (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, the debate, through the speeches which have already been made, has robbed me of arguments which I intended to offer the House, and I shall therefore willingly curtail my remarks somewhat.

The question of the food supply which is raised by this motion involves considerations which are of the utmost importance both to our country and to our Allies. No other question, Sir, has stirred and aroused the people of Canada more fervently, more deeply or more unanimously. This intense feeling which has been growing and spreading steadily since the outbreak of war may easily be explained by an impartial survey of conditions as they have existed and still exist in Canada at this time. On the one hand we have the prohibitive prices, which deny to the masses the very necessaries of life, with the accompanying hardships and misery. On the other hand we have the revolting disclosures that have been made from time to time concerning the hoarding of food, the cold storage operations, the nefarious greed of the profiteers. These, Sir, are the outstanding facts which cannot be denied. Mr. O'Connor has exposed them to the public. We had the story of the bacon manipulations; we had the egg disclosures; and more recently, and through another source, we heard of hundreds and hundreds of pounds of chicken left to rot in cold storage at Winnipeg. These may serve as illustrations of what is going on in Canada on a very large scale. Sir, in the face of such disclosures, nothing effective was done or attempted to be done by the Government to remedy such an evil. Are we not tempted, Sir, to laud the patience of the Canadian people in the face of such provocation from the men who daily exploit them, from the Government who refuses to protect them?

What has the Government done? A Food Board was created and a Food Controller was put in control. The Order in Council creating this board gave the Controller clearly defined powers. He had the right "to govern the prices of any article of food and to supervise the storage, the distribution, the sale and the delivery of these articles." Why were not these powers exercised, exercised especially in the cases which have been brought to the attention of the public by the High Cost of Living Commissioner?

Instead of taking immediate steps to curtail this open exploitation of the public, the Government, through its commissioner, preferred to follow the easier course of preaching economy to the people. Under the circumstances which I have related, I say that these mere words, followed by no effective action, may have satisfied the cold storage magnates, but they certainly have not satisfied the people of this country.

We have in Canada an abundance of food, sufficient not only for our own needs, but the greater bulk of which is exported to allied countries. This brings me to another phase of this same question—the campaign of production which the Government has so fervently prosecuted of late. To this campaign all loyal Canadians will give their hearty support. We all recognize that upon the success of our devotion to food raising depends in a large measure the victory of our boys at the front. We know that the world faces to-day a food situation which is nothing short of appalling. We know that the supply is not sufficient to feed the world's armies, let alone the civilian population. But, Sir, this is not all. We have had occasion to hear the representatives of Britain making to us an appeal,—

an appeal which will surely be heard and responded to, and which has thrilled each one of us in a patriotic determination to strive every nerve to do what is requested of us. Lord Rhondda, the British food controller, for one, has made his plea quite clear. "We look," he says, "to the resources of Canada and the indomitable energy of Canadians for an answer that will shatter Germany's threat of starvation." He tells us, that it is vital for the United Kingdom and the Allies to obtain from Canada foodstuffs in far larger quantities than under peace conditions. His frankness even goes so far as to recall to us that an increased export of food supplies must be forthcoming, even though the achievement of this task entails diversion of effort from other enterprises. It is Canada's duty to prove her efficiency and her determination. This plea must not be left unanswered. May I be permitted to confess that these words of the British food controller are comforting to those of us who through motives which cannot be challenged, opposed a measure which we sincerely believed if put into operation would decidedly diminish if not defeat our effectiveness in this war, by laying aside the most formidable weapon which could have been used against the enemy. We faced a storm of abuse and slander, but these attacks did not deter us from what we believed was our plain duty. We have at least the consolation of knowing that our conception of duty was shared, in some measure at least, by the brightest minds of Britain. What we need to-day, is a larger acreage and higher yields for the years to come. We need to increase our productive capacity, the problem is with us, and it must be solved. Upon its solution, to my mind, depends the success of our allies and ourselves in this war. To achieve our purpose, it is obvious that we need farm labour. It is not less obvious that it is a national necessity that we should remove the duties on farming implements. The Government have started in their task by means of the registration of the man power of the Dominion. I believe that, though that is a good step in the right direction, it has come a little late; it should have been done at the very beginning of the war. Nevertheless, I sincerely hope, that in its results it may procure more information and attain better results for Canada and for the Empire than has been achieved by the now famous National Service cards of a year ago.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I am perhaps a little audacious in rising to take part in this debate, since I have just entered this Parliament, and am in nowise familiar with Parliamentary procedure; nevertheless, when the voters of Hull county, which I have the honour to represent, elected me by acclamation on the 19th of last November, I gave them my solemn promise that I would seize upon every opportunity offered to protest against the exorbitant cost of living and try to bring it down if it were possible to do so. It was reserved, Mr. Speaker, for the right hon. leader of the Opposition, to afford me this opportunity in bringing about this debate this afternoon; for him who, in contrast to the hon. gentlemen seated on the other side of the House, has always been the protector and the defender of the people against the trusts and the monopolists.

It is useless, I believe, for me to say that the present cost of living has reached a price so high that the consumer is forced to deprive himself even of necessaries of life. I could mention things, foods like flour, bacon, eggs, which have surely increased 50 and even 100 per cent. If, at least, Mr. Speaker, salaries had increased in proportion; but I see, by the reports of the Labour Gazette which I have here before me, that salaries have not been increased by more than 15 to 17½ per cent. There has been a general protest. I remember, in the city of Hull, where I reside, on the other side of Ottawa, hearing Mr. Watters, the president of the Labour Unions of Canada, denounce the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) and even denounce the Prime Minister of this country because the workingmen could not procure the necessaries of life with the low salaries they were paid.

In the face of these protests the Government thought they would calm public opinion by appointing what they called a Food Controller, and it was then that the Government told us of the appointment of Mr. Hanna. Everybody was satisfied, the people believed that the Government was sincere and that by their appointing a Food Controller we could at least earn enough to enable us to buy the necessaries of life. The irony of it, Mr. Speaker! The Controller was well and duly appointed; he was given spacious offices, and it is said that his suite was furnished with luxury and that he was given a staff, both very numerous and very expensive—if I believe the gentlemen who have preceded me—and still he was not controlling; the cost of living was soaring all the time.

A moment ago I heard my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, say that the appoint-

ment of the Controller did not aim at control. My Lord! we were well aware of it, he never did control! His duty consisted simply in seeing that no food was wasted. Could he have forgotten what my hon. friend from Mégantic (Mr. Pacaud) said a while ago? Haven't we learned, in the last few days, through the newspapers, that a large quantity of foodstuffs, hoarded in storage warehouses in order to boost prices, had been sent to the incinerator in the city of Winnipeg? Well! if the duty of the Food Controller was to prevent the waste of foodstuffs, why did he allow such an enormous quantity of food to find its way to the garbage heap? Is it because those implicated are the friends of the Government? I ask you that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BUREAU (Three Rivers): Sir Joseph Flavelle.

Mr. FONTAINE (translation): My hon. friend brings to mind the name of a certain Mr. Flavelle. I remember that it was precisely this name Mr. Watters who gave us, at Hull, the history of this fellow Flavelle; he even told us that he was at the head of the William Davies Company and that he had found a way to make millions of profit while the people were starving to death. It seems to me, then, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government asks the people to subscribe to War Loans; when they ask the people to give generously to the Patriotic Fund and to the Red Cross; while they continue to crush the people with taxes, it seems to me, I say, that the people have at least the right to be protected by their Government, and still the Government has not given them this protection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have properly understood the hon. minister when Mr. Hanna had disappeared from the scene as Food Controller, he was replaced by three Controllers. Will they control more than their predecessor did? I do not know, but I may say without fear of error, that in the city of Hull, which I have the honor to represent, and which is essentially a city of working-people, the price of food has not been reduced one single cent. I wonder why the Government does not fix a maximum price for certain articles of food as it has done for newsprint. Was it led to take this action through fear of the press, or to compensate the newspaper proprietors nearly every single one of whom supported the Union Government? So I think it is high time, and even imperative that something was done in this matter.

Perhaps my friends on the other side of the House will accuse me of disloyalty because I speak of this question "in War Time" as they say. I would say in reply to these gentlemen that we on this side represent the principles of Liberalism and that we have as much at heart as any one the ultimate victory of the Allies. Each and every one of us, Mr. Speaker, holds that Belgium must be restored, each and every one of us desires that Old France and the British flag will be the victors in this conflict! But more than that, what we want is that the people who bear and who will continue to bear the burden of this war, be protected by the Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I forgot that the House met at two o'clock to-day, and, therefore, I had not the pleasure of listening to the speech of my right hon. friend opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but I have followed the debate since I came into the chamber. I may say that I have been a member of this House for nine years, and if a humble member of the rank and file may compliment a minister, I should like to say very sincerely that I have not listened to a more able speech than that delivered by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar). He will in due time develop into a powerful speaker. The hon. minister is an old friend of mine. In fact, so persuasive was he, Sir, that at one time while he was talking I said to myself: Almost thou persuadest me to be a controller. That is rather a difficult task. I objected yesterday to any control being placed upon the time at which I got up or went to bed. There are other things about the life of the country that have been controlled the controlling of which did not meet with my absolute approval. In regard to this particular fact, there was advanced by the Minister of Agriculture a very strong plea of justification of, at any rate, some of the work of the Board. If they had done nothing more than organize the arrangement by which these twenty-five thousand boys are going to work on the farms this summer, then I think that their existence as a Board has received some justification. There is a further argument that was presented by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) the other day as to the amount of organization needed whereby large sums of money are to be diverted to the provinces, to be spent in the various provinces along rational methods, under the control of very able men, with a view to promoting pro-

5 p. m.

duction in western Canada. But I should like, as far as any words of mine can reach the Food Board through the Government or through the press, to say to them very sincerely: "For goodness sake, whatever you do, control your expense, and also control your controlling." I find myself in absolute agreement with an old friend, who now is honoured by being the chief whip on the other side of the House (Mr. Robb), as to the difficulties of the regulation of prices. It is an extremely difficult process, and I understand, as far as I have been told the facts of the question, that what my hon. friend opposite said about it is correct, that it is an attempt at work that has broken down in many, many cases in the other belligerent countries on the continent of Europe. It is against the fundamental laws of economies, and even in war time it is extremely difficult to go against law. We would create more havoc than we would do good. There is a more excellent way than controlling and the fixing of prices.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am very glad to have the endorsation of my right hon. friend. I did not have it in the election, but in his heart he was not very much opposed to me. I still share with him very fully a great distaste of anything in the nature of control and a very great love of anything in the nature of freedom.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My right hon. friend anticipated what I was going to say. The free way is the more excellent way, and it is freedom that we are all fighting for at the present moment. It is one of the mischievous results of this war that we have become, or at any rate we think we have become, autocrats ourselves to put down autocrats. I think that one could in some measure establish that position. Because, after all is said and done, if a man is coming to knock you on the head with a bludgeon, and you refuse to use the bludgeon in your own hand, you are going to come very badly out of that contest, and your strict adherence to the principles of pacificism would work out very badly for your cranium.

An hon. MEMBER: In Russia there is that situation just now.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Yes, even the principle of freedom can be carried too far. I do want to say in reference to the subject that my right hon. friend is raising, that it has met a very large body of opinion which is distressed, and distressed in the most practical way, by what is one of the greatest evils we have in Canada at the present moment, and that is the enormous cost of living to a large number of our people who live on very narrow incomes in our large centres of population. The cost of living is a very real evil in the large centres of population, and it is a real evil that grows up in spite of the Food Control Board. That, I understand, was the position which was brought out in the speech which I had the misfortune to miss hearing. In any case, that position is distressing and is exercising the minds of our people.

Now, it goes without saying that we shall not only help the war but we shall lower the cost of living if we increase production. I want to make two practical suggestions in the most serious spirit, and in a spirit most desirous of being helpful to the Government—I made a great many suggestions to the previous Government to which they did not pay any attention. I want to make a suggestion which I made in my Budget remarks last year, however, and which I repeated in a parenthesis in the remarks I made on conscription. I am going to make this suggestion with very considerable confidence, because I am perfectly sure that my strongest supporter will be the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I cannot understand why, having regard to the cost of living, the Government does not at once take the bold step of putting all articles of food on the free list. I cannot understand why they do not do it. I am perfectly serious in the matter; I said so in the Budget debate of last year, and I gave some reasons, reasons which I know will appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They must appeal to him. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that in the very first weeks of the war Germany—the first precedent that my hon. friend mentioned yesterday about daylight saving was derived from Germany—Germany, a strong protectionist country, swept the duties off almost all her foodstuffs. She knew all the difficulties that the war would bring about in connection with her food supply. She knew the trouble she was going to have to get food for her people. She knows it better to-day. And she swept the duties off foodstuffs in the very first days of the war. Her example was followed by almost every other country in Europe, whether belligerent or neutral. Britain did not need to do it, because she had the good sense to sweep the duties off foodstuffs, whether in war or peace, seventy years ago.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is up against his own precedent of yesterday. Is the precedent of Germany and these other countries only good for daylight saving? I submit to his judgment that it is equally good for free food. I say, in courteous language, that I hope he will stand up to his own thinking, and to his own precedents, and press this matter before the Budget. There would be no use my mentioning this matter on the Budget; of course, once the Government has brought its Budget down, it must stand by it. Therefore, I want to be in time, and I am very sincere in this matter, in offering these observations, and in calling for the support of my right hon. friend at least in this simple suggestion. It may be said that it would not have much affect on the price of food. Well, we have a right to the advantage of a trial.

And I regret another of my hon. friend's arguments yesterday, and the arguments of many others who supported the proposition, when they said: This change in the clock cannot do any harm anyhow; it is an experiment, and one supported by the precedent of these foreign countries. I submit that free food is in identically the same position; we have the precedent of these other countries for it, and if it does not do any good to the people of the towns, at any rate it will not do any harm, and you can take the duties off food just as you dealt with time in the matter of daylight saving. I think the parallel is an absolutely perfect one, and I am sure that my hon. friend (Sir George Foster), for whom I have the very greatest regard, and who I am glad to see in his old fighting form in this House, is getting his thinking cap on in regard to it.

I have another simple suggestion to offer to the House in regard to the question of production. Cheap food is good, plentiful food is good, and plentiful food means inevitably too cheap food. The method by which I suggest that we should help the increased production of food is the simple one of placing all agricultural implements upon the free list. That would be an act of justice to the farmer, because if you place all food on the free list you take every vestige of protection, in the technical sense, from the farmer, and he surely has a logical claim to turn round and say to Parliament and the Government: If you expect me to produce more foodstuffs of all kinds in open competition with all the producers of the world, without the help of any protection, then in the name of common justice, afford me the encouragement to give you this increased production by granting me free implements with which to do it. That is a just, an equitable, a logical arrangement, and I think it would be an admirable experiment. It would have the element of courage in it, too, though perhaps not very much courage, seeing that it is supported all along the line by those precedents which led my hon. friend (Sir George Foster) so heroically to stay with that subject of daylight saving. I am a farmer myself, with three sons in khaki and only one left at home, and working like a nigger myself in all the time I had left to work after the multitudinous talk of last summer and the equally multitudinous talk of the election. We have done considerable producing; but we are prepared to face the competition of the world, as far as I am concerned. My three sons in khaki are fighting for freedom in Europe, and I believe in it here. I am prepared to support my views here with the same British courage with which my sons are supporting their views and principles upon the firing line, and I think there are a great many farmers like that in western Canada. We do not fear free food in western Canada. We are such good Canadians, and we believe so much in our country, that we know we can produce the stuff that will baffle competition anywhere. Just as our boys on the firing line are at the top of the tree for courage—because that is one part of the British line; they cannot even bend, let alone break it, so the farmers in the West are prepared to carry this principle of free food into the legislation of the country. but they follow that up by saying: Give us free implements wherewith to produce. I once heard a lecturer, Sir, when I was younger than I am now, on the inhabitability of the planets round us, and the lecturer went far to prove that really there were inhabitants on the planet Mars. In later years I have thought often of that lecturer, and if I had any good reason for it I would like to go to Mars, should there be people there, and meet its inhabitants. I would like to meet the people of Mars to see if there is anybody so foolish on that planet as to suppose that a good method of increasing your production is to increase the cost of the implements by which you produce. It seems so ridiculous on the face of it. If a man came from Mars who had not dealt with problems of this kind, who had an open mind and was free from prejudice on the matter, I would not be afraid, even if he passed through Toronto on his way, to convince him in a few minutes that one

of the easiest ways to increase production of food would be to make food free and to free from duty the implements with which to do your producing.

I submit to the House and to the Government that, so far as the farmers of this country are concerned, especially the farmers of western Canada—and I have good hopes that there is going to be union of thought between the farmers of western Canada and the farmers of Ontario on more things than the war—we should be given this opportunity of increasing production. And I was going to say, to finish the sentence as I began it, that the appeals to these farmers will fall upon deaf ears from a Government which persists in refusing to supplement its demand that the farmers should increase their production by giving them greater facilities, by making cheaper those implements with which they produce. What is the sense of stopping at tractors? There is no logic or sense in stopping there. Go the limit on this question; let us have free implements all round. Then we will produce and produce hard enough and fast enough. I must not leave this point, without clinching it and completing it as far as I know how, by referring once more to the fondness which exists in the Cabinet, which rules this country at the present moment, for precedent, and even for precedent as they find it in the United States. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) has justified the Control Board and the expenditure of that Board, by the existence of a similar board and the expenditures made by that board in the United States. Daylight saving in Canada was justified by the Minister of Trade and Commerce yesterday —and he did not justify it in any other way that I can see—by referring to the precedent of the United States and of the other countries of Europe. The logic is unbreakable. They have got free implements in the United States. For years and years the protectionists of this country used to say: it would be all very well to give you these free implements, but look at the tariff that is against us in that country. That argument has now gone, by the wise legislation of the United States. You have the precedent of the States on that, as on other two things to which I have referred, and I want to bring this argument to bear upon my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not think the Prime Minister will be hard to persuade if the number of his colleagues in favour of this salutary measure is sufficient.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): There are some of his colleagues that you cannot persuade.

Mr. CLARK: I thought my hon. friend had left the chamber.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Oh, no; he is right here.

Mr. CLARK: I will be very glad, indeed, to have my hon. friend smash my logic to atoms. I am glad he is here, and I hope he will speak immediately I take my seat, but he might make a better speech after he has read what I have said. I ask him, when he does speak, to say how the precedent of the United States can be good in daylight saving and in the matter of the Food Control Board, and bad in the matter of agricultural implements, and I should like him especially to tell me how he would convince that travelling inhabitant of the planet Mars that the way to increase food production is by making the implements by which to produce it dear.

I have spoken very sincerely, from convictions of a lifetime's duration on this subject. As a strong supporter and a well-wisher of the Union Government in the one specific and great purpose for which it was formed, I appeal to that Government to give earnest consideration to the remarks that I have ventured to address to them. I have come to the stage, Mr. Speaker, when I think it is well that we should all think this war may last longer than some of us hoped. The longer the war is going to last, the stronger my arguments are. The longer the war is going to last, the more the problem must be grasped of raising all the magnificent amounts that can be raised from those boundless tracts of arable land that we have in western Canada. Let the war be long or short, we are in it to the finish, and we are in it to win it. I submit respectfully to this House that even a patriot like the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) will not shrink from the sacrifice of giving away the petty duty on his implements if it is going to help to produce more and to win the war.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, it must be almost amusing to the older members of this House to hear a trumpet call from the other side, considering the company in which the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) finds himself. My hon. friend and I do not quite agree. I claim to be a Canadian free trader, and he appears to be an Old Country free trader. There is a considerable difference between the free trade that Canada requires and the

free trade that Great Britain requires and has adopted. I quite agree with him in his remarks with regard to free food. On that point, however, I have a motion on the Order Paper, and I will not enter into a discussion of the matter just now. In fact, it may not be necessary to discuss the resolution that I have on the Order Paper, because it is quite possible that the Government may see its way clear to adopt the suggestions in the proposed motion as a war measure. Therefore I shall wait until we see what announcement is made in the Budget.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the Minister of Agriculture. I want to warn him to be very careful; he is not in the best of company. I warn him to be very careful in regard to the expenditure that is likely to take place in Government departments. I wish to draw my hon. friend's attention also to a fallacy in one of his arguments in regard to the imposition of licenses. This license system may be injured very much by charging too much for the licenses, especially to dealers whose business is small. The revenue that would come from a license system will simply be added to the cost of living. Just before I left home I went to the office of a firm in Summerside and I saw on the wall five or six different licenses. I inquired what they were, and found that one was for one kind of coal and another for another kind; another for dealing in wholesale vegetables, and so on. Then there was a notice to the effect that if the firm sold cheese they would have to take out another license. As a matter of fact, if this license business is going to be carried too far by the Food Controller many small dealers may be put out of business. That is not according to the principles of Liberalism—and there are a good many Liberals on the other side of the House, perhaps almost as many as there are on this side. It is well that this should be brought to their attention now so that they may not be inclined to let gentlemen of the other stripe dominate the Government in that direction.

The old adage, a penny saved is a penny earned, applies to food control and to the cost of living. One of the greatest wastages that has occurred in Canada has been wastage in transportation, by reason of the very fact that the people have been refused free food. They have been forced to convey the food for a long distance, when by simply exchanging their customers the food could be carried at half the cost. However, that is a matter that will come up later, and I shall not deal with it now.

The question of labour is a very important one. My hon. friend says that the Government are going to look for voluntary labour. Well, if the voluntary system will secure labour, by all means use it. The greatest glory that surrounds the Canadian boys at the front; the greatest virtue that has been accorded the Canadians, is that the splendid effort made by this country in the war was the result of voluntary self-sacrifice and service. That is the basic principle of the great Christian religion—that a man lay down his life in order that another may live. That was the glorious virtue of the Canadian people in this war till a few months ago. If by the voluntary method boys from fourteen years of age—even from thirteen and twelve years of age—up to their attaining majority or leaving school can be obtained, by all means get them out of the cities and put them to work on the farms. I was born and brought up on a farm, and I am in a position to say that in view of the fact that so much farm machinery is now used, boys of ten and twelve years of age can in many cases do as much work as a man.

The Minister of Agriculture dodged the question of labour. Why did he do so? Simply because he knows that this Government made a tremendous mistake in not conserving the manhood of the country for the purposes of labour rather than use them for purposes that were not as much in the interests of winning the war. More useful ends could have been attained if many of the young men had been kept at home, or, indeed, if a number of those who did go and proved unfit for active trench work had been brought back from Europe. They should do that now. Every man who is not physically fit to go to the front lines in France should be immediately brought home and put to work on the farms.

What we want to do is to create an atmosphere throughout this country in favour of more plentiful production. Greater production is the most important matter we can bring before the attention of the people of this country. It is the history of all great wars that they have been followed by famine and pestilence, and greater production is required to obviate that, in the case of this war. It is quite immaterial, so far as the necessity for food production is concerned, whether the war lasts a long time or not. If the war were to end tomorrow, the same difficulty would arise, and we would be up against famine conditions. In this country, in which we have probably the largest acreage in the world in proportion to population, it is our duty

to increase production in preference to anything else, and in connection with that it is our duty also to increase transportation facilities, because, without adequate transportation facilities, increased production will be of very little avail.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): From this same spot a few moments ago, came some arguments to which I cannot quite assent, and I think perhaps I might be misunderstood if I did not place on Hansard my views in opposition to the speech made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). He has taken upon himself to give the Union Government a little advice, and although I believe he is a thorough supporter of the Union Government, I do not know that he is any more a supporter of it than I am, and I would advise the Union Government not to follow the advice given by the hon. member for Red Deer to-day.

Mr. MURPHY: Perfect union.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I claim as much sincerity as the hon. member for Red Deer possesses, and he possesses a lot. He says that three sons of his are serving overseas. I am on a par with him in that respect, because I also have had three sons serving overseas. In that respect, therefore, we stand together. I think I was the first member in this House to ask for the appointment of a Food Controller, which is the question under discussion to-day. I did not at that time ask for free food, that is, food to come in free of duty, and I do not ask it now. I believe the farmers of Ontario do not ask it, even if the farmers of the West do. The hon. member for Red Deer says that the farmers of the West want free food, and that free implements should follow in the wake of free food. As I understand the formation of this Government, it was the purpose to allow all such questions as the hon. member for Red Deer has raised to stand in abeyance during the war. The hon. member for Red Deer and myself are a unit so far as winning the war is concerned. We both believe in placing all the members of our family in khaki, and every member of the Cockshutt family that could go, that was fit, has gone, so that in that respect I do not take a second place to my hon. friend. The hon. member says that I could not defend my patriotism if I opposed the removal of the duties on implements. My hon. friend even went so far as Mars, and said that I should try to convert its inhabitants if I went there. I have not the acquaintance

of the inhabitants of Mars, and if they are as hard to convert as is the hon. member for Red Deer, I should be wasting my time. If the Government purpose meddling seriously with the tariff, they are breaking what we understood in our section of the country was an agreement, that is, that those matters were to stand in abeyance during the war.

That is what we understood, and that is what we stated from the platform and that is what we now believe. The duties on implements cannot be removed unless you are prepared to remove all the duties on all the raw materials that go into all those implements, and that would mean a tearing to pieces of the tariff from top to bottom. Let no one run away with the idea that it can be done with the stroke of a pen. A thousand and one things go into the manufacture of implements and, speaking as I do with some knowledge of that business, I want to say that if the hon. member for Red Deer is as efficient in his farming operations as the implement manufacturers are in their operations, he is making more money on the farm and doing it more efficiently than I give him credit for. It may be true that everything is being done on the farm that can be done, but if the farmers are just as efficient as the implement manufacturers, they have gone a long distance in the way of producing up-to-date articles at the proper prices. The implement manufacturers of Canada have been able to compete in the markets of the world where they have a fair opportunity, and they are prepared to do that now, but they cannot do it if you charge duties on all raw materials that go into the construction of those implements, and remove the duty on the finished article. Many of those raw materials pay as much duty as the finished article, and up to 35 or 40 per cent. Every one of those articles which enters into the construction of those implements has duty on it, and thousands of workingmen just as patriotic and honourable as any other body of citizens in Canada are making their livelihood out of the implement business. It is not a question of a few manufacturers; it is a question of tens of thousands of workingmen who rely upon this industry for their daily bread; and their wages, which are high, are bound up with the success of this great enterprise. I ask, therefore, that the Union Government take no such foolish step as the hon. member for Red Deer has mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I say foolish step advisedly, and for the peace and harmony of the splendid party that is on this side of the House I advise the Union Government to go very slowly in following the advice of my hon. friend from Red Deer, who has thought on only one side of this case, and who has brought the same heterodoxy from the other side over here on this one particular point, although in every other respect he seems to be as sound as a bell. In the sole matter of free trade and protection, he is apparently still in the darkness that he brought over with him from the old country, a free trade country, many years ago. Ontario farmers know just as well as Ontario manufacturers what this question means. It is a matter of live and let live in the Dominion of Canada. There are more than half a million workers engaged in the manufactures of the Dominion. Close on to the same number of men draw their living from the factories that draw it from the farms and there are more workers off the farms in the Dominion than there are on the farms, if it comes to a matter of population. According to a recent census—I do not think there has been one fully taken since 1911—there were 900,000 workers in the forests, factories, mines and railways, as opposed to 700,000 upon the farms, so that more than half our people are industrial. I for one say that a dollar produced from the mine or the forest or the fisheries is just as good as a dollar produced from the farm. I may not have a following in the House in that regard, but we manufacturers look upon ourselves as producers, as men who have produced an honest dollar from the calling in which we are engaged, and which we have endeavoured to systematize and to bring up to the perfection which it has reached in this Dominion to-day. I say with all sincerity that there is no country in the world, with the solitary exception of the United States, and that only in some few respects, that sells implements as cheaply as they are sold in the Dominion. That is the truth; it cannot be gainsaid, and to-day Europe has been sending orders to Canada.

Thousands of orders have come to Canada recently in order to increase production over there, and they did not ask whether these implements or the material in them had been subject to duty or not. They recognized that Canada is producing a class of implement the Allies want, and the consequence is that these implements are going over there to-day in large numbers. Why, then, disturb the splendid relations in which we live at the present time? We in Ontario have not asked for free food. I do not believe that would relieve the situation at all, practically speaking; I do not ask any farmer to forego protection on his products. The farmers in the West may think that is the proper policy, but the farmers of Ontario have voted time and again in favour of protection of farm products, and have got duties ranging from ten to fifty per cent on the various products of the farm. If I have a word of advice to give the Minister of Trade and Commerce—I do not think he needs it, for I believe he is as sound as he always was on this question—it would be to let well enough alone during the war. I am sure the hon. member for Red Deer and myself, if we had rifles here to-day, would both go into the firing line and relieve, so far as we could, the boys who are wanting a rest, and I ask him now to forego his free trade proclivities until after the war, and I will endeavour to forego my protectionist proclivities until after the war. I will not ask for any increase in duties if he will agree not to ask for any reduction in duties. Then, if I tried to steal a march on my hon. friend, and said to the Government: Impose a duty of 10 per cent on this, that, or the other manufacture, because it will be a fine thing as a war measure, he would rightly say that I had broken the arrangement that I professed to believe in, which is to let things stand as they are until after the war. Let us go on together to win this war. The situation is critical both with regard to food and with regard to men, and let us not lose sight of the main proposition in haggling over these different matters that might come between us. Let us unite to do our best for the Allies in every respect. I think that the resolution that my right hon. friend has brought in is a very good one. I should like to have dwelt on it more fully, but it is almost six o'clock, and I do not propose to go into the food question further than to say that I hope my right hon. friend will remember that though he knows how little the Food Board has done, he does not know how much worse it would have been if we had no Food Board at all. The Food Board has done a lot of good. They have set certain prices; they have educated the people, and when my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) endeavoured to show that nothing had been accomplished by the Food Board I think he failed miserably, and the minister answered him very finely in the splendid address he gave. In nearly all the cities and towns throughout this Dominion you will find in nearly all the houses food

cards in the windows. Nearly every housewife is carrying out the recommendations of the Food Board, endeavouring to reduce the consumption of those articles that we can best ship and which are required for our soldiers, and increasing the consumption of those articles that we cannot ship. All this is a matter of education, and the Food Board has done, and is doing, a splendid work in this direction. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Agriculture say in answer to the point raised by the hon. member for Wright about the tremendous salaries that are being paid in connection with the Food Board, that these are more than offset by the licenses given out to grocers and others dealing in foodstuffs. I believe the license system is an admirable one, and I have great faith in it as a regulator of food prices. If we have not food to spare a license cannot be obtained to ship it out, but if we have, then a license can say how much shall go out and where it shall go. I advocated that in this House over three years ago. I believe it is a splendid system, and if carried out in the spirit in which my hon. friend has explained it this afternoon, I believe it will have a very beneficial effect on the food resources of this country.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Tuesday, April 2, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

RETURN OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE.

ELECTION IN THE YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates and reports of the election and final returns of the members of the House of Commons to serve in the Thirteenth Parliament of Canada, and also a special report in respect to the election for the electoral district of Yukon Territory.

As the latter report is very voluminous, I have issued instructions that it be printed as an appendix to the Votes and Proceedings, and that copies be circulated among the members at the earliest possible moment.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of North West Mounted Police for the year ending September 30, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

AMENDMENT TO REPRESENTATION ACT, 1914.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME IN BRITISH COLUMBIA CONSTITUENCY.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Westminster District) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 26, to Amend the Representation Act, 1914.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the hon. gentleman please explain the nature of the Bill?

Mr. STACEY: The object, Sir, is simply to change the name of one electoral district in the province of British Columbia. Under ordinary circumstances, possibly, the name of an electoral district may be of comparatively minor importance; but in this particular case it is the cause of great confusion, inasmuch as the adjoining constituency is known as New Westminster, whereas that to which the Bill refers is now called Westminster District, and confusion has already arisen because of the similarity of the names. It is therefore deemed desirable by those immediately interested that a change should be effected. With regard to the proposed name of the riding, the object is two-fold. The constituency in question lies adjacent to the Fraser river, on both its north and south banks, for a distance of from sixty to one hundred miles, and the locality therefore seems to suggest a suitable title. In addition it perpetuates a name that should be cherished in the annals of Canadian history. For these two reasons, I beg leave to introduce this Bill to change the name of this constituency from Westminster District to Fraser Valley.

Motion agreed to and Bill read first time.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DISTURBANCES IN QUEBEC—STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the Day are called, it is proper that I should make a statement with respect to certain deplorable incidents which have occurred in the city of Quebec during the past four or five days. Those incidents commenced on Thursday evening last. It appears that a young man named Mercier had been asked by the Dominion police engaged in the enforcement of the Military Service Act for his exemption certificate, which he did not have with him. He was taken into custody until the certificate could be produced. As a matter of fact, under the provisions of sec-

tion 15 of the Military Service Act, it was his duty to produce it when called upon to do so. The certificate was sent for and produced, whereupon he was immediately discharged.

I am speaking of all these matters under this reserve: we have not yet a full, detailed, official statement of what took place. I hope that it will be forthcoming tomorrow, and if so it will be presented to the House. In the meantime, with that reserve, I am giving the facts so far as they have come to the attention of the Government.

Subsequently it seems that a number of men pursued some ten or twelve of these Dominion officers engaged in the enforcement of the Military Service Act and the officers took refuge in one of the police stations of the city. Eventually those who were making the attack forced their way in, and some of the officers sustained very serious injuries from the handling to which they were subjected by those who assaulted them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were the officers military or civic officers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They were Dominion officers engaged in the enforcement of the Military Service Act. It would appear so far as the Government has information at the present time that the disturbance might have been put down without much difficulty if proper effort had been made by the civic authorities. However, these men sustained the injuries to which I have alluded, and while the affair occupied a considerable time, nothing more of importance seems to have occurred that evening.

On the following evening an attack, apparently organized in advance, was made upon the registry office which contains the records connected with the Military Service Act. According to the information which has reached the Government, it would not have been difficult, at that stage even, to prevent what took place. Again I repeat that according to the information which thus far has come to us, no adequate or reasonable effort by the local authorities was made to prevent the disturbance and preserve public order. Accordingly the building was ramsacked and I believe it was set on fire; but fortunately all the important records came through without serious damage. They happened to be in a room other than that to which the crowd gained entrance, and where the crowd apparently thought that the records were kept. Consequently, very little loss of important records has occurred.

Then, on that or the following evening other unfortunate and deplorable incidents took place. Newspaper offices were attacked and wrecked, and attempts were made to procure arms. The situation on Saturday appeared to be so serious that the Government decided that the garrison of the city of Quebec should be reinforced, and on Saturday evening and on Sunday about one thousand additional troops were sent in. These are there now, under the command of General Lessard, who on Saturday was ordered to proceed forthwith to Quebec to take command and who arrived there, I believe, on Sunday afternoon. The troops which were sent from some parts of Ontario are troops which have been under training, I believe, for some time and have been gathered from various parts of Canada.

The most deplorable incident, however, is that which occurred last evening, and which resulted in loss of life. From the information in the possession of the Government it would appear that four persons have been killed and a great many wounded. I believe that about sixty persons who were actually engaged in the assault have been taken in charge by the military. The troops, so far as we can judge from the information presently available, acted with great restraint and moderation. They were pelted with bricks and stones; a great many different attacks were made upon them; they were fired upon with firearms of various kinds, and eventually the fire was returned.

So far as the enforcement of the Military Service Act is concerned, it is the duty of the Federal Government to see that it is enforced. We have endeavoured in all parts of the country to enforce it with impartiality, fairness, consideration and firmness. We shall continue to do so in the future, and we shall see to it that Federal officers engaged in the enforcement of the Act are adequately protected, if the local authorities fail to give them that protection which ought to be accorded. I say this in all calmness, and in the assurance that this duty on the part of the Federal Government will be recognized universally in the House and throughout the country, and even by those who in the first instance were opposed to the principle on which that law is based.

Further than that, if in any part of this country it appears that, by reason of the enforcement of this Act, the municipal or local authorities are unable or are not dis-

posed to preserve public order, it will devolve upon the Government of this country to see that public order is preserved, and we intend to perform that duty.

The incidents which have taken place have made it apparent to the Government that some amendments will be necessary to the Military Service Act. One of those which is now in preparation is this: That persons who engage in active or forcible resistance to the enforcement of the Act shall be forthwith enrolled in the military forces of Canada, without regard to whether their class has been called out; without regard to any exemption that they may have procured, and subject only to the consideration that they are within military age. I believe that is a proper principle to adopt. If any persons in this country are disposed to wage war upon the civil authorities of Canada engaged in the enforcement of this Act, then it seems to me they may well be given the opportunity to exercise their warlike spirit upon the enemies of their country.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I may, I hope, be permitted to say a word upon this matter, especially as the trouble which has taken place in the city of Quebec has occurred in the electoral division which I have the honour to represent in this House, and which I have represented in Parliament for more than forty years. My view is the same as that of the Prime Minister: that the law is to be observed. And, following the remarks that my right hon. friend has uttered, I may state that the law will be observed even by those who do not believe in it. The law, whether it is right or wrong, good or bad, judicious or otherwise, is the law, and it will be observed in Quebec as elsewhere. My right hon. friend made his statement under reserve to-day. I shall await what he has further to say upon the subject. I shall only say that, while the law is to be observed and must be observed, it is possible to have it enforced in such a way as to provoke public sentiment.

Mr. J. BEST: Oh!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I shall make good my words when the proper time comes. But if the law is enforced with proper regard for the rights of the people, my right hon. friend can be sure of it, there will be no difficulty at all in carrying it out.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall, of course, be very happy to hear any suggestions the right hon. gentleman has to offer in that regard, but I would like to make this observation: The incident which seems to have provoked the first disturbance in the city of Quebec is an incident which has occurred hundreds, if not thousands, of times in other parts of the country, and has had no such results as those which occurred on Thursday last. That might perhaps be borne well in mind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know how the law has been observed elsewhere, but I take especial interest in the city of Quebec, as I happen to be one of its representatives in this House, and, in my humble judgment, the law will be observed there as in other parts of the country.

THE WAR.

CABLE DESPATCHES FROM SIR EDWARD KEMP; HEROIC DEEDS OF CANADIANS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to read two or three despatches which have reached me this morning from the front, and which will be of interest, not only to hon. gentlemen in this House, but to the people of the country in general. There are three despatches which have been sent to me by Sir Edward Kemp and which embody reports received from Mr. Roland Hill at the front. The first one is as follows:

War Correspondents' Headquarters, France, March 28.

Fighting, digging, blowing up roads and bridges, Canadian railway troops have been worthily keeping up the traditions of Ypres and Vimy. A majority of the battalions were in the battle area and close to that heroic British line that gave but never broke. They fought at Gouzeaucourt and a good majority of them are old soldiers. One company of an Ontario Battalion whirled into the fight at Ham with a veteran British Division and stayed with them two days, fighting every inch of ground. Another railway battalion rescued three heavy howitzers, repairing their broken line and loading the big guns on trucks when the British infantry were holding back the Huns only a few hundred yards away. In Peronne sector another battalion, after getting all its equipment and rolling stock away, organized ambulance trains on what tracks were left, carrying out wounded. When the last engine and night cars came through, the track had to be mended seven times in less than an hour. One company of Canadian railway troops of a battalion that fought with the Americans at Court put up a wonderful fight to rescue a big railway howitzer. They patched up the shell shattered line with any material at hand, got it over a quarter of a mile when broken

rails spread and the task seemed hopeless. They bumped the twenty ton truck over ties for another hundred yards and found themselves alongside an old engineers' dump. The line ahead was torn and twisted and there were no rails to be had. Canadian railway builders started to construct line with heavy dugout timbers from the dump. The big gun was hauled another hundred and fifty yards towards safety when the Huns were sighted almost upon them. The battery commander reluctantly decided to blow up the great howitzer. He gave the railroad men ten minutes to construct some kind of a line to take the engine out and then destroyed his big pet. As the retiring infantry came up the gun crew and Canadians piled on the engine and steamed away through a hail of German bullets to safety. In no place where we had to retire were railway lines and bridges left intact. All the first day from Arras to Ham the battalion were running back rolling stock and blowing up the line. In many places they were doing their work of destruction with American engineers and more than once little companies of both found themselves alongside each other in the fighting line. When their own part of the work was cleared the majority of companies were gathered in under command of their own Canadian Brigadier and day and night they continued to give effective assistance in other directions. "And when they are wanted," declares one Canadian Colonel who has commanded troops in the line "they will be there, also ready to do their bit with rifle and machine gun."

The second cable reads:

War Correspondents' Headquarters, France, March 29.—One of the largest Canadian hospitals found itself medically strategical centre of the great battle which raged the first week. The whole front between Arras and Peronne contributed to fill wards. In those first days not a single ambulance convoy was turned away. Teams of surgeons and nurses from other Canadian hospitals outside the battle zone came down to help. From Halifax to Victoria was represented in this little brigade which, day and night, none hardly pausing for rest, fought to rescue battered human remnants. Wounded German prisoners were treated just as our own men. "I wonder if they are treating British fighting men like we are theirs?" asked a Toronto surgeon who only a few days before had narrowly escaped death by shelling of his hospital nearer the line. Extra tables were crowded into operating rooms, and still the line of stretchers where operation was necessary to save soldier's life continued to grow. In a large building adjacent to the hospital, there was the theatre. Notices were posted that "The Follies" would play there that night. Keen eye of the Canadian colonel in command spotted rows of electric lights and arc lamps that were to illuminate the stage. "Put two tables up there," he ordered, pointing to the stage, "and one down there in the orchestra." In half an hour white-robed nurses were busy giving anesthetics and surgeons were operating. In the body of the hall where there was to have been a merry audience laughing at quips and jests, were battle-battered soldiers on stretchers, too weak even to notice the great drama of war that was being played under the limelights on the busy stage. I recognized one of the surgeons. He was from a Toronto unit. Three days before, he had been working in a casualty clearing station near Ypres. Suddenly the hospital became almost a Field Ambulance and then they had to abandon all their huts. They worked all night getting their wounded and stores away. Next day the surgeon was operating in a hospital at Amiens, and then he came to this great centre to find most of the unit there too, sent as reserves into the wonderful fight which medical services have put up. Hospitals have had to fall back with armies they served, but always they are somewhere else next day, huts and tents up, doctors and nurses cheery, even if terribly fatigued, again busy with their work of mercy.

The next, dated London, April 1, 1918, reads:

Canadian officers who were acting as town Majors in places like Ypres, Royalcourt and Bus had exciting experiences before they retired. Their duty was to see that all stores which could not be moved were destroyed, and they spent their last evening in their respective centres blowing up what little ammunition was left, and burning up and obliterating canteens that might yield supplies for advancing Huns. They came out with the last of the British troops and gave a graphic story of how complete was the destruction of roads, bridges and railways which might have been of use to the enemy. Ypres was one of the largest railway centres in the sector. In addition to the Canadian Railway Construction Battalion, there were Canadian Railway Operating Companies at this point and large yards with immense quantities of both standard and narrow gauge rolling stock. Of the latter all the Huns obtained were two derelict light railway engines and about a dozen trucks. Bridges over the Nord Canal were all destroyed. Miles of sidings in the valley at Ypres were mined and rendered completely useless. Repair shops, after lathes and other machinery had been taken away on the last trains, were burned and even the dugouts destroyed. A delicate compliment is paid to the Canadian Railway destruction troops in German communique on Thursday. It says: "Our Railway troops are now coping with traffic behind the front and are working ceaselessly on the reconstruction of destroyed railways." That means to make the lines fairly effective.

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES.

NOTICE OF A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Did I understand the right hon. leader of the Government to say that a date will be fixed for a debate on the Quebec riots?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I merely said that to-morrow a fuller statement would be given after we had received official reports.

Mr. CURRIE: Might it not be well to fix, say, Thursday for the debate? Otherwise, I wish to give notice that on Thursday next I shall move for leave to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing this matter.

INCOME TAX RETURNS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I ask the Acting Minister of Finance whether, at the request of various boards of trade and business corporations, he is extending the time within which the income tax returns have to be made? I noticed in the financial press last week that a movement was on foot for that purpose, and as a great many people do not fully understand the operation of the Act, I think if my hon. friend would grant a further delay it would be all the better.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): No further delay has been proposed; in fact, it would be hardly possible. However, upon request, we shall be pleased to consider any suggestion for reasonable delay.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

AD HOC JUDGE.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Supreme Court Act, Chapter one hundred and thirty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that the Judge of the Exchequer Court, or if he is absent from Ottawa or for any reason unable to sit, a Judge of a Provincial Superior Court may, on the requisition of the Chief Justice or in his absence, the senior puisne Judge, attend at the sittings of the Court and act as an ad hoc Judge for such period as may be necessary; and that the said Judge so attending may be paid his travelling expenses and receive a per diem allowance for living expenses of ten dollars for each day that he is necessarily absent from his place of residence.

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of the measure which is intended to be based on this resolution is to obviate an inconvenience that has arisen at different times in the past, and that presents itself perhaps, more acutely at the present moment. As the members of the House are aware, a quorum of the Supreme Court consists of five of its members. Whenever by reason of circumstances it is not possible to unite such a number of the members of the court, while it is still possible for the court to proceed with four members only, the result of such a proceeding is not found to be satisfactory in practice. That litigants reaching a court of ultimate appeal should find themselves face to face with a court so constituted that it may possibly divide evenly, with the result either that the judgment appealed from may be considered standing or affirmed, or a rehearing be ordered is obviously not desirable. The purpose of this measure is to make it possible, when by reason of illness, unavoidable absence, or other sufficient cause, five judges are not available for the holding of the term, for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court or the senior puisne judge, in his absence, to call an ad hoc judge to fill the place of the judge who may be prevented from taking part in the sittings of the court by any of the causes which I have mentioned. This power, I think I can safely say, is vested in the Chief Justice of all the provincial courts; certainly that is the case in the province from which I come. We propose to empower the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or, in his absence, the senior puisne judge, to call in as an ad hoc judge first the judge of the Exchequer court, or if that judge for any reason should not be available, then a judge of the superior court of any province.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Any of the judges of the Exchequer Court?

Mr. DOHERTY: As at present constituted, there is but one judge of the Exchequer Court, with an assistant judge. This measure does not propose to call in the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court, but the judge of the Exchequer Court, or if he is unable to act, a judge of the Superior Court of any of the provinces. The reason the measure had to be premised by a resolution is simply that it makes provision that where an outside judge is so called in he shall be paid his travelling expenses and the ordinary per diem living allowance which is allowed under the general law to any judge who is called upon to serve at a place other than the place of his residence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand there is no provision in the Supreme Court Act for retiring a judge with superannuation after a certain period of service.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand not. Would it not be an opportune time to insert a clause in this resolution that a judge, after a certain tenure of office, might be retired, under the Supreme Court Act, with superannuation? It is possible, as I understand the law, for an officer to occupy the position of a judge in the Dominion of Canada long after the period of his usefulness has passed. Will it be possible, when this Bill is before the House, to amend it in that respect, without any further resolution?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would not be possible in a measure of this kind, nor, indeed, in any measure passed by this Parliament, to make provision for the compulsory termination of the holding of a judicial office by any judge of the Superior or High Court, because under the provisions of the British North America Act the tenure of office of the judges of the High Court continues during good behaviour. There is no power, therefore, either in the Government or in Parliament, to compulsorily terminate the holding of such an office. The hon. gentleman is aware that there are certain provisions under which, if a judge voluntarily retires at a certain age, he becomes entitled to a superannuation, determined according to his period of service and age. But there is no power in this Parliament, as I understand the law at all events, to make provision such as the hon. gentleman suggests. I think, in order to attain that result, if Parliament considers it desirable, it would be necessary to amend the provisions of the British North America Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened with great attention to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and I may say at once that this proposed measure strikes me as being right. I am informed that of late many litigants from various parts of Canada were held up because there was not on the Supreme Court bench the number of judges required by law to hear cases. However, the legal fraternity accepted the fait accompli, and legislation is proposed to-day to obviate such a state of things in the future. About 1896 or 1897 similar legislation was under consideration, if not presented, by the then Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat. I do not know if the Bill was ever printed, but, at all events, there was an intention on his part, expressed in the Senate where he held a seat, to appoint ad hoc judges in such cases as the present Minister of Justice seeks to provide for under this Bill. However, the measure was not introduced, and to-day we see the necessity of it. I should like to call the attention of my hon. friend to one point. The Chief Justice will be empowered to request the services or attendance of the judge of the Exchequer Court. Everybody in this House, and everybody in the legal fraternity or in the judicial world, has the highest regard for the Chief Justice of the Exchequer Court. I say the Chief Justice advisely, because it is a well known fact that there are two judges in the Exchequer Court, the Chief Judge and the Assistant Judge. The Assistant Judge has the same power as the Chief Judge, and both are men of very high standing. I do not see why a distinction should be made, and, on the contrary, I think there are reasons—which my hon. friend will easily understand—which would seem to require the presence of the Assistant Judge. I need not dilate at any length on that special phase of the case, but I know that at certain times there may be reasons why the Assistant instead of the Chief Judge should be called upon to act. My hon. friend will perhaps consider the point when he introduces the Bill. As regards the ad hoc judges coming from the Superior Courts, I have nothing to say. I do not know whether there will be a distinction between the Chief Justice of the Superior Court, the Assistant Chief Justice and the other judges or whether all judges of the Superior Court will be made eligible.

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to the suggestion concerning the Assistant Judge of the Exchequer Court, I will be very glad to consider the matter. It will be open to us, I think, to make an amendment, if it is decided upon, when the Bill is introduced. I may say that there was no intention, in providing for the services of the Judge of the Exchequer Court to cast any reflection on the learned Assistant Judge of that Court. As to the suggestion that there might be occasion when it would be desirable for special reasons that the Assistant Judge should act, I think the hon. gentleman will find, when the Bill is introduced and the circumstances considered, that it will be very easy to make a provision which will be found adequate.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. DOHERTY thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 27, to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved the third reading of Bill No. 17, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

He said: Before the Bill is read the third time, I wish to call attention to a feature of the amendment which has developed. The Bill as it stands provides for

the extension of the terms of the agreement of 1890, between the Dominion and the province of British Columbia, so as to make it applicable to forest reserves. It makes it applicable to forest reserves, or at least, not inapplicable to reserves as it was the intention that it should be applicable to forest reserves. However, the Bill as it reads, is applicable not only to forest reserves but to park reserves. The Department of Justice advises us that in the original Order in Council, which constitutes the agreement between this Government and the province of British Columbia, there is no provision which requires its application to park reserves, and the officers of the parks branch are very desirous that the parks should be preserved from invasion at the hands of miners or others. Consequently, I wish to move:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it as follows: "That clause 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out all the words from the beginning of the clause to and inclusive of the word "expedient" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the following words: "Provided however, that where in a Dominion forest reserve, outside of the area of the Dominion Parks now or hereafter established, it is not expedient for topographical or other reasons."

Then it would read on:

To use for public road purposes the existing road allowances, the title to which is vested in the Crown in the right of the province, the provincial governments may, by order of the Governor in Council, be permitted to lay out such roads as may be necessary for the convenience of the public, and may be granted title thereto in consideration of the surrender of such portions of the said road allowances as are not required for public roads.

It is desired that parks be not opened to the laying out of provincial roads the same as forest reserves.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A public road, I presume, means a wagon road, not a railroad?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not a railroad. The chief amendment is to the second clause. I wish to move, as relating to this clause:

That clause 2 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following proviso: "Provided that this section shall not apply to any Dominion park now or hereafter established."

It simply limits the operation of the Bill to forest reserves and does not include Dominion parks.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

[Mr. Meighen.]

On section 1—to authorize granting road sites to provinces upon surrender of certain road allowances:

Mr. MEIGHEN moved that the section be amended by striking out all the words from the beginning of the clause to and inclusive of the word "expedient" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the following words: "provided, however, that where in a Dominion forest reserve, outside of the area of Dominion parks now or hereafter established, it is not expedient for topographical or other reasons," etc.

Mr. BUREAU: I think you read, in the tenth line, the words "vested in the Crown in the right of the province, the provincial government may by Order of the General"—

Mr. MEIGHEN: May by order of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: Those words are not in the Bill I have here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The words "by order of the Governor General in Council" were inserted in the Bill while in committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Why are Dominion parks exempted from the right of changing a highway for topographical reasons?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is desirable that no other authority than the Dominion shall have power to enter the parks. There could not be the same objection to allowing the provincial authorities to make roads in forest reserves. Forest reserves are not beauty spots as are the tracts reserved for park purposes. If the provincial authorities were permitted to enter the parks, our control would not only be invaded but it would be very seriously impaired to the detriment of the parks. There is nothing in the original agreement by which we are in any way enjoined to allow the provincial authorities to make roads through parks.

4 p.m.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 2—to authorize grant of minerals in forest reserves to the province of British Columbia under agreement of February, 1890:

Mr. MEIGHEN moved:

That clause 2 be amended by adding to the clause as within the printed Bill the following proviso: "Provided that this section shall not apply to any Dominion park now or hereafter established."

Mr. BUREAU: That is on the same principle as the previous amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same principle exactly.

Mr. FULTON: As this Bill effects the constituency which I represent, I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in regard to it. I think I am right in surmising that the cause of the amendment being brought in was a difficulty that arose in connection with certain mineral claims in the Highland Valley near Ashcroft. These claims were located prior to the establishment of the forest reserves by the Act under which they are now constituted. When the owners came to apply for Crown grants they found that, the reserve being established, the Crown grant could not be obtained, as the Forest Reserves Act prevented the Dominion from transferring the minerals or surface rights to the province. In the case of these mineral claims, it is only right that the applicant should obtain a grant not only for minerals, but for surface rights. I understand from the minister that has been recognized and that a Crown grant in respect to these mineral claims will be issued in due course; that is, that the right to the minerals and the surface rights will be transferred to the province so that the province may grant them to the locator under its Mineral Act. It seems to me that, now that the Dominion Government has recognized the principle of allowing these forest reserves to be entered and the mineral claims within these reserves to be developed, the department might go farther in the matter. There is nothing in the amendment which provides for the granting of the surface rights along with the grant of the minerals. I feel sure that the locators of mineral claims, or the parties who undertake to develop these claims, will want to be assured as to what rights they will get. In my opinion, they should get more than they can get under the provisions of the Forest Reserves Act, namely, a license or a lease. Mining companies are very sensitive, and they are likely to hesitate in the expenditure of a very large amount of capital unless they can have a more permanent title surface rights than can be obtained under the Forest Reserves Act at the present time. If, however, the minister does not feel that he can go that far, an assurance might be given in the Act itself that the surface rights will be dealt with at the same time that the mineral rights are transferred. These companies will then know what title they will get to the surface rights, and it is absolutely necessary for them to have some rights upon the surface in order to develop the claims. I would suggest that in this clause some provision be made whereby these men will know that they will get the right to use the surface.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The case that the hon. member (Mr. Fulton) refers to had something to do with bringing to the attention of the department the necessity of this amendment; that is quite correct. The case he refers to, however, as he explained clearly himself, was one in which the mineral rights were acquired prior to the establishment of the Forest Reserves Act, and by a saving clause of that Act, no rights that had previously been acquired were to be interfered with. In the next place, the department felt that it was in a position to grant the mineral rights and surface rights in respect of the lands covered by the Mining Act in the province of British Columbia. The present Bill purports to take care of cases that have arisen since the establishment of the forest reserves, and to provide a means whereby the parties interested will get all the mineral rights that belong to the Dominion—that is, all the rights to the baser metals. The hon. gentleman suggests that there should be some provision in the Bill which would make clear to the party dealing with the mine what his surface rights are to be as well. Under the Forest Reserves Act—I think it is section 17, at all events, under the section of the Act which empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations—power is given to make regulations for the leasing or licensing of surface rights, and regulations have been made providing for the leasing of such rights. Under those regulations any miner who lives up to the provisions of the law of British Columbia is able merely by applying to the department, to secure a lease of the surface rights. The hon. gentleman states that capital is timid, and would be more likely to invest if the applicant was aware that he could get the fee simple. That is in a measure true. This, however, was the policy established in 1908, by the Forest Reserves Act, in relation to rights in forest reserves. I call attention to that fact first; but, secondly, and more important, an Act was passed by this House in 1914 whereby the granting of the fee simple to mineral claims—the granting of the fee simple in relation at all events to coal rights and the greater mineral claims—was put an end to and a system of leasehold established. Since that time, under the authority, indeed under the instructions, of Parliament, the administration of our resources has been taken care

of, as a matter of fact, by a general policy of leasing.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about your royalties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the royalties have been reduced too in very many cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From ten to five cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, from ten to five cents in the case of coal. In the face of that policy laid down by Parliament, it would be scarcely fitting now to introduce legislation that would re-establish the old conditions, and in relation to the very class of cases where they never formally obtained at all. Instead of moving in that direction, Parliament has been moving in the other direction, and moving very rapidly. So it appears to me the proper course now is to leave to the applicant his right to leasehold. I have no hesitation in stating that applicants who conform to the law of British Columbia and to our regulations will receive and be entitled to receive under those regulations, a lease of the surface rights, and I do not think he can ask for more.

Mr. FULTON: I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that under this Bill the baser minerals will be transferred to the province to deal with, and the province will issue a Crown grant, notwithstanding the policy of the Dominion in adopting a lease. The only question is with regard to surface rights, and it would be rather anomalous that the miner should have a Crown grant of the minerals and only a lease, or license, with regard to the surface rights. He has a grant for all time of the minerals, and license or permission only and that for a limited period to use the surface rights. What I suggested was that there should be an assurance that he would get the right, possibly by way of a Crown grant, and if not in the form of a license or lease, to enable him to work the minerals for which he will have the Crown grant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have given the assurance, provided, of course, the miner complies with the Provincial Mining Act and with the regulations of the department. He has to do that before he can make application.

Bill reported as amended.

[Mr. Meighen.]

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

House in Committee on Bill No. 4, to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the Solar Mean Time during the summer months.—Sir George Foster.

On section 1—Act cited as The Daylight Saving Act, 1918.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the new legislation is in force in the United States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It has been in force since yesterday, has it not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Since 31st March.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And as a consequence our trains have to wait an hour at the boundary line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: At some points.

On section 2—Time advanced one hour.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Instead of Solar Time I propose to make an amendment by striking out the last line and substituting therefor:

> in each province shall be one hour in advance of the time which under the law of the province is the time prescribed for such province, and if there is no time so prescribed, of the accepted standard time.

In each of the provinces of the Dominion, with the exception of Quebec, standard time is the accepted and legalized time. On inquiry from the Attorney General of Quebec I find that eastern standard time is the accepted time in that province, but that there is no legalization of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is meant by "accepted time?"

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the time which is accepted in the province. Eastern standard time is carried out there, although it has not been legalized by Act of Parliament. The amendment provides that the time shall be one hour in advance of the standard time as it is legalized in all the provinces, or in any province in which it is not legalized, of the accepted time, which in Quebec is eastern standard time.

Mr. BOYCE: Would it not be well, Mr. Chairman, so to word this Bill as to provide that county or township councils may adopt the law or not, as they see fit? This measure is going to work great hardship on the farmers. As a farmer, I have no objection to the people of the cities adopting such a measure as this if they wish to

spend the day playing ball and amusing themselves, we farmers are not going to find fault. But in this serious time, when we should all be united with the object of producing food, the loyal farmers of Canada consider that no new legislation of this kind should be enacted. I trust that this suggestion will be carefully considered. Seventy thousand of our farmers are now fighting at the front trying to uphold the rights of the British Empire, and we should not make it any harder for those who are at home to solve the great problem of producing food for the people. We should, therefore, be permitted to use our own judgment in the matter of the saving of daylight. We have to get up early in the morning anyway, but we cannot start work until the dew dries, especially during haying and harvest time, and if this Bill passes we shall lose two hours of valuable time in the evening.

Mr. HALLADAY: I do not believe that it is the intention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to turn the sun back an hour or to compel the sun to rise in the West and set in the East. I represent one of the largest farming constituencies in the Dominion. I have farmed a number of years in Manitoba and Alberta, and I know whereof I speak. I cannot see how the passing of this measure will increase or decrease production in our part of the country. Show me the man who is not up with the sun at harvest time and working until the sun goes down, and I will show you a man who is not keeping pace with his neighbours. It is absolutely necessary that we gauge our work by the sun, not by the clock. We in the West are not troubled with the dew, but the passing of this Act does not force our eastern farmer friends to get up one hour earlier than they do at present. I cannot see that the measure will adversely affect the farmers of Canada, but I can see that it will give the great army of indoor workers an extra hour of sunshine, and for that reason I am prepared to support the Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he is seriously encroaching on the Sabbath day. For at least two thousand years the Sabbath day in this country has begun at a certain hour; it has been so established by Divine decree.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You are given twenty-four hours of it; that is quite enough for you.

Mr. McKENZIE: The good, conscientious people in my part of the country will object strenuously to my right hon. friend's encroachment on the Sabbath. An old magistrate in my county once said to a minister: when I find that you are on one side and Moses is on the other, I am with Moses every time. In the same manner, when I find Divine Providence fixing the Sabbath at a certain time, I stand by Divine Providence when I find that the Minister of Trade and Commerce alone is on the other side. But, laying all jokes aside, in our part of the country men who have to go to work at twelve o'clock Sunday night will object very seriously to going to work at eleven o'clock instead of twelve; they will regard themselves as working on the Sabbath day. It is worthy of consideration whether the sanctity of the Sabbath can be thrust aside by simply altering the clock.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's authority must be biblical; I would like him to give me the chapter and verse. I know that he can do so very easily.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would refer my hon. friend to the twentieth chapter of Exodus, where it is laid down that we should remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy; no part of it is to be transgressed.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—annual enforcement:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I was under the impression that the Act was to be for one year only, as an experiment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is not so expressed in this section.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I meant that the Act should apply to the summer season applicable during the year. The provision that the Act shall be enforced each year during such time as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council was made for this reason: we should have liked to bring the Act into force coterminously with the Act in the United States, but legislation had to be provided, and it was not known exactly when this legislation would be through. Therefore, a clause was put in giving the Governor in Council power to call it into force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But the amendment goes much further than my right hon. friend intended.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, I understood from my right hon. friend the other day that this measure was to be an experiment for only one year, and that it would have to be renewed if found satisfactory. Under the section as amended, it is in the power of the Governor in Council to carry it on from year to year without any reference to Parliament at all. If that is not what my right hon. friend intended, he should amend the section accordingly.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Act shall be in force during the present year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is it.

The CHAIRMAN: The section, as amended, reads:

This Act shall be in force during the present year, for such time as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Adjustment to meet special conditions:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of this section? Has my right hon. friend any concrete case in mind?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER. This is copied entirely from the English Act, and is meant to provide a means for making any adjustments which may be found necessary.

Mr. McMASTER: What kind of adjustments?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Adjustments where times clash, for instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend has a copy of the Bill. I thought he might have a case in mind.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no case in mind. This is simply a precautionary section.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—power of Railway Board to advance standard time one hour:

Mr. MORPHY: Supposing the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada did not advance the standard time used by railway companies, what a muddle we should be in in this country if trains were running on one time, farmers working on another and industrial men on another.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The railroads will not object to the change in time. What this section is meant to do is this, which is taking place now under the regulations in regard to standard time and the running of the railways in the United States of America. It is often inconvenient, although they divide the country up into zones, that those zones shall be absolutely fixed as regards certain lines of railway, for instance, at terminal points or divisional centres that run a little beyond or fall a little short of the limiting meridian. In that case the Interstate Commerce Commission in the United States has the power, and our Railway Board here will have the power, to extend or set back the time within the zone for the traffic on that line.

Mr. McMASTER: In section 2 a certain interpretation is given to standard time. I think, therefore, it will be necessary to make section 5 agree with that. I would also suggest that the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners should be only in accordance with the Act, that is to say, their powers to make this change should be no wider than the terms of the Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is done, is it not? In the first place, as to time, section 5 says:

The Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada shall have power to advance by one hour the standard time.

It is standard time that has been adopted. Then as regards the carrying out of the power, the section goes on to say:

—and to make such orders as may be necessary for the convenient carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

They cannot go beyond the provision of this Act. Does not my hon. friend think that is sufficiently safeguarded?

Mr. BUREAU: The period of time for which they can make the order is not limited?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They have to conform to the the Act, and the time during which the Act is operative is prescribed by the Order in Council. It does not seem to me they can get further than that. It is just as binding upon them as though the times were stated in the Act.

Mr. MORPHY: When I spoke I had not the Bill before me, but it struck me that this Parliament, in the method of expression in the section, is not exercising its functions over the Railway Board. The section reads:

The Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada shall have power to advance by one hour the standard time used by railway companies in Canada.

Why not make it imperative that they shall advance the time? Why give them

an option? Unless this Parliament makes up its mind as to what they shall do, and unless this Bill makes it clear that they shall do it, there is bound to be confusion if they do not follow the Bill. There may be reasons why they should not advance the time; there may be reasons why they should.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would think that this gives all the power that is necessary. The Act in the first place, shows its intention. The Board of Railway Commissioners, making arrangements for the railways are given power to advance the standard time by one hour. In some cases they may not require to advance it by that hour, for instance, in the case of a junction point which is just short of the meridian at which the time changes. If my hon. friend will look at a railway map of the United States, he will find instance after instance in which the railways do not run on standard time right up to the meridian point, simply because it would upset matters and be generally disadvantageous to do so in those cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Our conditions with regard to latitude and longitude are about the same as the United States, and we should follow them as closely as possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose there will be no question raised that this Bill does not apply to Government Railways. Section 5 refers to "railway companies," but Government railways are not railway companies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be impossible for them to work out of joint with the other railways.

Mr. McKENZIE: I presume the intention is that this legislation shall apply to all railways. I was just bringing to the notice of the minister the wording of the section.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no objection to inserting after "railway companies" the words, "including Government railways."

Mr. McKENZIE: That would remove all doubt.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On the preamble:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The preamble will have to be changed to accommodate itself to the change made in the Act. I therefore beg to move that the words "solar mean time" be struck out and the words "accepted standard time" be substituted therefor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the preamble is adopted I should like to ask the minister if there has been any pronounced demand for legislation of this nature, and if so, from what quarters it has come. It seems to me this legislation is introducing a disturbing element into the country and so far as I can see there is absolutely no need for it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have already laid on the Table a list of the public bodies and companies by whom application has been made for this legislation. There is a very general desire all through Canada by all branches of industry and business for the adoption of the Daylight Saving Bill. With reference to the farmers, as I stated in my explanation of the Bill, there is a fear that it may work prejudicially to their interests so far as keeping labour at work during the latter part of the day is concerned, and a number of representations from farmers' organizations and municipal councils, as well as individual opinions voiced here in the House, have come to the department not favouring the legislation; but as we progressed in the discussion of the question the other day, the objections to this legislation were all pretty thoroughly thrashed out, I think, and the consensus of opinion in the House seemed to be that the Bill would work advantage to the greater number. I laid stress on the experience of other countries. Exactly the same fears were expressed in Great Britain and France, and the United States as have been expressed here, and when it came to the practical working out of the measure, those fears were proved to be groundless to a very large extent if not altogether. Experience has taught that a measure of this kind is of very great benefit, and is not, on the whole, detrimental to the farming interests.

Mr. McMASTER: Has any association of farmers told the minister they were in favour of this legislation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: At a very large meeting indeed, representative of western farmers and of persons intimately connected with the farming districts in Saskatchewan, including reeves and other municipal officials, this matter came up and a resolution was passed favouring the Daylight Saving Bill. That voiced a widespread opinion in the province of Saskatchewan, which is a representative farming

community, and ought to be taken as pretty well indicative of the farmers' feelings.

Mr. McMASTER: It would seem to me that people who grow grain almost exclusively are hardly representative of farmers; they are specialists. Before the preamble passes, I should just like to put this on record. I am the representative of an agricultural community in eastern Canada and since this legislation was before this House for discussion on the last occasion, I have made it my business to find out from the farmers in my county what they thought about it. One of the leading farmers writes me as follows:

> In regard to the Daylight Saving Bill, my opinion is that it is worse than useless in these eastern provinces. During hoeing, haying, and harvesting, of both grain and root crops, they are so wet with the dew that we cannot do much with them before seven, and sometimes it is eight o'clock or even later before they are dry enough to work in. One hour from five to six in the evening is worth three or four early in the morning, especially during the haying and harvesting time. However, I think that the farmers will not pay much attention to it; but men who work by the day in haying and harvesting time may want to commence one hour sooner in the morning and stop one hour earlier at night. If so, I think it will be a discouraging feature to a Greater Production campaign.

That is the evidence of a practical farmer in the county of Brome, and a member of the Quebec Council of Agriculture. I put these matters before the minister, because it seems to me that, however useful the work done by people in their backyards may be in the way of growing vegetables and other products, the man we have to depend upon for greater production in the country this coming season is the farmer, and I am very much afraid that the minister is running counter to the best opinion of the informed agriculturists in the country East and West, and especially in the East.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the application received from the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta, I should like to point out that conditions in western Canada are very different from conditions in Ontario. The daylight is much longer in those provinces than in Ontario. They do not have the heavy dews that we have in the older provinces. That fact is quite apparent to every one, and, consequently, it is not going to affect them to any marked extent. I was a little surprised at the minister stating that applications had been received from practically all industries and businesses. If agriculture is not an industry or business in this country, I should like to know what is. I think it will be generally conceded that the most important industry that we have in Canada at this particular time is farming. I say most emphatically that little consideration has been given to the need for greater production by the introduction of this Bill at the present time. I believe consideration has been given to those who are anxious to have more time for recreation and pleasure rather than for production. I think that this is not the proper time to introduce this measure, and I believe the minister would be well advised, in view of the serious condition confronting us, if he would hold this legislation back until some time in the future, when conditions will not be as serious as they are at present. If the people in towns and cities are anxious to extend the daylight, as they term it, they have absolute power to do so. They can pass legislation for that purpose when it does not affect any one but themselves, but you are going to make this measure apply to other people, who will be very seriously and very materially affected. I believe this Bill will prove more disastrous to the cause of agricultural production in this country than the propaganda that is being waged for greater production will accomplish. I think it will much more than offset anything that will be gained by the propaganda. I expressed my views on this matter when the Bill was up for second reading, and I desire now to make myself clear, and to warn the Government that this is a very inopportune time to introduce legislation, which, I am quite confident, has been largely urged by people who are anxious to have more time for leisure and sport at a time when such matters ought to be foreign to our minds.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the introduction of this Bill. It shows that he is progressive and is meeting the demands and desires of the people generally throughout the Dominion. There has been some objection to the Bill, and I do not think it is altogether becoming to those who have raised the objection when we consider what the large cities and the smaller cities and towns are doing to assist in greater production. Take the city of Toronto with its large population: we are told by one of the city members of the great production in Toronto in the backyards. The Council of the city of Toronto last year granted the sum of $2,500, and certain citizens also made contributions, and alto-

gether six or seven thousand dollars was raised to assist in greater production, and to educate the boys and girls of the city. The Rotary Club, which has had this matter in hand, raised this amount of money. They first secured a supervisor, an expert on soil and seed, who gave instructions and lectures to the boys and girls of the city. To illustrate the result of that movement, this year the farmers made application to the city for many of the boys who assisted them last year. Altogether they applied for some 15,000 boys to assist in greater production. I may say further that this movement has a tendency to interest the boys and girls in the work, and to create a desire for greater freedom and open air in the country than they have enjoyed in the past. Thousands of those boys and girls who have gone to the farm to do the seeding and other work will drift back eventually and become permanent residents of the outlying districts. Surely that is a consideration. We are getting greater numbers from the city, and we will educate them along the line of freedom and open air. There has been some opposition, although not a unanimous opposition, from the farmers throughout the Dominion. One hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon is a very extensive farmer in the West, and he expressed his approval of the measure. Many others have done so. Therefore, I think, after the debates which have taken place in connection with this Bill, that it is a move in the right direction, and will benefit the farmer. The farmers may not feel the benefit at the moment, but in a very short time they will be surprised at the response which will come from the cities, towns and villages in the way of assistance. I therefore, congratulate the hon. minister on bringing this measure forward at this time. He is progressive and desires that the young Canadians shall be in advance of the young people of the great country to the south. They are a few weeks in advance of us in the United States, and, although they are a great and progressive people, we want to show them that we are up to date, and that in a short time we will be ahead of them in this matter.

Mr. SMITH: I expressed my views last year as fully as I thought desirable, but I desire to refer to an article which appeared in one of the Ottawa papers, which had all the earmarks of being inspired, which stated that no supporter of the Government had a right to express an opinion in opposition to any measure the Government submitted to this House. I desire to say, as a supporter of this Government, not as its slave, that my idea in connection with this Bill is that they have not touched one of the great fundamental principles of agriculture, namely the details of farming. My view, after long years of experience with many of our leading public men, is that, whilst they may know a good deal about some things in connection with farming, they do not know enough of the details which go to make up farm life and which go to make a really prosperous farmer. We are told the farmer can do as he likes. I know that I can go to bed when I like, no matter whether the Bill passes or not, and I can get up when I like; but I cannot control my men. The whistles are blowing and the bells are ringing in the surrounding towns, and when the city men get through their work at five o'clock, do you mean to tell me I can control my men? I say no. If I could appeal to the hon. minister, my appeal would be along the lines of the remarks of the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that the hon. minister should, for a time at least, withdraw this Bill. It appears to me that the time is inopportune, and that the enforcement of such a measure would be irritating and disturbing, especially when you consider that our boys across the water are being battered in every possible way. This Government should have bigger and greater things to consider than this Daylight Savings Bill.

Mr. ARGUE: The minister has made reference to a public body in Saskatchewan representing the farmers asking for this Bill. I would like to know what body in Saskatchewan that is. I represent a constituency in Saskatchewan, and there is only one association there that has the right to speak for the farmers. That is the Grain Growers' Association. Is that the association which asks for it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No; neither for nor against in so far as they are concerned.

Bill reported.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved second reading of Bill No. 5, to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Are the amendments contained in this Bill detailed amendments to the various clauses, or are they following a principle, or are they for the purpose

of changing or improving the administration of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's first statement is absolutely correct; they are detailed amendments clause by clause, and there is no general principle running through them whatever. They do not in any way radically amend or change the principle of the Dominion Lands Act. There is no fundamental change except the feature of the Bill which I referred to on its introduction, namely, that which confirms an Order in Council withdrawing altogether Dominion lands from purchased homesteading and pre-emption.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

Mr. McKENZIE: These amendments are so extensive that it is almost a pity that the minister did not consolidate the Act. It disturbs, perhaps necessarily, the previous Act very much, and I think it would have been almost as well to have consolidated the Act entirely in order that when one gets the Act as consolidated he will have the whole of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are close to the date of a general consolidation of the Dominion statutes. I do not think the amendments are of sufficient importance to warrant one in bringing in a new Dominion Lands Act for the reason, embodied in the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), that there is no fundamental change in principle. They are amendments in the strictest sense.

On section 1—Declaration as to improvements prior to entry and valuation by homestead inspector:

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand this rightly, it is to give sanction to the clause which existed in the old Act which left it to the judgment of the minister to cancel the entry if the improvements were not reported by the entrant. Now you cannot grant entry unless he who makes application first discloses the improvements which are made either by himself or by his predecessor or predecessors—is that the change which is made?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The old Act was worded something like this: that the applicant for entry should make a declaration as to the value of the improvements, if any, that were on the land, and it was provided that later on the minister had power of cancellation in the event of anything false being so declared.

5 p.m.

[Mr. Bureau.]

The purpose of this amendment is to give legality to what has been the practice of the department, that is, in each case to make compulsory a statutory declaration, to provide for a homestead inspector's report and to provide that the improvements must be paid for. That is not provided for, I think, in the old Act. I have just sent for a copy, but there are no copies in this building at the present time, and we can only get them by sending to another building. This provision legalizes the existing practice of requiring that the homestead inspector's report must be received. Then the amount of the improvements must be paid by the applicant. Furthermore, it provides that where there is a seed grain mortgage registered against land on the records of the department the amount to be paid by the applicant, before the entry can be completed, shall include the amount of the mortgage, that is in so far as the seed grain mortgage exceeds the amount of the improvement. Of course, the original entrant gets the value of the improvements, and the Government is enabled to get rid of the entire seed grain mortgage.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the minister give me a concrete case? I do not exactly understand what is meant with respect to improvements and the excess value of the seed grain mortgage. Supposing I make entry on a piece of land, and my predecessor has made $500 worth of improvement but owes $500 for seed grain?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then you would have to pay $500.

Mr. BUREAU: That amount only?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The Government reserves to itself the right to collect from the men who bought the seed grain; that is the mortgagor, the amount of the mortgage, and there is no discretion in the matter of paying it back?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the case my hon. friend refers to, where there were improvements to the value of $500 and a seed grain mortgage of the same amount, the entrant would have to pay that $500, which amount would go first to the credit of the former entrant who had abandoned the land or whose patent had been cancelled. Then it would be placed against his obligation for seed grain, thereby discharging that obligation, and we would get our money back.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the money is paid to the Crown?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Had there been no seed grain mortgage the minister would have had power to give that $500 to the former entrant. Now we simply absorb it to satisfy the seed grain mortgage. If the seed grain mortgage had been $600 he would have had to pay the whole of that sum, and the minister then could give the excess of $100 to the former owner.

Mr. KEEFER: I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior how the law would operate in the case of a man who had placed a mortgage on his homestead in order to buy a tractor?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. No man could mortgage his homestead to buy a tractor. The only way a homestead could be mortgaged is for seed grain under a special Act. The case he cites is not in point.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the Government or the minister, ascertain the value of those improvements?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under clause A.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand the practice to be that if a man goes in and takes an entry on land, and fails to comply with the regulations, and is either ejected—I believe there is a process of that kind sometimes—or abandons the place, but has made some improvements before abandoning it, the Government still recognizes his right to be paid for his improvements? In such event how is the value ascertained?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not recognize it as a right, but the minister has had power—at all events he has exercised the power for many years—of transferring the value of these improvements as paid by the new entrant to the old entrant if he could be found. It was not always done, but virtually always. It was not paid to him as a right, he could not have sued for it, but as a matter of course, the value was given to him. He had improved the land to that extent and it was felt to be his money. The value is ascertained on the basis of an inspector's report, and the entrant has to make a declaration as to what he deems the value should be. If the amount is too low he has to pay the balance before the entry is completed. If the amount is too high then he gets a repayment. If the man makes a false declaration he will not get the entry at all.

Mr. BUREAU: Are these powers exercised by the minister himself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, not by the Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does not the minister think the clause is too severe altogether? The law which it is now sought to amend reads as follows:

> A person applying for entry for a homestead, a preemption, or a purchased homestead, shall declare, before being granted entry, what improvements, if any, there are upon the land with respect to which his application is made, and shall pay the value of such improvements,—

Should he fail to make such declaration his entry shall be liable to cancellation in the discretion of the minister. Now, as I understand the amendment, the party who seeks to make entry is bound to declare what improvements there are upon the land, and to pay at once what charges there may be upon it. Would it not be preferable to wait a little while before exacting a payment? The entrant may be a poor man, and if you require him to at once pay whatever charges there may be on the land he may not be able to do so. On the other hand, if you allow him to work his homestead for a few years his circumstances may be improved to an extent that will enable him to defray whatever charges have to be met. I am afraid that if you compel an entrant to pay these charges immediately upon applying for entry on the land which has been deserted by its previous owner you will possibly prevent him from making entry, whereas if you allow him to work the homestead he may get more firmly on his feet and obtain that improvement in his circumstances which will make it easier for him to pay the necessary charges. Of course, the Government must have sufficient protection in cases of this kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The applicant has always been compelled to pay at once the value of the improvements, it being recognized, doubtless, that he got the benefit at once of the existing improvements. For example, if there was a house on the land he got the advantage of that house and was thus able to enter upon and cultivate the land more quickly than he otherwise could, and therefore enjoyed greater benefit by reason of the fact. There has been no hardship in the past in collecting the value of the improvements. My right hon. friends' remarks may have greater weight with regard to the case of seed grain, fodder, and other relief. The new entrant does not get the benefit of that; the former entrant gets the benefit of the seed grain,

fodder, and other relief. So far as we have carried out the practice which will be here made law. We have not given anything to any one abandoning a homestead where there was a seed grain mortgage against it unless he paid the amount due. It may be worth considering whether or not the minister should not have the power to grant an entry subject to the payment of the amount of the seed grain mortgage, in so far as it exceeded the amount of the improvements, such amount to be paid prior to the issue of the patent. I would rather have the legislation go through in this form because these seed grain mortgages have been due since the spring of 1915. We have not been quite as successful in collecting them as we had hoped. Approximately half have been collected, but there would seem to be no reason why more should not be collected. However, the utmost efforts have been made to get them in, and all concerned are most anxious to exert every possible pressure to attain this end. By "all concerned" I mean the farming communities and organizations themselves. The farmers' organizations and loan organizations are most anxious that these liens be removed as rapidly as possible. While liens against abandoned homesteads may have to be taken up by homesteaders who have a little money, it seems to me that the advantage we get is well worth that discrimination, if you call it such, in their favour. We will get the money in, whereas if we let it stand until the man gets his patent, he may postpone the getting of his patent a considerable time, and cause us to be out of our money that much longer.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Has any provision been made for the collecting of taxes which may be due on a homestead, which has been abandoned, for the municipality or school district in which the land is situated?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not looked into that point, but my belief is that the homesteader's interest in the land is taxable, but once his interest is gone and the land reverts to the Crown, the right of the municipality to that tax lapses.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—cancellation and compensation for improvements:

Mr. BUREAU: What is the difference between this and the similar clause of the old Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the old Act compensation could be paid to the former entrant, but now power is taken to pay it to any dependent. There are some cases where a homesteader abandons his land and his wife and family at the same time. Under the old Act we had power, if we could find the man who had skipped out and was the least deserving of all, to give the money to him. We could not give it to those who were most deserving of it and who had been deserted.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the only change?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On sections 3 and 4—requirements for homestead letters patent; computation of period for performance of requirements.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the word "residence" in this section mean from the time that the man takes possession, or from the time that he begins to reside on the land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Begins to reside on the land.

Mr. McKENZIE: That means he must have a house and live in it before he is a resident?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not like the word "shifted" in line 42; I think the word "changed" would be a better one. We do not shift dates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I brought this matter to the attention of the draftsman, who informed me that this clause was before a committee of Parliament last session and was approved in this very language. I believe also that it is the language that was used prior to 1908 when the same principle was invoked. In 1908 stricter rules were adopted as to computation of residence, and it is now desired to come back to the more lenient rule. Cases of great hardship have arisen. Under the rules as amended a man might reside for thirty-five months on his land and still not have covered the necessary eighteen months in occupation of the land. In fact it was found to be impracticable to be fair and just to homesteaders and at the same time follow strictly the rules laid down. The proposed change gives a wider scope; it enables us to compute the residence years in one of two different ways, or part in one and part in another. In every case, of course, a man has to put in six months of residence in each of three separate years. I do not know why the word "changed" would not do just as well as the word "shifted," though per-

haps "shifted" is a little more comprehensive.

Mr. McMASTER: It may be western, but it is not good English. I would ask the minister to agree to that change. I should not like to be a member of a legislature which talks about "shifting" dates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am agreeable to the change.

Mr. BUREAU: The old section provided that only in the case of unsurveyed lands could the date of residence be computed as before entry. When a settler went on a piece of land that was not surveyed and made entry after it had been surveyed, he had the privilege of having his entry computed as from the date of his commencing residence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is provided for in another section. That is the law.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On section 1—declaration as to improvements prior to entry, and valuation by homestead inspector:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move, inasmuch as from a date about two weeks ago, purchased homesteads and pre-emptions cannot be entered for, that section 1 should have these words in lines 7 and 8 omitted:

For a homestead, a pre-emption or a purchased homestead.

The clause will then read:

A person applying for entry shall declare.

Mr. BUREAU: The word "entry," I suppose, covers everything in accordance with the interpretation section at the beginning of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

On section 5—absence on military or naval service, and for three months after discharge, to be counted as residence:

Mr. BUREAU: This adds the naval service and service with the Allies, which were not in the old Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. Under the old Act any one engaged as a member of a military force enrolled under the authority of the Minister of Militia and engaged as a member of that force in the suppression of an outbreak or insurrection in any part of the British Empire, or in the defence of the British Empire against a foreign power, is entitled to the benefits therein set out. He is entitled to count as residence the time during which he was so engaged and also three months after his discharge. This amendment extends those benefits to members of the British and Allied forces, and it also includes within the scope of the section-holders of purchased homesteads or scrip locations. Not only are homesteaders so entitled, but men who are in the position of having purchased homesteads, and purchasers of South African scrip locations, are also included.

Mr. ARGUE: I would like some information with regard to our soldiers who are at present overseas. Last week I received a letter from Major Cameron who enlisted in the city of Swift Current, and I know many other men who went from there who, before they went away, were given to understand that their time of enlistment would apply on their homesteads. Some of them entered for their homesteads before they enlisted; some of them entered after they enlisted. Major Cameron informs me that the time of those men in his company who entered for a homestead after enlistment does not apply on their homesteads. I do not see why such a distinction should be made. I do not see why the time of a man who entered for a homestead yesterday and enlists to-day should apply on his homestead, while the time of a man who enlists to-day and enters for a homestead to-morrow is not permitted to apply on his homestead. Both men are fighting for their country. They may be men from the same place, perhaps even boys on neighbouring farms, and they may have enlisted in the same battalion the same day. One man on his return will receive the title to his homestead, while the other is told he cannot have it unless he puts in eighteen months' homestead duties. Is that the meaning of this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the meaning of this section at all, but speaking generally, my hon. friend's statement of the law is correct. What we are doing is simply amending and extending the benefits of section 22 as it has always read. I may, however, answer what my hon. friend asks. Under the ministry of my predecessor that rule was adopted, and personally I find no fault with it. At first sight it appeared to me to be an arbitrary distinction, but I think it is founded on a sound principle. It is, indeed, the principle recognized in this section as it has always existed. A man who is a bona fide homesteader and who

then enlists in His Majesty's forces, or in an allied force, if he has been a resident of Canada, is entitled to credit in his residence duties all the time occupied during his enlistment. There was a body of opinion that urged that the same advantage should be given to the man who homesteaded after his enlistment; that he should also be allowed to count the time occupied during his enlistment as residence on his homestead, but I think a few moments' serious reflection will show that that would open the door to a very great abuse of the homesteading privilege. If that were to be granted, then it would only be reasonable to expect a flood of entries from every one who enlisted, who did not, perhaps, intend to become a bona fide homesteader at all, but by the mere act of entering after enlistment, he, if he were enlisted for three years, would be entitled to a free grant of land, merely upon having certain improvements done. In that way the whole settlement provisions of the Act would be obliterated. The whole spirit and purpose of the Homestead Act would be so abused as to be practically wiped out. It is true, when you come to distinguish, as my hon. friend does, between the case of a man who homesteads the day before he enlists and the case of a man who homesteads the day after he enlists, the distinction appears very arbitrary, because between those two there is virtually no distinction; but the line of demarcation must be found between one case of a bona fide homesteader and the other, and that is the only place I know of to locate the line. In the case, however, of those who have homesteaded after enlistment, consideration has been shown. They have been granted protection of their homesteads while they are on duty. That land is reserved for the soldier so long as he is on active service, and will be reserved for a sufficient length of time to enable him to locate on it after he returns. That will be his homestead, entirely irrespective of his right of entry under the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Mr. ARGUE: According to the minister's ruling, it would seem that all that is required to make a man a bona fide homesteader is that he go on his homestead one day before he enlists.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the extreme case.

Mr. McMASTER: I notice that the soldier is allowed three months after his discharge to go on his homestead. The question arises in my mind whether that period is quite sufficient. When the war is over we expect there will be a great dearth of shipping, and in the case of a Belgian or French reservist discharged in Belgium or France, there might be a delay of several months before he could get passage home. Has the minister considered that point?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under this Act we can give him as much time as we wish in which to take up his residence duties. All that this Act fixes is that the time during which he is absent on military duty shall count as residence on his homestead plus three months more. I do not think it would be well to extend that three months. I fancy that in the great majority of cases it will not be necessary, because the residence duties will already be done.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the minister considered whether it might not be advisable to extend this privilege to any man serving in the forces? I see that it is provided that the minister may "permit him to resume his residence upon his homestead, preemption, purchased homestead or land located by him under any land warrant or scrip," and it says that the time "may" be counted as residence. Why not use the word "shall" if this provision is solely for the benefit of the entrant?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The word "may" is almost invariably used in association with the conduct of the minister, and in this case I think it is the better word. There may be an exceptional case where it would be deemed justice not to apply the rule at all.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there a provision that the wife can take over the homestead in the case of the husband's death?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In case of death the patent is granted forthwith and in the name of the deceased soldier. This has been done by Order in Council ever since some date in 1915, and we are now making statutory what is now law by virtue of the Order in Council of that date. If a man is so disabled as not to be able to resume his duties his patent is granted to him. If he is killed the patent is granted in his name just the same as if he had lived.

Mr. NESBITT: His heirs would have to take out letters of administration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. CROWE: Suppose there is a certain sum of money due on the purchase price in the case of a soldier who has been killed, and that his widow who has remained on

the land while her husband is overseas cannot afford to pay the balance; what would the Government do in a case of that kind?

Mr. MEIGHEN: She could raise the money on the land.

Mr. CROWE: Is it right to ask a woman who has given her husband to the country to raise this money? She may be bringing up three or four children on the land, and that is surely a benefit to the State. I think there should be some clause in the Act providing for a case of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So long as the woman is able to raise the money and get the patent, there is no difficulty in her way except the financial one. Of course, if we were to take the ground that wherever there is a debt to the Crown by the widow of a deceased soldier, that debt should be cancelled, we would be open to the charge of inequality because it would hardly be fair to treat the widows of soldiers who were indebted to the Crown on one scale, and the widows of soldiers who had discharged their indebtedness on another scale. There can be no inconvenience to the widow in paying her debt so long as she gets the land immediately. She gets the patent and pays what indebtedness there may be due on the land to the Crown.

Mr. BUREAU: I agree with the minister's contention if the indebtedness has been paid off after the soldier has been enrolled. But I do not see why the widow should get the refund if the deceased soldier had discharged his indebtedness before he enlisted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose there are two men side by side; one man pays off his indebtedness because he owes it, and is able to; the other man is also able to pay, we will suppose, but does not do so, because he is getting the money at five per cent. My hon. friend would say that in the case of this second man, if his widow paid while her husband was at the front, the money should be refunded to her, but that in the case of the other one who is honest enough to pay before going to the front, the money should not be refunded?

Mr. BUREAU: I assume that these people are honest and that they will pay when they have the money. My hon. friend assumes that they won't pay when they have the money, preferring to have the use of the money at 5 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are both honest.

Mr. BUREAU: Then why not alleviate the widow's burden without necessarily having to refund to the other woman the money that has been paid? The woman in the second case is on the land with her children and is not deprived of anything; she has everything the farm has produced. The two cases I submit are not on all fours. However, I do not take any exception.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend would penalize the one who was prompt and pay a premium to the one who was not prompt.

Mr. BUREAU: I assume they are both honest.

Mr. CAMPBELL: As to the question raised by my hon. friend regarding the different status of a man who entered, either before enlistment or immediately after, it seems to me this matter is passed over rather lightly. I recognize the contention of the Minister in this respect, that there must be some arbitrary line drawn, but surely not one quite so arbitrary as suggested. The point is that the man should be a bona fide entrant. Should there not be some way of providing what a bona fide entrant is? I know of young men who enlisted early in the war who did not know about this regulation, but when it became known, others made entry for homestead, and they were put in a different position entirely from those who first enlisted, because if they entered after they enlisted they would have a different standing entirely from those who entered before enlisting. It would seem to be quite reasonable that there should be some clause setting out what a bona fide entrant is—some provision such as that a man must be on the ground, or must have done something in connection with the land, to make him a bona fide entrant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are cases, no doubt, of inequality under this law. As I stated before, I was impressed with the need for a change when the question was first addressed to me. At that time I was not minister of this department. I took the matter up with the officials and the minister of the department, and I was persuaded that the line was drawn in the best possible way. I do not know of any rule that could be adopted that would better determine the bona fides of an entrant, or better determine his right to be considered a homesteader that the fact that he entered his land, paid his entrance fee, and committed himself to his homestead quarter section. Some better rule might be discovered, and if the hon. gentleman would

think the matter out, and make a specific suggestion, I would be very glad to consider it. But we must remember that up to this point, in the administration of the department, entrants who made their entry, and then enlisted, got the benefit of this provision. You have to bear in mind that, up to the present time, they got the benefit of this provision. What the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan suggested was not that you should go back, but taking the case of the man actually residing on the land, that you should not only give him the right, but extend the right to others who had not resided on the land. I was combatting that suggestion. If my hon. friend would suggest a specific rule as to a fairer test to apply to decide whether the homesteader should get the right to count his enlistment time as homestead time. I would be very glad to consider it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: My idea is that it should be either one thing or the other, either along the line suggested by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan, to put them all on the same footing, by giving everybody the right, or along the other line, and provide that no one shall be given the right, unless he is a bona fide entrant. But the word "bona fide" should be defined in some way.

Mr. REDMAN: This question of allowing time to count in the case of a soldier filing subsequent to enlistment has been brought to my attention hundreds of times. On several occasions when regiments were going overseas from Calgary almost the entire regiment went down and filed, which, of course, would be subsequent to enlistment. This matter has been brought to my attention by men who have pointed out the extreme cases cited by the minister. I quite realize, that if we should make an absolute rule we might have difficulty in that others who are overseas might file, and so practically all the available suitable land would thus be taken up and not developed. I would suggest that the matter should be carefully considered with the view of providing, if it is at all possible that those who have already filed subsequent to enlistment should be given their homesteads. I do not know the number who have so filed, but the relative importance of the question can be better understood when the number is ascertained. There is a great feeling of unrest in regard to these cases.

Another matter which has to be taken into consideration is the Soldiers' Land Settlement Scheme. It seems to me there might not be sufficient suitable land to give a homestead to each soldier under this Act, and also provide for him under the Land Settlement Scheme. It is very possible that if the regulations should allow them to keep the homesteads under this Act they might have to keep them in lieu of the land they would obtain under the Soldiers' Land Settlement Scheme. If we had the information as to the number who have filed we would then know whether it is possible to grant them this privilege.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend from Calgary will bear in mind that if all enlisted men who have entered and homesteaded recently were granted this privilege, then we would be in difficulties with the other man who had not entered. He would say: "You said you would not count my enlistment time; therefore I did not enlist, and you have discriminated against me grossly." I do not know what answer you could give him. Therefore I think, subject to any suggestion that may be made, that we had better stick to the rules we made, especially because it is not improbable that many of the returned soldiers, in view of the privilege that is granted them of making the soldier entry as well as the homestead entry, will want to abandon the entry they have made and will want to re-enter again, in a locality where they can have the homestead and soldier entry together. In view of that, I think there would be very great difficulty encountered if we receded from the rule we have followed so long.

On section 6—issue of Letters Patent to British subjects only:

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister realizes, I suppose, that he is departing from the English common law. This is the first time, I think, in the history of legislation in any British country that we have drawn this distinction. At English common law an alien can hold all kinds of property except property in shipping. That has been the law for ages and the minister is now departing from it. It is a very radical change and it ought to be very carefully considered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is not quite accurate in his dates. This has been the law ever since we have had homesteads in Canada. An entrant could not, while he was an alien, get a patent of land. It does not change the law in that regard at all. He can hold property but he cannot get a patent. He cannot get any homestead privileges in this country, and he never

has been able to in so far as I know. Under the law as it stood an exception was made in the case of the legal representative of a deceased entrant and also an entrant who had become insane or mentally incapable. Those exceptions have existed since 1908, and the effect of this amendment is to add three other exceptions of a very similar character. The principle which my hon. friend suggests as being violated has not been a principle in regard to our homesteads since we have had homesteads in this country.

Mr. McKENZIE: I concede the superior knowledge of my hon. friend as to these dates, but at the same time there seems to be no principle in this Bill. A foreigner can come to Ontario and buy land and there is nothing in our jurisprudence to prevent it. He can buy a farm, put his deed on record, and he owns it; but his brother, who comes from the same country and who has in every particular the same qualifications, cannot get land in the Northwest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can buy land, but he cannot get a free homestead.

Mr. McKENZIE: I cannot, on any principle of law, recognize any difference between a man qualifying himself by going through the different stages to get land in the West, where he has to go through this homesteading process, and a man, who has the money, coming in and buying a farm. You can buy a farm in Ontario while at the same time being an alien. I cannot see the force of the objection to a man under similar conditions going through the different stages to qualify himself to get a farm in the West, and if he qualifies himself to get a title, putting it on record just as the same person could buy a farm in one of the older provinces. There may be a reason, but so far I have heard no sufficient explanation.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Canadian Indemnity Company.—Mr. Allan.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Spinney.

Bill No. 9, respecting Fraser Lumber Company, Limited, and Fraser Companies, Limited.—Mr. Elkin.

Bill No. 22, respecting The Canadian Society of Civil Engineers and to change its name to "The Engineering Institute of Canada."—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate Merchants Casualty Company.—Mr. Andrews.

Bill No. 24, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company. —Mr. Fripp.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 5, to amend The Dominion Lands Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think all the paragraphs have been read. With reference to paragraph (e) of section 6, dealing with an alien female infant who has been granted entry for a homestead, and who is prevented from becoming a British subject by the provisions of the Naturalization Act of 1914, I would like the minister to give me a concrete example of such a case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Take, for instance, the case of a woman who complies with the conditions enabling her to get entry and who marries an alien. She is not empowered under the provisions of the Naturalization Act to naturalize, consequently she could not qualify to get her patent at all unless this provision was inserted.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Area of cultivation may be reduced.

Mr. BUREAU: Under the old Act the power to state the area of cultivation required was a matter for the Governor in Council, whilst this amendment brings it directly under the jurisdiction of the minister. Is there any particular reason why the change should be made?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the former law, in case of pre-emption as distinguished from cases of homesteads, the whole township had to be declared of the character set out here in order to enable any pre-emptor to have his cultivation reduced. In that case, one-half of the township might be incapable of having the requisite duties performed on any quarter-section, and the other half might be just the other way. Indeed, you might have a case in which the law could be applied to one-half of the section and not to the other half. The first object of this amendment, there-

fore, is to permit a distinction between one pre-emption and another pre-emption, not between one township and another township. That being the case, it becomes desirable that the necessity for an Order in Council should be dispensed with. The recommendations are made on the report of the homestead inspector in each case, and I do not see any value in the intervention of the Governor in Council. In other instances also the necessity for Order in Council is being dispensed with. The time of Council has been taken up with the reading of Orders in which members of Council do not take any interest, and which of necessity must be a matter of administration, to be left to the responsible minister.

Mr. BUREAU: In the official Gazette I often see recommendations by the minister to extend the time of a man's residence on a homestead and the like.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be in the case of a homesteader. The Order in Council would set out that that particular homesteader was relieved of his duty, but in the case of a pre-emptor the power was given to place townships, not single pre-emptions, in that category.

Mr. BUREAU: The publishing of those Orders in Council in the Gazette must serve as an official report available to the public, and also as a precedent in the case of further applications of a like nature being made. Unless there is some objection other than that of taking Council's time in reading the recommendations, I do not see why this change should be made. Otherwise, there is no way of ascertaining what changes are made or what conditions are required by the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The regulations are known to homesteaders who can easily secure copies of them, and who therefore know the conditions under which their cultivation duties may be reduced. I do not think the public generally are sufficiently interested in whether a certain homesteader has his ploughing duties reduced from thirty to twenty acres to warrant the publication of each Order in Council in the Gazette.

Mr. BUREAU: But the settler is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The settler is, but he knows it without reading the Gazette. I doubt if there is one settler in the whole West who takes the official Gazette.

Mr. BUREAU: If some one made an application to my hon. friend in the course of his practice of law with regard to the reduction of cultivation duties, my hon. friend would probably refer to the Gazette.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I were the practising lawyer I would go to the regulations and there find the conditions under which my client was entitled to apply for a reduction of cultivation duties. The reduction would then be made, and my client would have a letter from the department, stating that his area had been reduced. That is all the authority he needs; I do not think that either the laywer or the entrant would look at the official Gazette.

Mr. BUREAU: No, but there should be a general rule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only rule you can have is in the regulations. One man might have a homestead in which thirty acres would be required; another right across the road might have a homestead where eighteen acres would be required, and some one else to the north might have one where twenty-five would be required—all depending on the varying character of the soil.

Mr. BUREAU: It is concentrating everything in the minister's hands.

Mr. MYERS: I suggest to the minister that he incorporate in this provision some discretionary power to reduce the area of cultivation where land becomes flooded, and it is impossible to get under cultivation the number of acres required by the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see no objection to inserting the word "flooded" after the words "wooded, rocky."

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 8—holder may obtain patent by extra payments where he is in default for residence duties solely:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the law as it stands now and has stood for about three years the pre-emptor who has obtained patents for his homestead and is in residence on either his homestead or his pre-emption may, if he has done his cultivation duties and effected the necessary improvements, secure his patent by simply paying up. Previous to three years ago that was not the case; the pre-emptor had to complete his residence duties as well in respect of pre-emption, and might complete them on the homestead. This rule was relaxed three years ago to the extent of enabling him, if he continued in residence after he was through with his homestead duties and had

his patents, to dispense with all the other residence duties by simply paying up. Cases, however, arose where the homesteader who had pre-empted left his homestead, forsook his residence duties altogether, came back and reinstated himself as a resident on the homestead, and then demanded his patent on the payment of $3 an acre. Cases of hardship arose where the department had to require such a man to perform his three years' residence duties. This provision, therefore, is to enable the department to give him this answer: you have abandoned your residence duties; if you do not want to go ahead and perform them you must pay $3 an acre extra for the land. There are cases where men who are in business want to avoid the necessity of the residence duties, and where it is felt that it would be equitable to allow them to do so on paying that extra price for the land.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—certificate of recommendation to holder of entry for a pre-emption on completing all duties except payment:

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that certificate to have the same value, so far as the rights of the entrant on the land are concerned, as if he had the patent? He can dispose of his interest?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: But before the patent is issued, the patentee, or whoever gets his interest in the land, has to pay the purchase price. What is the particular object of this? Has there been any hardship on the homesteader because he could not get the money?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. members who were in the last Parliament will remember that this subject was pressed upon the House by the hon. member who then represented Saskatoon. Very many cases arise where the holder of a pre-emption owes the pre-emption moneys to the Crown. He has performed his cultivation duty; he desires to raise a loan with which to pay off the Crown; but he cannot do so; he can do nothing at all with his land until he secures his patent. In order to meet difficulties of that kind in relation to homesteads, there previously was a provision in the law for granting certificates of recommendation for homesteads, but those were abolished in 1908. There was not the same reason for the certificate of recommendation for homesteads that there existed for certificates of recommendations for pre-emptions, because there could be no money owing to the Crown in relation to homesteads, homesteads being free. But where a pre-emptor finds himself in the position that he wants to pay off the Crown, but there is no means by which he can put a loan on his pre-emption in order to pay off the Crown to get the patent, he is practically forbidden access to the money markets. This provision gives him that access for the period of a year, which period may be extended at the discretion of the minister. The effect is that he can deal with his homestead as if he owned it, subject, of course, to the possibility of that certificate of recommendation failing unless lived up to within the year.

Mr. BUREAU: In a case like that, would the lender put his mortgage on record before the Crown was paid off? What would be the effect, supposing I advanced a man $1,000 upon a pre-emption and he gave me a mortgage and I put my mortgage on record before the patent was issued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The certificate itself sets out what he owes to the Crown, and any rights he has to mortgage or deal with his land are naturally subject to the indebtedness to the Crown.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Entry for purchased homesteads:

Mr. BUREAU: That is the same thing as for pre-emption.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same thing in the case of a purchased homestead.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Myers moved to amend section 10 by adding the word "flooded" after the word "rocky".

Mr. McMASTER: Might I point out that by adding the word "flooded" there, you make it possible of interpretation that the land must always be flooded? I would suggest it would be better to say "or subject to floods from time to time". I believe that is the meaning of the amendment. I do not apprehend that, in order to have the benefits of this proviso, the land must always be flooded. I would imagine it would be subject to floods from time to time so that it could not be cultivated as fully as if it were not subject to floods.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think the point is very well taken. In the Northwest there are tens of thousands of acres of good land that are flooded at times. Such land could be made arable by drainage. Rocky land could not be made good by any process known to farmers. In my opinion the word

"flooded" should not be inserted at all. I can point out to the Minister of the Interior tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres of such land in the Northwest of Canada that in time will be the best land in the country, and all it wants is a little drainage. Although that land is flooded to-day, it should not be exempted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section as it has been amended at the suggestion of the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Myers) is the best possible for the following reason. It is not intended to exempt land that is only subject to flooding, that may be all right one year and perhaps flooded another year, because the homestead duties can be performed the second or third year. If you make it simply "subject to floods," then the door is opened too wide, because there is a great proportion of land, as the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) has said, that is subject to floods. But take the case of land say adjoining lake Manitoba, which is near my own home. A man may homestead a quarter-section there, and there may be only a fraction of that quarter-section that is really capable of cultivation. Why? Because the rest is flooded by the lake. It is not only subject to the floods, it is flooded land, and it is only right and proper that in a case of that kind his duties should be proportionately reduced. It has been the practice of the department so to reduce them. To put the word "flooded", as suggested by the hon. member, covers a case of that sort. If you use the words "subject to floods," the door is opened too wide, and it would enable a reduction to be made, because merely in a certain year the land was covered by water, and in such a case the duties might be capable of being performed the next year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As the minister is aware, two or three charges of dynamite properly placed might drain all the flooded land around lake Manitoba. I can point out one place in the Northwest, that I have had in view for a long time, that is flooded on account of a beaver meadow. We have not secured it yet, but we are watching for an opportunity to get hold of it. A week's digging will drain it. Although that land is flooded to-day, at an expenditure of less than fifty dollars it can be made arable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In a case of that kind it will be the duty of the minister to reduce the area of cultivation.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: If he has the authority, that is all right.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 12—sale of agricultural lands to entrant prevented from completing duties but with equitable claim:

Mr. BUREAU: Is not that provided in the old Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section is the same as the old Act except that the power is placed in the hands of the minister, instead of in the Governor in Council. My hon. friend will agree that any man who has had the training of a Solicitor General can be trusted with that.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—sale or lease of lands unsuitable for cultivation:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section is important in this sense: it gives the department the same power to deal with lands that should be reclaimed by drainage that it now has with regard to lands that should be reclaimed by irrigation. Section 34, if this amendment is agreed to, will read:

> Lands unsuitable for cultivation without the aid of irrigation or drainage, or lands required in connection with any system of irrigation or drainage may be sold or leased in such manner and under such terms and conditions as are fixed by the Governor in Council subject to the provisions of the Irrigation Act.

In November, 1916, conferences were held between representatives of the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and representatives of the Irrigation Branch of the Interior Department, at which arrangements were arrived at drawing the line of responsibility with regard to irrigation and drainage as between the provinces and the Dominion. These arrangements were afterwards implemented by legislation in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I think also in Manitoba, but at all events, in the other two provinces. A scheme was also devised at the conference whereby the provinces might enter upon irrigation and drainage enterprises affecting Dominion lands, and the responsibility of the Dominion with regard to those enterprises was defined. Therefore, it is now the part of wisdom to place the drainage lands of the Crown in the same position as the irrigation lands, so we can deal with them as we are now able to deal with the irrigated lands.

Mr. BUREAU: Has there ever been any arrangement between the provinces and the Dominion with regard to what are known as the marsh lands, or has there ever been any transfer of these lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend refers to the swamp lands?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those lands have been transferred from the province of Manitoba to the Crown; there were none in the other provinces.

Mr. BUREAU: It would be to lands of that sort this Act would apply in the other provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; such of those swamp lands as are unsuitable for cultivation without the aid of drainage. Portions of those lands may not need drainage at all, even though described as swamp lands.

Section agreed to.

On section 14—Regulations to control disposal of timber and pulpwood berths:

Mr. LEMIEUX: These lands are disposed of by public tender?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The object of this section is to enable the Governor in Council to extend the area in the case of pulpwood leases. Of course, a pulpmill will not be established on the basis of an area that is insufficient for its requirements for any reasonable length of time.

Mr. BUREAU: The object is to increase the area in the case of pulpwood?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: I am not familiar with the original law, but paragraph (c) of this Bill says: "no offer by tender shall be accepted unless accompanied by the full amount of the bonus." I suppose bonus and bid mean the same?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, in a sense. Tenderers have to agree to pay the license fee, which is fixed. Then in addition to that they give a bonus, which really means a bid.

Mr. McMASTER: It does not mean they will have to accompany their bid with the full purchase price?

Mr. MEIGHEN: With the full purchase price except the license fee, which is based on the amount of timber cut.

Mr. McMASTER: Might I suggest that that might operate against the poorer tenderers, and perhaps result in the department's not getting as high a price as might otherwise be obtained.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has always been the practice to collect the purchase price of the berth before the timber is cut. I think it would be rather the part of folly to wait until the timber was partially or wholly cut before collecting the purchase price of the berth. As soon as a man goes into one of these berths he immediately commences to deplete the supply, and we collect as he proceeds to cut, the license being in proportion to the amount taken off.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It has occurred to me that in the far Western Provinces through lack of sufficient advertising and on account of the long distances, there might be a very limited number of tenderers, and as a result the pulpwood limits, which are very valuable to-day, might be sold for a song. What is the policy of the department with regard to these sales? Is an outside price fixed after a preliminary cruise of the limits? I understand that in Quebec and Ontario the outside price is generally based on the report of the cruiser.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the practice of the department and has been since 1908, to have a cruise of the area made by an inspector, and an upset price is fixed, based on his report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and sixty days' advertising in every case—a minimum of sixty days in one newspaper of local circulation, and in one newspaper of at least provincial circulation. All timber berths are sold by public auction, so that every possible chance to exploit the department, I think, is eliminated.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the minister state that it was the practice to have these limits cruised?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How long since?

Mr. MEIGHEN: 1908.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. minister explain the system of opening tenders in the department? In ancient days we have heard that there was a possibility of tenders not being properly looked after in the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The system is to have no tenders. The sale is by public auction; consequently there are no tenders to open.

Mr. CAHILL: Where will the auction be held?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At the office of the crown timber agent for the district.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that when the limit is put up the bidders pay in cash so much per mile, which is called a bonus?

Mr. MEIGHEN: So much for the entire berth. That is the bonus. Then, in addition to that, the bidder has to pay so much per thousand feet.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the stumpage?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Does he not pay a yearly license?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He pays five dollars per square mile in addition to that. There are other elements in the payment. There is the stumpage of fifty cents per thousand which he pays, then five dollars per square mile, and then the bonus.

Mr. BUREAU: The five dollars is for the license, and he pays the stumpage as he cuts?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And an auction sale is held to ascertain what bonus is to be paid besides. The man paying the highest bonus gets the limit.

Mr. FULTON: It appears to me that in many cases it may be a very great hardship to have to pay a bonus in a lump sum, especially in a case where, as often happens, timber being much more inaccessible now than in previous years, it is necessary, either to put in a railway or build flumes in order to get the logs out. This entails considerable expenditure of capital, and it might very well be that the bonus should extend over a number of years, instead of being paid in a lump sum. To my mind the license fee is too small, and it has given rise to this practice, in many cases, even after the timber berth has been logged off, the company holding it continues to hold it, and pays a small annual rental, which does not amount to anything, but the berth is a great asset to the company in making a statement on paper to the shareholders or the bank. They may have a good many square miles of holdings, but a large proportion of them may have been logged off, and yet on paper they have still very large holdings. In this way they are in a position to show these berths as an asset in their statement to the shareholders.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The answer to the first inquiry is that the bonus does not require in certain cases to be all paid at once. The regulation reads:

> 6. Purchases to the amount of one thousand dollars or under shall be paid in cash at the time of sale. Purchases over one thousand dollars and not exceeding five thousand dollars shall be paid one-half in cash at the time of sale, and a note or notes shall be given for the remaining half of the purchase price payable in three months with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum. Purchases over five thousand dollars and not exceeding ten thousand dollars shall be paid one-third in cash at the time of sale and notes shall be given for the remaining two-thirds of the purchase price, payable in three and six months, with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum. Purchases exceeding ten thousand dollars shall be paid one-fourth in cash at the time of sale and notes shall be given for the remaining three-fourths of the purchase price, payable in three, six and nine months with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum. Notes given as herein provided shall be made payable at a bank in the city or town in which the sale is held or at a bank in the city of Ottawa.

So that, the department provides that in all cases under one thousand dollars the payment shall be in cash, and provides in every case for such payment as will enable the Department to receive the money before its security is gone. That meets the objection raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. FULTON: Then why does the regulation say that the tender shall be accompanied by payment of the full amount?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will see that clause C reads:

> No offer by tender shall be accepted unless accompanied by the full amount of the bonus.

Where it is sold by tender, that applies. Where it is sold by public auction, the regulations which I have just read apply. The practice is to sell entirely by public auction. This amendment leaves the matter just as it stood before in that respect, that wherever the sale is by tender the full amount must be paid.

Mr. FULTON: In both cases it might be taken into consideration whether the principle might not be extended still further, so that the balance of the bonus unpaid might remain a charge on the remaining timber to be taken out. In that way the bonus would not be lost, because the money would be collected as the berth was being depreciated in value by the timber being taken out.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the uniform price of the license five dollars per mile?

Mr. MEIGHEN: East of Yale the uniform price is five dollars per mile. West of Yale it is five cents per acre.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—conditions of licenses—erection of mills:

Mr. BUREAU: In the case of an ordinary timber limit the purchaser has to erect a mill within a certain time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: It must have a capacity, I think, of a thousand feet a day for every two and one half miles purchased, and it must be operated six months in the year. Is there any regulation, or any provision, that forces the purchaser of a pulpwood berth to erect a mill and operate it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have no provision up to the present time for selling the timber limits for the purpose of the pulpwood industry. This is our first venture in that line. We have already provided, in order to meet the new conditions, that no timber limit shall be larger than twenty-five square miles. We here enact the clause that imposes on the pulpwood operator a corresponding obligation to that all along imposed on the lumber operator. But we have not had experience enough to enable us to say just exactly what character of mill that man should erect, and within what time, and so forth. Consequently, pending that provision, we place the power in the Bill to enable the minister to fix the nature of the mill to be erected, just as stated here.

Shall erect a mill or mills of such capacity and character, and at such point or points, and at such time or times, as the minister may decide.

Experience will teach us in this, as in the case of lumber mills, what should be required.

Mr. BUREAU: Has any discussion taken place with the officers of the department, or those who have been more especially charged with looking after the pulpwood berths, as to the conditions that will be imposed on the purchaser, the capacity of the mill, and the number of months it will have to be operated, or the quantity of wood the purchaser will have to saw a year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The form of regulations with respect to pulpwood has not yet been discussed with me. The officers of the department have the matter under consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: Will those regulations be published in the Official Gazette?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister considered the point about the control of the limit. As I understand the law, the minister has the option of saying whether or not he will wipe that man out. In other words, the minister, or officers of the department, could close a man out by requiring him to put up a mill of a certain size and under certain conditions, and operate it in a certain way, and could make it impossible for the owner to carry on business. Why not fix it more definitely, and have a general clause in the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be desirable to fix it definitely, but we have not the data to enable us to do it, and we do not think we are able to make all the provisions, at all events without some experience in the operation of the pulpwood industry.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the minister, before advertising a limit for sale, to set out the regulation as to the mill, and the cutting of the wood that would be necessary on that particular limit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MACKIE: With reference to the amendment to section 15, I would like to ask why the minister is given discretionary powers as to the points at which mills have to be erected in connection with pulpwood concessions. At certain points along the Athabaska river where there are enormous areas of pulpwood, there is natural gas and at many places there are valuable water-powers. It might be more advantageous to the owner of a timber berth to erect his mill at a point where these natural resources could be made use of rather than at the point which the minister might designate. Therefore, I would ask why it should not be left to the owner to say where his mill should be located.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is only proper that the department should have some say as to the location of the mill. It is quite true that no matter what power you put into the hands of the minister he may so exercise it as to be oppressive, but I think the principle is sound that the minister should have some supervision as to where the mills should be located in reference to the timber berth which he puts up for sale. Of course, the tenderers for that berth would be in a position to inquire as to what the requirements of the minister would be in

that regard; and so they would not be purchasing in the dark. This is similar to the regulations that have been in force for years in reference to lumbermen.

On section 16—withdrawal of portion of timber berths from license after notice:

Mr. BUREAU: Why has the notice been shortened from one year to sixty days?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The main purpose of the amendment is to enable withdrawals to be made for other useful purposes as well as for agricultural purposes. One year's notice has been given in the past, but the experience of the department is that a year is quite unnecessary and it is believed that sixty days is sufficient. When a year's notice is required it makes the regulation of very little value.

Mr. BUREAU: It may not give a person sufficient time to remove camps or other things if only sixty days' notice is given. If it were in the summer season, or in the logging season, and the licensee were given notice to get out, it might mean that his license would be cancelled, his land withdrawn and he would not be in a position to take his property away.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In such case a longer time would be given. This is simply a minimum of sixty days, because in most cases sixty days is sufficient, but wherever more is in equity required, it is given.

On section 19—pulpwood included and area of tract extended;

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is to make a limit not exceeding one square mile and it is to include pulpwood as well as timber and cordwood.

On section 22—no department employee to purchase land;

Mr. BUREAU: That is to prevent employees from dealing in land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. It means that an employee cannot get a homestead entry or deal in land in any way.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does that prohibit an agent of the Government in the United States from dealing in land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the olden days Government land or immigration agents in the United States were privileged to take commissions on the sale of land, and I say advisedly that it was a very good plan. That was stopped and it had a very injurious effect on immigration coming into our Northwest from the United States. I do not know whether this would affect it or not. There is no reason why Government agents bringing in immigrants should not be authorized to sell land and take a commission on it.

9 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not affect that point at all. The law as it stood forbade any employee of the Government to locate any land or act as agent for any other person in that behalf, and any employee violating that subsection was liable to dismissal. This amendment provides that an employee cannot take land by homesteading it or otherwise.

On section 23—Cancellation of letters patent or recommendation issued in error.

Mr. BUREAU: This is to allow the amendment of the certificate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all, on account of the certificate or recommendation.

On section 24—Cancellation of patent if issued through fraud, improvidence, or in error.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there anything in the old Act which authorizes the department to take action similar to this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the law as it stands now, when the patent has once issued the only way the department can have it cancelled is by laying information in the Exchequer Court. That will still prevail, but additional provision is made.

Mr. BUREAU: That is, after the patent has issued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Justice Department has held that as soon as the patent is sealed it is issued, even though it remains in the department. Consequently, we cannot prevent the man from getting the benefit of that patent, even though we find it has issued through fraud. The amendment enables us to cancel under such circumstances.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want to get the reputation of being a purist in language, but the word "improvidence," I think, is intended to connote carelessness. I think what the law intends to convey is that the instrument has issued through fraud, or carelessness, or error. "Improvidence" really means extravagance, and I do not think that is what is intended to be conveyed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is better to retain the wording as it is, because in the

old Act exactly the same words are used: "Whenever letters patent, or other instrument respecting land have issued through fraud, or improvidence, or in error, any court having competent jurisdiction"—and so forth. When we are putting a proviso into the Act we had better follow the same language. Doubtless there have been cases decided upon this provision, and I think the language should be continued.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not familiar with the wording of the old Act. Is the language here much the same as it is in the old Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The language is the very same. We are using the old section just as it is, which enables us to go to the courts and secure cancellation of a patent issued through fraud, or improvidence, or in error; but it is provided in addition that if the patent had not left the department, even although legally issued at the time and with the seal of the Crown affixed the minister, upon proof of the improvidence, fraud or error, may himself cancel the patent without going to the court at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: What strikes me is that there may be cases where the patentee may regard himself as being harshly treated if he has not got the right to appeal. In this case the minister seems to be the sole judge, and no machinery is provided whereby the man interested has the opportunity of presenting his case. In connection with matters arising under other departments that opportunity is given. For instance, in the Department of Customs, if a vessel is seized for infraction of the customs laws, or improper entry, the minister may declare that the vessel be condemned, but the owner is given the opportunity of appeal within thirty days, either to the Government or to a court. Now I would like to see a loophole here for a man who feels himself aggrieved to present his case before some independent court, or to appeal to the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The situation is this: Up to the issue of a patent to a homesteader or a pre-emptor the minister is the judge as to whether or not he has earned that patent. There has never been any need for a court of appeal over the minister, although I presume that if a man claimed to have lived up to all requirements of the law and then been arbitrarily refused his patent by the minister, he would be entitled to action against the Crown, and he is entitled to that yet. But subject to that right, the minister has had the power of decision as to whether or not the patent was coming to that man up to the moment of issue. After the issue then the minister could no longer decide, but if he wanted the patent cancelled he had to go to the court. All this amendment does is to extend that point very slightly. The minister has the power to decide not only up to the moment of the legal issue, which is the sealing of the patent with the seal of the Crown, but up to the moment that the patent leaves the department on its way to the patentee. I went into the matter with the Department of Justice and held that the patent was not issued at all until it left the department. However, the Department of Justice took the view, and I think rightly, that the patent legally issues when the seal of the Crown is affixed. We therefore think that the minister's power should still be exercised, and should still prevail, up to the moment that the patent leaves the department.

On Section 25—Stock in lieu of cultivation in case of certain quarter-sections.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister indicate what changes, if any, have been made with reference to the substitution of cattle for the cultivation of the land?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act says that the holder of a pre-emption which is not of a class suitable for agriculture may substitute stock in lieu of cultivation, notwithstanding the fact that there may be a sufficient area of arable land on the homestead to allow the performance of cultivation. If the required area of arable land can be found either upon his homestead or his pre-emption, the practice is to require the entrant to do the necessary cultivation, and it is desired to bring the Act into conformity with the practice. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. MYERS: I would suggest that the minister use his discretion as to whether it is necessary for substantial buildings to be erected in certain localities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course, where a homesteader has his pre-emption as well, he may use the buildings now on the homestead. He may utilize those buildings wholly, and at the same time avail himself of the stock substitution regulation with regard to his pre-emption; but it has never been felt that we could do away with the necessity of the buildings altogether and merely allow the homesteader to put stock on the land. To do that would be to invade, too seriously, I think, the spirit of the

regulation which requires the use of the land as a homestead for the purposes of agriculture.

On section 26—Patent to be issued in name of deceased entrant in certain cases:

Mr. MEIGHEN: In British Columbia, while there is provision for the appointment of an administrator of the estate of a deceased person, no power is given to the administrator to acquire in his own name the real property of the deceased. Under the law as it stands now, therefore, there is imposed on the Department of the Interior, in relation to the Peace River land and the railway belt, the obligation of ascertaining who the heirs are. We think that is no part of our duty, and we are providing that in such cases the department, when the time comes to issue patents, may do so in the name of the deceased person. We do that now in the case of deceased soldiers, and we shall be doing it, if this Bill passes, in the case of patents of lands in British Columbia.

Mr. McKENZIE:: No province, so far as I know, gives the administrator power so to acquire real estate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The administrator has this power in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. McKENZIE: At common law he would not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be his duty at common law simply to see that the estate was distributed to the heirs; but in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, where our Crown lands are, the administrator has power to take to himself the legal estate of the real property, and that enables us to convey to the administrator as soon as he is appointed any lands to which the deceased was entitled. We cannot do that in British Columbia; we are compelled to search out the heirs. We now wish to issue the patent simply in the name of the deceased and have the administrator distribute it according to the law of the province.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before we come to the preamble I wish to submit an amendment which is to constitute section 27 of the Bill, the present section 27 to be section 28. The effect of the amendment is really to ratify the Order in Council, the spirit and purpose of which I stated to the House on moving the introduction of this Bill—to abolish altogether purchased homesteads and pre-emptions:

27. (1.) The privilege of pre-emption entry on Dominion lands as provided for by section 27 of the Dominion Lands Act, Chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1908, as amended by sections 2 and 3 of chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1914, is hereby withdrawn.

(2.) The privileges of purchased homestead entry as provided for by section 28 of chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1908, as amended by section 4 of chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1914, is hereby withdrawn.

(3.) Where land has been reserved for pre-emption entry for any homesteader who is on active military service, or where notice has been issued to any person allowing him a specified time within which to appear and secure pre-emption or purchased homestead entry for a given quarter-section, such land may be sold to the homesteader or to the person so notified, at the rate of three dollars per acre, subject to the duties, terms and conditions which would have obtained if the pre-emption and purchased homestead privilege had not been withdrawn.

(4.) This section shall be deemed to have come into operation on the twentieth day of March, 1918.

Mr. BUREAU: Why is the twentieth day of March particularly mentioned?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the date the Order in Council was passed abolishing purchased homesteads and pre-emptions. It was considered wise to do it by Order in Council and subsequently to ratify it by legislation, for if we simply waited for the passing of the legislation there would likely be a rush for homesteads and pre-emptions, and to that extent the purpose of the amendment would have been defeated.

Mr. BUREAU: The old provision is in force only in respect of those who enlisted and are now at the front, and who made application for homestead before they left?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: It must have been a great relief to the broad-minded, non-partisan Minister of the Interior when patronage was abolished in all departments, for I am sure that it would grate upon his nerves and feelings if he had to divide the population into two camps and be kind to some and do nothing for others. But something is still lingering behind which looks like patronage, and it is found in the different Tory newspapers in my part of the country. In the Sydney Post, for instance, which I have before me, I find a synopsis of the coal mining regulations, to which is appended the name of the Deputy Minister of the Interior. This notice finds its way into all the Tory papers of Nova Scotia, but by no chance gets into others. If patron-

age is abolished the minister should eliminate this patronage altogether, or, if such advertising is necessary in his department, give a share of it to the Grit papers, which are, if anything, more widely read in Nova Scotia than the Tory publications.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend's principles are sound, but his information is rather antiquated. Patronage is abolished wholly. The advertisement my hon. friend refers to is, I assume, from a paper of last month, because while it was possible for us to abolish patronage, we could not regard existing contracts as "scraps of paper."

Mr. McKENZIE: The date of this paper is March 22.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These contracts are contracts, and all of them expired, I think, at the end of March; but after the expiry of these contracts, these regulations are no longer inserted in any paper, Unionist, Liberal, or Conservative, and thereby the country is saved a very large annual outlay.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall not ask that we carry the preamble. I wish to leave the Bill in Committee for this reason: I have under consideration an amendment which I purpose submitting, providing for a change in the law relating to the interest on school land sales. The amendment will be ready when the House next goes into Committee. I, therefore, move: That the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister tell us the purport of the amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I speak what is now in my mind in this regard. It is this, that as to all future sales the rate of interest shall be raised from 5 per cent to 6 per cent with 7 per cent on arrears. That is to say; suppose that the terms are one-tenth down and the balance one-tenth yearly for nine successive payments with interest at six per cent; then if a purchaser permits his payments, whether of interest or of principal, to run into arrears, he shall pay seven per cent on those arrears. As regard past sales, a difficulty arises, because they have been made on express terms, and, of course, in so far as a purchaser lives up to those terms, his contract will not be interfered with; but where a purchaser fails to live up to those terms, the department has not power to raise the rate of interest without his consent, and it is proposed to ask for power, on obtaining his consent, to raise the rate of interest on arrears to seven per cent in respect of those sales as well. We are, of course, able to obtain his consent unless he is prepared to pay up the arrears, because the power of cancellation is vested in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: It will not be a hold-up?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The idea is that as regards arrears the rate of interest shall hereafter be seven per cent, and that in new sales the rate of interest on money not in arrears shall be six per cent. The idea is to make it in the interest of purchasers to pay up in accordance with their contracts and not merely to hold school land for purposes of speculation and not even pay interest or principal.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

VAN BUREN BRIDGE COMPANY.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals), Bill No. 14, to confirm an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company, was read the second time.

Mr. REID moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: We have not had much information in regard to this contract, which is a long one, and it would be worth while looking over it before we go into Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REID: The Bill has been on the Order Paper for a week or so, and the agreement is printed in the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister knows how it is with these agreements. It is necessary to know what brought about the agreement, why it was brought about, and what were the considerations.

Mr. REID: I will explain it when it gets into Committee.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—agreement of 8th March with Van Buren Bridge Company confirmed;

Mr. REID: This Bill is to confirm an agreement for the leasing of a stretch of about two miles of the Bangor and Aroostook railway between the International and Transcontinental railways. The Bangor and Aroostook railway runs from the state of Maine across the Transcontinental and up to the International, and our object in

leasing this line is to do away with the upkeep of two stations. When this agreement is ratified, the trains now going over the International will go over these two miles of line, and the Transcontinental station at St. Leonard will serve as a union station for both lines. We shall then require but one set of station agents and shall save the operating expenses on two miles of road. The lease expires in 1934, which is the year when the bonds of this railway fall due. The owners could not sell this railway or we would have purchased it. The rental is $1,200 a year, which is the estimated amount of the interest on this portion of the railway. At the expiration of the lease the Government will have to consider whether to take a further lease or purchase the two miles.

Mr. MICHAUD: I have just arrived from home where I had an opportunity of interviewing the residents of the village of St. Leonard, and I have here a petition, also a number of letters and telegrams, protesting against the leasing of this road, if it be the Government's intention to have a union station for the International and Transcontinental.

Mr. REID: Our object in acquiring this piece of road is to have a union station for the International and the Transcontinental. At present passengers coming in on the International have to drive or walk over the Transcontinental if they are going on to Levis or Moncton. The union station will obviate that.

Mr. MICHAUD: It is all very well for the minister to say that if passengers on the International want to go to Quebec or Moncton they have to walk or drive over to the Transcontinental railway station, but as a matter of fact the Transcontinental train passes through St. Leonard, going west, at three o'clock in the morning, and going east, at twelve midnight; so hardly any one travels over that road because of the inconvenient hours. On the other hand, it is very easy for them to catch the Canadian Pacific, which runs parallel to the Transcontinental. The people of St. Leonard object very strongly to the idea of this union station. It is proposed to be built outside of the village altogether, about a quarter to half a mile away. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read the following petition without reciting all the names, prepared by the citizens of St. Leonard against this proposed legislation:

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

To the Honourable Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE CITIZENS OF THE VILLAGE OF ST. LEONARD, IN THE COUNTY OF MADAWASKA, AND PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK

HUMBLY SHEWETH:

That we the undersigned citizens and residents of the Village of St. Leonard, N. B., are desirous that the terminus of the International railway shall remain at its present location and are all strongly opposed to the erection of a Union Station at or near the St. Leonard Station of the National Transcontinental railway for the following reasons:

1. That the present location of the terminus and station of the International railway is to the best advantage to all the citizens of the said village, and to the best accommodation to all the travelling public;

2. That there is no local train service on the National Transcontinental railway of any kind for passengers nor other local accommodation. The only passenger trains are the one north-bound due at St. Leonard, N. B., at 12 p.m. and the south-bound at 3 a.m., thereby no train service at the dispositions of the local travelling public;

3. That passengers from the International Railway points desirous to make connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway trains for local points, as well as passengers from other points to points on the International railway, would be compelled to travel for a 10 minutes' walk or in cab, the baggage to be transferred by truck teams, if the proposed union station is built at the Transcontinental railway, to the great disadvantage of all the passengers as well as the citizens of our village. Furthermore that it will be removing local train accommodation from the most business centre of our village to a location most out of the way for all the people's advantage, except a very few families in that direction.

4. That such change in the terminus of the International railway and its passenger station and freight office will lead beyond any doubt to the detriment of the future as well as of the present welfare of our village and its citizens.

And further pray that this our petition be approved as to the views and opinions of the undersigned, and that instead of a Union Station being built at the Transcontinental railway as proposed, a passenger station be built at or near the place of the present terminus and yard of the International railway at or about the most business centre of our village.

We therefore humbly pray and urge for your serious consideration the urgent need of granting our request.

As in duty bound we will ever pray.

This is signed by all the merchants of the village of St. Leonard. I think there are between 70 and 100 signatures, including members of the legal profession, customs officers, postmasters, station agents and men of other professions. I have no doubt the hon. minister wants to do what is right by the people of St. Leonard. I have visited the place where the station is proposed to be built, and I have also seen where the

old station in connection with the International railway was built. You are doing a great harm to the people of St. Leonard if you remove the present station of the International railway and build a union station outside the town altogether. While they were trying to get an Act passed in this House to build that short line of railway, to unite the Van Buren bridge with the International railway, the citizens of St. Leonard objected strongly to that short line of railway, for the reason that the Americans were building a bridge over the St. John river in order to connect with the International railway, for one purpose only, namely, to be able to transport our national resources in the province of New Brunswick into the state of Maine. They have been transporting our national resources, pulpwood deals, manufactured lumber, and other kinds of wood. When the Act was about to be passed in this House I received a message from the citizens of St. Leonard asking, before the Act be passed, that a certain provision be inserted. I could not obtain the Act to-night, but I will produce it at the next sitting of the House. The telegram was as follows:

> Give your hearty support for railway bridge here providing that it is strictly understood that International station and terminus remain in St. Leonard Village at its present location.

That is where the station of the International railway is now built. They ask that it shall remain where it is. I do not think the minister will desire to remove it at the present moment unless he wants to change the whole line. That telegram is signed by five citizens of St. Leonard.

Mr. REID: Do I understand that is the charter that was got by the Van Buren Bridge Company, or by the International Railway Company?

Mr. MICHAUD: I believe it was the Van Buren Bridge Company, and they are the people who built up the short line of railway which you are about to lease under this Act. If you are going to lease that short line of railway, and remove the railway station, because you are buying that short line of railway, you are not following the provisions of the Bill. The Bill says you cannot remove the station except to the International railway, and that the terminus shall remain at St. Leonard in its present location. From my point of view, it would be unfair now to change the whole law. I have been asked to state by whom this message was signed. I find the following signatures: F. C. Rivard, J. R. Cyr, B. R. Violette, Raymond Hebert, A. J. Violette. These are the leading men of the village of St. Leonard. I would ask the hon. minister to give me an opportunity at the next sitting of the House to produce the Bill passed in 1913, wherein we can find a clause providing that the terminus of the International railway and its station cannot be changed from one place to another. I hope he will give me an opportunity at the next session of the House to produce the Bill.

Mr. REID: Of course, the hon. gentleman knows the locality better than I do. I have never been in St. Leonard, and I have simply to take the statement of the officials of the road. As I understand the situation, there are now three railway stations in St. Leonard, the National Transcontinental station on the through line between Levis and Moncton, the Canadian Pacific Railway station on the line that runs through St. Leonard, and the station of the International railway. The Government owning both the International and the Transcontinental and keeping up two sets of employees at the two stations, I think the House will agree with me that that is hardly fair or right. The proposal is that the International railway shall have its terminal at the Transcontinental station. If this is not done, we must keep up the two stations. You may change the location of the station on the International, but you must maintain the station on the main line between Levis and Moncton. When the matter was brought to my attention by the officials of the department it struck me as a reasonable business proposition and one to which I could not see that any person could object. The hon. gentleman raises objections, one of them being that the trains go through on the Transcontinental road, that there are no local trains and therefore, it would not be of service. I can hardly see that is a reason why the trains should not have their terminus at the same station. I do not see why you should keep the International station where it is because it is a little nearer the Canadian Pacific. The hon. gentleman has raised two questions which of course I shall look into. One is that the station on the Transcontinental is not proposed to be placed in as convenient a spot for the public. If the Transcontinental had their station built there, and all completed, it would be rather difficult to move it now. I do not see how I could agree to that, without looking further into it. The hon. gentleman also

referred to a clause in the charter for this bridge across the river between the state of Maine and province of New Brunswick at St. Leonard. It must have been when that charter was granted that the clause the hon. gentleman mentions was inserted in the Bill. If there is anything of that kind in the charter it was not brought to my attention. I do not wish to press the Bill until everything is thoroughly understood. I am quite willing the Bill should stand over. I will go into the question with the hon. gentleman, so that we will thoroughly understand the whole situation. I thought the Bill was so reasonable and fair that there would be no objection to it whatever, but until the hon. gentleman has all the time he wishes to look into it, I shall not press the measure.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Fisheries—salaries and disbursements of Fishery Officers and Guardians, including the expense of the Advisory Board and an allowance of $200 to W. J. E. Casey, Secretary thereof, Fisheries Patrol Service and Oyster Culture, $400,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is a decrease.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Reid, that the words "and an allowance of $200 to W. J. E. Casey, secretary thereof," be struck out. I would like to drop this provision because Mr. Casey has been otherwise provided for. The officers of the department who are members of the advisory board receive no remuneration, but when Mr. Casey was made secretary he was in the third division, and as his salary could not go beyond $1,200 per year, it was considered that he should have extra pay. He has since taken the examination for the second division and will be promoted this year to subdivision A of the second division at $1,600. He is now receiving this amount with the allowance as secretary of the advisory board.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the members of the advisory board?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Nova Scotia: H. B. Short, Digby; W. C. Smith, Lunenburg; A. King, Halifax; G. A. Hemen, Arnold. New Brunswick: A. B. Carson, Rexton; F. T. B. Young, Caraquet; John Jackson, St. John. Prince Edward Island: C. H. B. Logworth, Charlottetown. Quebec: A. Arseneau, Magdalen Islands. British Columbia: F. H. Cunningham, New Westminster; O. H. Nelson, Prince Rupert. I am thinking of doing away with this advisory board. I think we can get along without it, but that has not been definitely settled upon as yet.

Mr. COPP: What were the expenses of the advisory board last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The expenses for 1916-17 were $815 and the allowance amounted to $620, making a grand total of $1,435.02.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has appointed quite a number of inspectors; or perhaps they were appointed before the minister took charge of the department. I understand their duties to be connected with the inspection of salted and pickled herring. I would like to know how many there are of such officers, and if he has any reports from them, or what services they are rendering. Are they of any particular advantage to the fishing industry of this country? Reports have come to me from time to time that in the part of the country from which I come there are a great many of these officers drawing big salaries and doing nothing.

10 p.m.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is quite true that the department has a very large number of guardians and overseers, and also what are called, fishery inspectors. The guardians, as the members of the House are no doubt aware, do not hold their positions, except to the extent that they have been engaged from the first of April in one year to the first of April in the year following. We have, in my opinion, altogether too many guardians. I also have my doubts in regard to the efficiency of those guardians, and as their term of office expired on the 31st of March we have not got, at the moment, any guardians at all from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I have caused, through the officials of my department, the very strictest instructions to be conveyed to the various inspectors of fisheries from one ocean to the other that they are only to engage such guardians as they deem necessary, that they are not to engage a guardian for any political leanings he may now possess or may have had, but solely for his efficiency. Possibly it may be necessary to pay this class of official a little higher wages than the department has been in the habit of paying in the past, but we hope by the means stated to secure efficient and live guardians. I do not think that we shall need more than one half the number that

we have had in the past. The number may even be less than that—I cannot for the moment say—but the instructions are that no guardians are to be taken on unless they are really wanted. In that event, the period of service is to be for the week, or the month, as the case may be, and when these men's services are no longer required they are to be allowed to go. As far as the overseers are concerned, if there are any vacancies in their ranks—and this also relates to the guardians—the appointments will have to be made by the Civil Service Commission. What I am trying to do, however, is to place the responsibility on each one of the superintendents of fishery districts throughout the country of putting his district on a proper basis. Each will be held responsible for his district and the overseers and guardians under him; if these overseers and guardians do not perform their duties efficiently the inspector has authority to dispense with their services without referring the matter to Ottawa at all. Now if it should transpire later on that the inspectors of the various districts are not performing the duties that they are called upon to discharge to the Government and to the department, their services will also be dispensed with. I have not been long enough in the department to form an accurate opinion as to the efficiency of the large number of guardians, overseers and inspectors that we have, but I hope to familiarize myself with these matters as time goes on. At the present time we have eight hundred guardians, and I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that we do not need anything like that number.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: How many inspectors have you?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will give you that information in a moment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the minister tell me what portion of the vote of $400,000 is applied to the fisheries patrol service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The appropriation for that service is $190,000 and the expenditure to February 28, $187,073.72. We have 134 overseers, 800 guardians and 28 inspectors.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some years ago oyster culture was carried on in the waters of Prince Edward Island. I am sorry to say that the succulent Malpeque is fast disappearing, and the same fate appears to be overtaking the oysters at Miscou, New Brunswick. I think it would be in the interest of consumers if the department would, under the diligent and energetic direction of my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) look carefully after this food. The Malpeque oyster is, as the minister knows, a very excellent food, and commands the respect of all the connoisseurs in North America. It is really a pity to see the excellent Malpeque oyster disappearing so rapidly. I remember that some years ago an effort was made by the department to promote oyster culture, but I do not know what progress has been made.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The private oyster beds have been taken over by the several provincial governments, therefore, oyster culture is now in the hands of the provincial authorities.

Mr. COPP: I want to ask a question or two of the minister, and at the same time to congratulate him upon the resolution he has made in regard to the carrying on of the business of the department. I have had occasion during the last two or three years to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whilst the estimates were under discussion, to a situation which prevailed in the province from which I come in regard to the inspectors, fishery overseers and wardens, and I have never yet been able to get an absolute answer as regards these different classes of officers. Now, there is a multiplicity of officers along all the sea coasts of Canada who pretend to look after the fishing rights and interests in their respective localities. I find on pages R 46 and 47 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 31st of March, 1917, reference made to the fishery overseers and inspectors in the province of New Brunswick. Did I understand the minister to say that the term of office of the overseers and wardens expired on the 31st of March last?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, what I said was that the term of office of the wardens, who are also known as guardians, did expire on the 31st of March, but not so with the overseers or the fishery inspectors, who are permanent.

Mr. COPP: I have noticed that there are inspectors, overseers and wardens, and also special guardians. In the province of New Brunswick, I notice, the special guardians during the year ending 31st of March, 1917, cost $33,933.85. Am I to understand that these officers have been abolished, and that there are no special guardians in existence to-day?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. COPP: So much with respect to that. I have on previous occasions drawn the attention of the department to what I believe to be an absolutely irregular, unnecessary, and unbusinesslike way of engaging and paying the overseers and wardens. It is a different matter with the inspectors. There is a certain number of these officials who have prescribed areas over which they exercise control.

There are a number of inspectors, each in charge of a zone or area and each in receipt of a fairly good salary. One of the inspectors in New Brunswick gets $2,000, besides travelling expenses, $787; allowance for stenographer, and so on. The overseers and wardens are also paid salaries. For instance, Mr. Prescott, of Baie Verte, gets the magnificent salary of $150 a year, but for travelling outlay he received last year $752.70. I know the location; I know what has taken place in that office during the last number of years. These men are paid practically no salary, but they send in a report as to mileage and that is the way they make up their salaries.

Mr. J. D. REID: They cannot live on $150.

Mr. COPP: No, they cannot live on that amount. In the same locality there is an inspector at Barachois, Mr. Vinneau, whose salary is only $120 a year. He does the same work as Mr. Prescott, but strange to say his travelling outlay last year was $1,022.30. This is an indication of what has been taking place in the department for some years.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: These guardians are allowed ten cents a mile when they travel. Apparently these two men have done considerable travelling; I have no way of checking that up just now.

Mr. COPP: The department should have some check on these matters. They should pay these men a reasonable salary and require them to make proper returns and give full value for what they receive, or be subject to dismissal. What is true of these two cases is true of the other overseers and wardens. I hope the minister will see that his department is placed on a business basis and operated along business lines, irrespective of political favours.

I wish also to bring to the attention of the minister a matter that was referred to in the House early last session. Along the shores of New Brunswick, not far from my own county, illegal lobster fishing has been going on. The inspector sent his patrol boat out, caught the men fishing lobsters out of season, seized the boats, and, I think destroyed one. When it was found that boats belonged to some person friendly to the Government, close to the department, a commissioner was appointed to investigate the matter, and I have a copy of the return that was brought down containing all the evidence. I notice that an amount for legal expenses is charged up in connection with this investigation. If the minister will look at the commissioner's report he may readily draw a conclusion whether there was illegal lobster fishing in this case and whether the person whose boats were seized was properly dealt with by the inspector. The inspector tried to do his work in a proper manner, but as soon as it interfered with some who had pull, the inspector's jurisdiction was set aside, the matter taken out of his hands and a commissioner appointed to investigate. I draw the minister's attention to these facts simply to point out to him that he has a great gulf or chasm to bridge in order to get away from what has been going on in his department during the last few years.

Mr. DUFF: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the explanation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with reference to this item. I am pleased, indeed, to hear that he is going to make a change in the appointment of fishery guardians. The minister should be congratulated that at last he has taken hold of this part of his department in a businesslike manner. The county from which I come is, perhaps, the largest fishing county in Canada—and I have in mind other counties in Nova Scotia where these guardians have been appointed during the last twenty years and where there was really no necessity for them at all. I suggest that great care be exercised with reference to those who appoint these guardians. I think the minister said that the appointments were to be made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The appointments are in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, but if that body needs any advice —and I assume it will—the inspector of the district in question would be the man from whom we should seek advice. If we find that he is not giving us the kind of advice that we would expect to get from a business man then we will put another inspector in charge of that district.

Mr. DUFF: I conclude my remarks to the minister by merely saying that the House

would like him to give instructions to those inspectors to be sure to employ men who are not partisans, but who will do their duty.

Mr. VIEN: In regard to the minister's explanation as to the decrease of $101,000, I understand that the decrease in the number of overseers will account for some portion of it, but I would like to know what portion of the decrease is accounted for by the decrease in the staff and what portion by the decrease in other expenses.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not agree with the cut in the estimates of $101,000 that has been made here, and I think I shall be forced a little later on to insert it in my supplementary estimates. I really do not think the cut should have been made at all, but economy is the watchword now, and the cut was rather forced on me.

Mr. McMASTER: We were going to congratulate the minister on the decrease.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: Wait a minute. We are not talking for talk's sake; we want to get some practical result out of this inquiry. Before the commissioner came in, I was asking the minister about the inspectors of pickled fish, quite a number of whom were appointed under the Act that was passed in this House two or three years ago. The Opposition very severely criticised that Act at the time it went through, objecting that no benefit to the people would result from the appointment of a number of officials. In the part of the country from which I come, which is largely a fishing district, those inspectors are of no practical value or utility to the district at all. They are drawing salaries for which they give no real return. In the island of Cape Breton there are one or two of those inspectors receiving large salaries, and, I suppose, large travelling expenses, and I would like to know from the minister what quantity of pickled fish they have examined and of what practical utility they are to the country generally, and particularly to the fishing industry. If he finds they are not turning out to be of benefit to the fishing industry and to the people generally, I think, even if they have been appointed under the Act, it would be proper economy to dispense with their services and to use the money for some more necessary purposes.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Will the hon. member be good enough to wait until we come to that appropriation? I shall be very glad to give the information then.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are now on an item relating to inspectors. I do not want to be talking in too partisan a fashion, but we must bring matters to the notice of the minister. I do not know whether the minister likes this or not, or whether it suits him or not, and I am not going to say; but it is all very well to drop patronage at this stage when every crevice, every corner, every conceivable office is filled with Tories. The minister says: I will not do anything; I will not exercise any patronage; I will pass it on to another man. Let us inquire who he is. He is a Tory of the Tories, and if any latitude is left to him, he is going to swing the old axe in the old way, and the old patronage will continue. That is human nature. I am afraid the minister will find that he and some of his brethren are in the position of the old gentleman who was passing away into the eternal bliss that awaited him and who said to his spiritual adviser: "I am willing to forgive everybody and I do forgive everybody; but there is one man whom I will forgive, but you, John,"—(pointing to his boy)—"look after him after I am away." The minister may say: I will not exercise any patronage; I will do nothing of that kind, but I will hand it down to the inspectors. Who, pray, is the inspector? A very strong partisan, and if he is given latitude to select men, he will naturally—and I do not blame him for doing so—select his own friends. That is what will happen, at least, in our part of the country. It has often been thrown at me from across the floor by members from British Columbia that they are not as partisan as we are, but I speak from observation in my own little province by the sea. I hope this thing will pass off and appointments made, not because of partisanship but because of fitness for the duties of the position.

Last year, I brought a matter to the notice of the department. In my county we have an official who was charged by one of his neighbours with destroying property without justification. This neighbour sent letters to the department, but he was told by this official: You need not make any reports about me; you can save your breath; you can save your paper; this is a Tory Government; there are Tory officials, and they will simply laugh at you. I sent these letters to the minister's department, and I received a letter from some official—I forget his name now—stating that inquiry would be made into the matter. I believe this official who scorned the idea of being brought to time because he was a Tory is

still in office, and I have not heard that anything has been done about the matter. I do not want to mention any names. This man is in the district of Little Bras d'Or, in the county of Cape Breton. It is very easy to find out who he is. The letters are on file. I hope that official of the Government will not be permitted to sling lip—so to speak—at his neighbours and say: I can ride roughshod over you; you have no remedy because I belong to the Tory party, and you can whistle for your porridge for any good it will do you.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am too old in years to learn any of the political tricks to which my hon. friend refers. I am, as he knows, an amateur politician, and rather proud of that fact, but I do claim to be somewhat of a trained business man. I do not know of any other way to rid the department of the influence the hon. member has referred to except to place responsibility where it properly belongs. I have already placed the responsibility on the inspector of the district. If the hon. member finds that the inspector of the particular district that he represents is not acting fairly and is making appointments on a political basis and not on an efficiency basis, and he brings that to my notice, I will guarantee him instant dismissal of that inspector, I do not care how long he may have been in the service. With such a large department as that over which I have the honour to preside, reaching from one ocean to the other, I could not possibly adopt any other course. I do not know, of course, all the particulars of every division and constituency throughout the country. I cannot do any more than emphasize what I have already stated, namely, that it is the only business way to put the matter into the hands of the inspector that is in charge of the district. I will see that he carries out his orders in the way he should. If he does not, I will discharge him.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Until the minister made the statement that he was thinking of re-inserting the item of $101,000 in the supplementary estimates, I felt like congratulating him. I quite agree with his suggestion that a good many of those overseers could be eliminated without any injury being done to the service. I would advise the Government as a whole to take into consideration whether it is not in the public interest to have the Department of Fisheries a separate department altogether from Marine and Naval. There is plenty of room for such a department in the Government, because I think some of the new ministers have not too much to do. The fishing industry is one of the most important industries in the Dominion; it is to-day second only to the industry of agriculture, and it is not half exploited. Now that meat is scarce, the people are beginning to ask for more fish, and evidently that means more brains. You cannot do better than to make the Department of Fisheries an entirely separate department.

With regard to the falling off in the production of oysters, that has perhaps resulted from the importation of American oysters. As far as the Malpeque beds are concerned, I think our local government is perhaps more largely to blame than the Federal Government. They began to encourage the importation of a large number of American oysters, and from all we can find out, it would appear that they have introduced a disease which has decimated the native oyster almost entirely. Either that is the cause, or it is one of those freaks of nature where it sometimes occurs that these luscious bivalves have periods of increase and periods of decrease, or it may be because in the great Richmond bay, which produces Malpeque oysters, they have permitted indiscriminate lobster fishing and perhaps induced the starfish to come in there and destroy our oysters. There is no question, however, that the oyster industry of Malpeque, or Richmond bay, Prince Edward Island, the great field of that fine bivalve, misnamed Malpeque—I think it should be called the Richmond Bay—oyster is becoming almost extinct. It would be well for the department to look into that matter and see if they can if possible discover the real cause and remedy it.

If the minister expects to have non-partisan appointments, he will not have them by giving the inspectors power to make them, because the inspectors, as a rule, are far more partisan than the men who appoint them. That is true as far as my county is concerned. It is true of our province that the man who is appointed is appointed because of his extreme partisanship. If the Union Government is to warrant its existence at all, it should warrant its existence on the basis of non-partisanship and no patronage.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest to the minister that at a convenient time—I shall not say he should do it now, because it is rather an important matter—he should give the House some authoritative information as to what has been or is being done by a rather important commission which has recently held sittings to inquire into

fisheries matters? It is a commission of an international character. According to the reports in the public press, some very important changes are being made in our fisheries, but I am not taking exception to any action of the commission. I am inclined to think some of the recommendations I would cordially approve, and I am not sure I would oppose any of them. I am aware, however, there is some discontent in Nova Scotia as to what is regarded as the insufficiency of the opportunity given to people who wish to be heard on the subject. The commission came to the conclusion that they ought to have a public hearing in Canada, and they selected one point in the Maritime Provinces, the city of St. John. If only one point could be chosen, I would find no fault with the city of St. John, which is central. It seems to me—and I know it is the impression in the fishing communities—that in a matter of such great importance, opportunity should be given by the commission for hearings at other points.

There may have been good reasons why this could not be done. I am not making my suggestions to my hon. friend in any critical spirit, but this is a large question; very much has been said in the press about it, and I only take advantage of this occasion to say that at a convenient time when he has had the opportunity of studying the matter he might give the House official information as to what has been done or is being done at this moment, by the important commission which has been charged with the duties of investigating the fishery affairs not only of Canada but of the United States.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be very glad to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for. The commission have not yet finished their sittings, and in the course of a week or two will be going out to British Columbia. As hon. gentlemen know, this is an international commission, the American representatives being Hon. Wm. C. Redfield, Hon. E. C. Sweet, and Dr. H. M. Smith; and the Canadian representatives Chief Justice Hon. J. D. Hazen, Mr. G. J. Desbarats, and Mr. W. A. Found, Superintendent of Canadian Fisheries. Without going into detail, what this commission have accomplished with regard to eastern Canada is simply this: In the past Canadian vessels were not allowed to land or dispose of their catch at American ports, nor were American vessels allowed to land and dispose of their catch at Canadian ports, but arrangements have recently been arrived at whereby this will be possible in future for the fishermen of both countries. This agreement was readily agreed to by the American representatives, and it is highly appreciated not only by the Government of Canada but by the people as well. In addition to that, in the past we have had a close season for lobster fishing, and during our close season, American smacks used to fish for Canadian lobsters outside the three-mile limit; but now an agreement has been reached whereby the American Government will not allow American smacks to fish outside the three-mile limit during our close season for lobster fishing. I am sure hon. members will agree that these concessions are of the greatest importance not only to the fishermen of Canada but to the country itself. Of course I cannot foretell what decisions will be arrived at when the commission hold their sittings in British Columbia. There are many important problems for them to solve, particularly the question of the conservation of salmon.

Mr. KAY: I am very glad to hear the minister say that the commission has not finally closed its sittings, because I would suggest to him that he take up with the Canadian representatives of that commission the question of fishing in Missisquoi bay.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It was an error on my part not to mention that. At the request of the Canadian Government, during the sittings of the commission that have recently been held, it was mutually agreed between the two countries that there should be no commercial or seine-net fishing in Missisquoi bay. The hon. member knows of course, that Missisquoi bay forms a very small part of lake Champlain, and the United States Government have been urging the Canadian Government for a great many years to prohibit commercial fishing in Missisquoi bay, as that was the chief place where the fish from American waters came up to spawn.

Mr. KAY: Notwithstanding what the hon. minister says, I should like to submit to him certain reasons why the views of the American Government should not have been acquiesced in so readily by our commissioners. For some forty or fifty years new fishing has been allowed in Missisquoi bay from the 1st of March to the 15th of April. A very considerable quantity of fish is caught there during that period, the average for the years 1916 and 1917 being 164,000 pounds, or 82 tons of fish. The contention of the American Government is that seining

destroys the pike that infest lake Champlain, but as a matter of fact, only 34,000 pounds, out of this 164,000 pounds, are pike, the balance being what fishermen call "rough fish," largely made up of perch and fish which are not game fish. I may say that bass fishing is very good in lake Champlain and Missisquoi bay, but the fish cannot be retained by the fishermen. They catch very few, and those are returned to the lake unhurt. It would appear to me that, especially at this time when we are urged to consume as much fish as possible to save meat for the Allies, the commissioners should have considered the matter very seriously before they prohibited the catching of this large quantity of fish so near to Montreal, which, I presume, is the largest fish-consuming city in Canada. The Government can hardly expect the people to take their propaganda for eating fish and saving meat very seriously when they prohibit the catching of a large quantity of fish, for the purpose of allowing pleasure fishermen with rod and line to catch fish in lake Champlain. The department says: That the United States Government, in conjunction with the authorities of the States of New York and Vermont, are trying to build up the fisheries of lake Champlain, with the purpose of making the lake a favourite summer resort, commercially the fisheries could never attain much importance. It is a question of whether, in normal times, this is a perfectly true statement of the facts, but surely even the United States Government, who are at present our allies, would not wish to deprive this country of a large amount of fish, simply with the object of making an attractive summer resort of the villages on the border of lake Champlain. As the hon. minister has said, this has been a question which has been debated between the two countries for a great number of years. There have, apparently, always been very good reasons which have compelled, or impelled, our Government to refuse the request of the United States to prohibit seining. I personally am quite convinced that during this period of six weeks, which is before the fish are spawning, more pike will be destroyed by the large number of perch left in the lake than are taken out by the seine. The perch abound there in great numbers, and they live on the newly-hatched spawn of the pike and bass. So that I think this prohibition of seining will really result in a large increase of perch, and, therefore, in a large decrease in the number of sporting fish. However, at the present time, I base my request to the Government largely on the importance of securing all the fish possible for consumption in this country.

There is another matter which is worthy of attention. These fishermen have been fishing in this lake under license from the Government, as I said before, for some forty or fifty years. The season commences on the first of March, and the Government passed an Order in Council on the 18th day of February. This was not published in the press until about the 23rd of February. I know that the fishermen have quite large investments in their seines and ropes, and several of them who fish in this lake purchased new equipment this year. It would hardly seem fair to these men that they should be deprived without some notice, of what they have regarded for so many years as a right from the Government to fish. I would urge the hon. minister to take this question up with our Canadian commissioners, and procure evidence from local people as to the truth of the assertion of the United States commissioner, in order that, for another year, the rights of fishing in lake Champlain may be restored.

Mr. DEMERS: I am glad that the hon. gentleman from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) has brought this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because we, in that part of the country, are interested in this question, which is a very important one for us. I believe the Government has misjudged the true situation, and that this question was not fully considered. Apparently this Order in Council was the result of mutual concessions between the United States and Canada, but I believe that the only concession was on our side. I submit that there can be no comparison between the action of the United States Government in prohibiting the importation of lobster taken outside of our territorial waters and the action of the Canadian Government in prohibiting at any time fishing by means of nets in Missisquoi bay and the Canadian waters of lake Champlain. Our close season for lobster fishing is as beneficial to the United States as to Canada. With our protective legislation as to lobster fishing, lobster is more plentiful not only in Canadian waters, but outside, and even in American territorial waters. But in this case it is not the same thing at all. Here we have an Order in Council passed by the Canadian Government which will be beneficial only to the United States. Pike perch is not lobster and lobster is not pike

perch. Lobster is not a migrating fish as pike perch and bass are and the consequence of this difference is that as pike perch and bass resort to Missisquoi bay in springtime for spawning purposes only, as soon as the spawning time is through these fish migrate to American waters and never come back. By their nature they always tend to go upstream; and they go into American waters and do not come back. I submit that by this Order in Council we will be deprived of this kind of fishing at all times and the only result will be to give the benefit of that kind of fishing to the Americans, particularly American sportsmen.

But there is another aspect of this question which should be considered by this House. There are a good number of families of fishermen who for two or three generations have been partially engaged in this occupation. During the winter time they go to large expense in order to be ready for the season and they rely very largely on fishing for their living. Just at the opening of the season, without any notice, and although this question has been studied for many years, there comes an Order in Council which says that all this expense to which they have gone shall be a complete loss and that they must look elsewhere for their living. I do not think that is fair or reasonable, and I blame the Government for having acted in this matter by Order in Council. If this Government, or the minister, wished to imitate the Americans, for whom some of them seem now to have so much admiration, they had excellent occasion to do so. They could have introduced a Bill into this House as the Americans have done with regard to the question of the lobster fishery, and as we can see by the letter which my hon. friend received from the department. We see that with regard to the question of the lobster fishery the United States have not yet made a concession, but they have introduced a Bill into Congress. They did not pass any Order in Council. I think this Government would have done better to have imitated the action of the United States Government and introduced a Bill into this House. That would have been more democratic, more constitutional, and in that way the Government would not have hurt these poor fishermen.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. members who have spoken. As hon. gentlemen are quite aware, lake Champlain, which is owned by the United States, is fifty miles long and seven miles wide. I am sure that hon. gentlemen are also aware that for many years the United States Government have not permitted any nets to be used in lake Champlain. Our great ally is standing shoulder to shoulder with Canada to-day, not only with her men at the front but also giving us freely of her money. Our American friends also have granted to Canada the vast privileges that I mentioned a moment ago by allowing our fishing vessels to clear for American ports and to dispose of their catches there. They own lake Champlain, fifty miles long and seven miles wide, and we own Missisquoi Bay, which is only from three to five miles wide: They are anxious to preserve the fish of lake Champlain and have been pressing upon us, a friendly nation, for years, to prohibit net fishing for perch at the time of the year when the fish are spawning. What attitude should we have taken? It has been clearly proved that this is the time of the year when the perch spawn. It also has been clearly proved that Missisquoi bay is the spawning ground of the perch. Hon. gentlemen have said that probably this action was taken very hurriedly. I wish to assure them that it was not done hurriedly at all. We have on the international commission, men who understand thoroughly the fisheries of Canada and the United States. When representations were made from the States of Vermont and New York before this international commission when it was sitting in the city of Boston as to the effect of this net fishing, when it was asked to prohibit net fishing of perch in this small Missisquoi bay, was it not the logical, the businesslike course for Canada to say to her cousins, that Canada would agree to the fair proposition that our allies made? I think the House will take this broad view of the question. We cannot take a local view of a question like this, and even if we did, I do not see any ground that would cause the commission to refuse to give to our American friends the very fair concession that the Canadian Government has just granted.

11 p.m.

Mr. KAY: Would the minister tell the committee if he considers such action proper at this time, in view of the very urgent appeal for food production and conservation made by the right hon. the Prime Minister no later than last week to the Canadian people when he uttered the following words:

> It is the earnest hope of the Government that every citizen will realize his or her personal individual duty to adopt and carry out the suggestions made by the Canada Food Board.

Mere perfunctory observance will not be enough; the crisis is grave and urgent beyond possibility of exaggeration, and it will only be through an earnest sense of individual responsibility that Canadians will be able in this matter to honour their obligations to their heroic soldiers overseas who are defending our liberties at a cost beside which any personal inconvenience or discomfort on our part is insignificant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are weighty and serious words from the Prime Minister. Does it not seem to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that even the amount of ninety tons of fish, in view of the great scarcity of food, is more important at this time, not only to Canada but to the Allies, even to the United States herself? I consider that this is more important than the interests of a few American sportsmen who propose catching a few more pike when they are fishing during their holidays in the summertime. That, Sir, is to my mind one of the very important aspects of the case at the present moment.

With reference to the fact that the United States Government have prohibited seine fishing in the waters of lake Champlain, I might say that formerly that government permitted seine fishing in the channel leading from lake Champlain to Missisquoi bay. This channel is about three miles long and about one-half to three-quarters of a mile wide. It is the only passage, of course, by which the fish come from lake Champlain to Missisquoi bay, and when seining was permitted in lake Champlain, that was where all the seines were, and they practically stopped the fish from getting up at all. They caught every fish, or nearly every fish, that came up, whereas the fishing in Missisquoi bay is not done anywhere near the channel. As to the fish being caught by seines when they are spawning, I would again draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the close season begins on the 15th of April, and that when the close season begins, which is the time when the fish are supposed to spawn, the fishing is stopped.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance, and inspections of cold storage for bait, the conservation and development of deep sea fisheries and of the demand for fish and to provide for better transportation facilities for fish—$110,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Railways is present (Mr. J. D. Reid), and I would therefore ask whether any refrigerator cars have been provided for the transportation of fish. It is all very well to keep the fish in cold storage at the various harbours, but it is important to transport that fish in cold storage, on the Government cars, from the Maritime Provinces to inland points. For some years past accommodation of this nature has been provided, and I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) to tell me what has been done lately in that regard.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have a number of refrigerator cars on the Government railway system, but the business of transporting fish is increasing and we need more cars. Within the last few days I have awarded a contract for, I think, one hundred and fifty or two hundred and fifty refrigerator cars. The Canadian Northern Railway system have a number of refrigerator cars, and there are a few belonging to the Canadian Government Railway system, but not a sufficient number. However, it takes some little time to procure new cars, and I sent the superintendent of car service away a few weeks ago to buy some second-hand cars so that we might get a few that we could use in the meantime. We are preparing as fast as possible to increase the number of cars for this particular service. Of course, the Amercian lines are taking a lot of these cars to the other side—even a number of those that we have, and when they get over there it is very difficult to secure their return. This applies not only to refrigerator cars, but to box cars and freight cars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There will be a debate on this question later on, and at present I am mainly concerned with the consumption of our fish in Canada, and I would ask my hon. friend to see that a number of refrigerator cars are put aside for the Canadian service proper. He is aware that for months to come fish will be more and more in demand. It is an excellent food, and certainly the fish found in Canadian waters are of a very superior quality. It is a thousand pities that more fish is not consumed inland—in Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Kingston and elsewhere. I represent one of the maritime constituencies and I know the great need for refrigerator cars. However, I have a motion on the Order Paper in regard to this matter, and intend to bring it up again.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was brought to my attention within the last month that cars should be obtained almost immediately for the carrying of such products as have been mentioned, between the lower provinces and, say, Montreal and Ontario. As I have said, I have arranged to purchase ten or fifteen second-hand cars, which will be available within the next month or six weeks. We have awarded a contract for a large number of new cars, but they will

not be delivered until September or October and these second-hand cars will be available in the meantime for the short run between Montreal and the lower provinces.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a limited refrigerator express service now one day each week from Mulgrave and Halifax to Montreal, the Department of Marine and Fisheries paying for the icing of the car as well as one-third of the express charges. In addition, we have a refrigerator fast freight service from Mulgrave and Halifax to Montreal three days each week, the department guaranteeing the earnings of the car on each trip west to be at least $35 plus the cost of icing. I sympathize with the suggestion of the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that it would be well to have more refrigerator cars; we hope to have an express system instead of the system I have just referred to. Hon. gentlemen will see that the Government are doing a good deal in paying the charges which I have mentioned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the large centres more fish will be consumed in future, and if it can be obtained at reasonable prices certainly the community at large would be much benefited. Some years ago the Department of Agriculture paid bonuses to cold storage establishments in different parts of Canada. Is there not also an arrangement whereby the Department of Marine and Fisheries, with a view to encouraging these establishments amongst the fishermen, grants the latter a bonus on their cold storage operations, subject to plans and regulations adopted by the department?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I take it that the matter of refrigerator cars comes under the Department of Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, the Department of Railways furnishes the cars.

Mr. J. READ: When the Minister of Railways brings down his estimates I hope that he will have made provision for a very much larger number of refrigerator cars than appears to be now contemplated. A great number of these cars will be needed in the immediate future for the service between Prince Edward Island and Ontario and Quebec, for the carrying not only of fish, but of potatoes as well.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not mean to say that the 150 or 250 cars that we are ordering are entirely for the carrying of fish. Officials of the Canadian Northern and Government railways met and decided that we should order the number of cars that I have mentioned, for the carrying of apples, fish, potatoes and other articles which should be transported in refrigerator cars. When my estimates are brought down I will have full information on this subject.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad that in this item the minister is making provisions for assisting the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage for bait. The fish used for bait in Nova Scotia is a small kind of herring which comes in large quantities around the coast in the spring and is to be obtained only during a short period of time, possibly a month or so. Unless he catches sufficient quantities of that small herring at that particular season, the ordinary fisherman cannot get it at any other time and is not in a position to furnish himself with all the bait that he will require during June, July, August, September, and late in the season. It is all very well to say that the fishermen should themselves provide a place for the storage of bait, but the experience of the last fifty years is that they will not do it, and fortunes are lost, one might say, because the fish come in large quantities around the coast and the fishermen cannot get them unless he has the bait. For many years I have urged that some such provision should be made as is effective in the colony of Newfoundland, where the Government obtains and sells bait to the fishermen. I suggest not that the Government give the bait away, but that facilities be provided for the storing of bait at suitable places and that it be available for sale to the fishermen at all times while fishing is on. I hope that provision made by the minister under this item is a beginning in that regard. We are too niggardly about the spending of a few thousand dollars, even a million dollars, on the fishermen. We have no conception of the immense wealth that is at our doors, particularly in Nova Scotia, in connection with the fisheries—wealth of which we are getting only the fringe. Thousands of tons of the finest fish come along the shores, and we take only one of every million of them, simply because we are not properly equipped. I can assure the minister and the Government that any money they spend in providing bait facilities to encourage the fishermen in the catching of fish will be money well spent, and the people of Canada will appreciate and praise what they are doing in that direction.

Mr. DUFF: I am glad to hear my hon. friend speak of the necessity for cold storage facilities in Nova Scotia. I think I am correct in saying that there are at present mechanical bait freezers at Halifax, Canso, Port Hawkesbury and Lunenburg. These mechanical bait freezers are doing excellent work, much better than the smaller freezers. The small bait freezer has not been a great success, but the large bait freezer has been doing excellent work. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Government to the absolute necessity, in view of the fact that we are asked to produce more, of providing further bait facilities. As far as my own county is concerned, at present we have about 125 vessels engaged in deep sea fishing, and these vessels have to send as far as Providence in the United States, for their bait. About three weeks ago about 25 cars of bait were imported from there to Lunenburg, to partly supply the fishermen with the bait they require for their first fishing. I would suggest to the minister that if any place in the province of Nova Scotia deserves to have a bait freezer it is the county of Lunenburg. If a bait freezer were established there, the fishermen would be so encouraged that they would go into the steam trawling business, and inside of two years there would be a considerable number of steam trawlers fishing out of Lunenburg and other parts of the province. This would mean that the production of fish in Nova Scotia would be increased two-fold. I trust the minister will take this suggestion into consideration, and agree to have at least one bait freezer at Lunenburg, and another at North Sydney, where the vessels call in the fall of the year.

To provide for fisheries Exhibit at Canadian Exhibition at Toronto, $5,000.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I understood that all the exhibitions were going to be cut out this year. Is there any real reason for this exhibit at Toronto?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: According to the information I have here, I think the department are fully justified in continuing this exhibit. During the exhibition we run a good fisheries restaurant on the grounds, where we serve a fish dinner at 35 cents. During the ten days of the exhibition last year, we served 38,772 fish dinners, and our exhibit only cost $4,399.02 and the restaurant $5,455.07. This year we have cut the item down from $10,000 to $5,000, and I really think in view of the information I have here, I am justified in asking the House to pass this small amount.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Have you increased the price of the dinners?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. KAY: A few moments ago the minister stated that economy was the watchword of this Government. Now it does not seem to me that an expenditure of even the small amount of $5,000 is necessary for a fisheries exhibit at the Toronto exhibition. I have at the present time a resolution on the Order Paper urging the Government to prohibit all exhibitions this year, and to be consistent with the view which I very strongly hold, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. McMaster, that this item be struck out.

Mr. McMASTER: It is not necessary for me to make any lengthy remarks on this motion at this advanced hour of the evening. The Government has very properly been making an appeal to the Canadian people for thrift and economy. With the price of bacon and other meats as high as it is in Toronto, is it necessary to encourage the Toronto folk to eat more fish by supplying them with these dinners?

Mr. JACOBS: More brains.

Mr. McMASTER: I think it would be only fitting if the Government set an example of economy and thrift to the people by cutting out this item, and therefore I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would remind my hon. friend from Brome that this is not simply a Toronto Exhibition, but a national exhibition, to which people come from not only all parts of Ontario, but from all over Canada. When we take into consideration that very nearly 39,000 fish dinners were served by our restaurant on the exhibition grounds last year, and if, as my hon. friend from Cartier suggests, this is going to add to the brain power of the people of Ontario, I think the House, appreciating as it does the value of advertising, ought to feel justified in voting this small item.

Mr. JACOBS: We have voted the amount so often without results in added brain power that I think it should be cut out.

Mr. McKINLEY: Or the vote made very much larger.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friends must appreciate the advertising value of this exhibit, when they remember that the Canadian Exhibition at Toronto is visited by nearly one million people every year. Surely hon. gentlemen do not wish to

retard the fishing industry of Canada by objecting to this small sum.

Mr. ROBB: I must say that earlier in the evening I told the Government Whip there would be no vote to-night. Perhaps the Government would consent to adjourn and leave this item over.

Mr. REID: If there is any objection to this item we could let it stand and take up some other item; it is only for a small amount anyway.

Mr. McMASTER: It is not simply a question of $5,000, but it is a question of spending $5,000 for something that is not absolutely necessary, and then spending $3,000 on some other work that is not absolutely necessary. It is here a little and there a little, and it comes to a considerable sum in the aggregate. We are merely asking the Government to show the sincerity I am sure they possess in their desire that the people of this country should economize.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Toronto Exhibition is a very large one, I suppose the largest in Canada. It has been customary to have an exhibit there. The item has been cut down this year to $5,000. People come from one end of the Dominion to the other to attend this exhibition. It is quite evident that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after taking the matter up with the officials, has come to the conclusion that, rather than do away with the item altogether, it would be better to spend a small amount. However, if there is any objection to it, there is no reason why the item should not stand.

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to say that the motion of the hon. member for Missisquoi is not in order, because he moved to reject the resolution in its entirety. The only way to do that would be to vote against it. The resolution will stand for further discussion, and members of the Opposition have a perfect right to vote against the resolution when it is again brought before the Committee. Any motion to have it struck out is unnecessary.

Item stands.

Salaries and maintenance of fish breeding establishments, $300,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to draw to the attention of the Committee, and of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) that the Government have cut this item down $100,000, which is in keeping with his wishes.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, but I hope the good impression made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not be removed in a moment by a statement that he will place another fifty or seventy-five thousand dollars in some supplementary estimate. He raised our hopes very high. He pointed out $101,000 of a decrease in item 227, and when we were prepared to congratulate him he said that in the supplementary estimates some further amounts would be brought down.

To provide for the inspection of pickled fish, $15,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Now that explanation about those inspectors will come in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Do you want to know the names of the inspectors?

Mr. McKENZIE: I want to know what they are doing, their justification for living.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. gentleman is aware that these inspectors are called upon to inspect pickled fish there, and while it is voluntary we have given some consideration to the possibility of making it compulsory later on by introducing legislation, probably next session. In the meantime, I might state that those inspectors inspected last year in all 8,977 barrels of herring and mackerel. Of these 3,083 failed to pass the inspection.

Mr. McMASTER: The cost of inspection is almost $3 a barrel.

Mr. DUFF: In my county alone there must have been 20,000 barrels of pickled fish caught and handled, and I do not think the inspector ever saw 100 barrels of fish. I think in the interests of economy the money spent in my county, at least, could be very well saved, and the inspector's services dispensed with.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not very much of a fisherman, nor am I very much interested in fish, except that I represent a large number of fishermen. It has been dinned into my ears continuously that we have an inspector residing in the city of Sydney receiving a very considerable salary and he is not doing anything. I should like to know if in the four counties, Inverness, Richmond, Victoria and Cape Breton, there has been any inspection which would justify the existence of an officer of this kind, at a high salary. If he is earning the salary, I have no objection, but if he is sitting in his house or attending to his other business and receiving public money that he does not earn, I would certainly object.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am advised by the superintendent of fisheries that the salary of the inspector at Sydney is $1,200 a year; and that he has made very many inspections there. I am sorry I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the exact number to-night, but I will be very glad to furnish the information to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE: The furnishing to me of the information does not concern us very much, but I want the minister to inquire if this man is earning his money.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. McKENZIE: He does not need the salary, because he is a well-off man, and a big merchant.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thank the hon. gentleman for bringing the matter to my attention. I shall look into it to-morrow; if this inspector is earning the money he will remain—if not, he will go.

Mr. COPP: I want to ask a question in regard to fish hatcheries. You have reduced the estimated expenditure $100,000. Is it the intention to close up some of the fish hatcheries, or is this a reduction of salaries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is a saving of $30,000 a year in not reopening the fish hatcheries, and there are other matters which go to make up the reduction.

Mr. COPP: Is there a reduction of salaries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. The largest item is the $30,000 to be saved by not opening up the lobster hatcheries, and, in addition to that, we are not going to carry on the usual programme adopted by the Government. We are going to curtail, and that is one of the reasons that we have every effort possible to make the handsome reduction shown here of $100,000.

Mr. COPP: Are you closing the fourteen lobster hatcheries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Closing them all.

Mr. COPP: For what reason?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not an expert fisherman, but I have taken the best technical advice I could from those on the spot, and also from expert technical people who have devoted a great deal of time and study to the lobster industry, and I have been informed—and I think credibly informed—that the lobster hatcheries do not produce within 70 per cent of the small fry which would be produced if they were allowed to go on in the usual way. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that when the female lobster is caught, it is taken to the canneries, and the eggs are brushed off, then an officer calls for these eggs, and they are put into a jar, and hatched in the hatchery. I am told that in this way there is only thirty per cent production.

If the eggs are allowed to remain on the female lobster in the usual way until the time has arrived when the female extrudes her eggs, there is a one hundred per cent production. We have, therefore, decided not to continue the hatcheries and consequently we can save $30,000 a year.

Mr. COPP: I had occasion to read the very interesting and valuable report made by Prof. Knight on this question, and he advises very strongly against the further maintenance of these lobster hatcheries. Has the department come to the conclusion absolutely to do away with these hatcheries and dispose of the property?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is the final decision of the department to permanently do away with these hatcheries and we are going to advertise the buildings and lands for sale.

Mr. KAY: Referring again for a minute to the question of seine fishing in Missisquoi bay, I would ask the minister if he would not consider the advisability and fairness of indemnifying these fishermen for the expense they have gone to in preparing for the season's fishing under the impression that they would get their licenses as usual.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman's recommendation will be taken into consideration by the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: I notice the minister says he is going to abolish the lobster hatcheries. He told us that the better way was to rely upon the natural propagation of the lobster. Our difficulty in the Maritime Provinces has been that the lobster fisherman catches the berried lobster as well as the other, and uses it. Has the minister any well matured scheme by which he can protect the mother lobster?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That question has also received very careful consideration by myself and the technical officers of the department. We are going to send Prof. Knight down there, together with some students who have given a great deal of time and thought to this industry, and we

are going to carry on a campaign amongst those lobster fishermen to endeavour to prevail upon them as far as we possibly can to return to the sea every female lobster they catch. Just how far we will succeed time will tell.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend any news about the Stanley? The fishermen on the Magdalen Islands are waiting patiently for a ship. A member of the Quebec Government wired me to-day. The Minister of Agriculture wants to ship grain to the people of the Magdalen islands, and he wants to know if the Stanley is to be sent in a few days.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry to inform my hon. friend that the Stanley was damaged by ice when she went to the rescue of the Russian steamer. She is being repaired in Halifax now and I hope to receive definite information by to-morrow. I am fully seized of the necessity of sending the steamer Stanley to the Magdalen islands as I understand the fishermen are badly in need of gasolene and coal oil. I hope to be in a position to let my hon. friend know definitely to-morrow.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the members of the Government to make inquiries to ascertain where the $160,000 paid in fishing bounty comes from so that we will have that information when the question comes to be discussed in the House. It strikes me that this is the interest which is being paid on the $5,000,000 that was granted under the Fishery Award in 1872 or 1873. I think it would be just as well to look into that so as to be able to present the information to the House when the matter comes up.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can answer my hon. friend by telling him he is perfectly correct in his statement. This bounty is the interest under the Award which was made in 1877.

Mr. READ: When that item comes up I want to point out that there is an unjust and unequal distribution of the money.

Mr. FIELDING: The item will not come up, because the payment is fixed by statute.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand, as a result of my ramblings in the county of Gaspé that a very large number of the fishermen transfer these bounty cheques to the merchants on the coasts, sometimes for a very small consideration, and that they regret after a while that they have negotiated these cheques. Was there not a regulation passed some years ago whereby these cheques were honoured by the department and paid only to the fishermen and whereby merchants getting hold of these cheques could not use them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is quite true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that condition still exist?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The money is paid directly to the fishermen and not paid to the merchants?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so. I appreciate very much the way in which the committee has helped me to get my estimates through. There is just that little Toronto item if you want to clear everything off.

To provide for a fisheries exhibit at the Canadian Exhibition at Toronto, $5,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. McMASTER: Under pressure brought by the representatives of the Maritime Provinces who evidently wish to stand in well with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.56 p.m.

Wednesday, April 3, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 28, respecting The Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company. — Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 29, respecting a patent of O. G. C. L. J. Overbeck.—Mr. Fripp.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

SUGGESTION BY MR. SPEAKER TO SAVE UNNECESSARY EXPENSE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to direct the attention of hon. members to a matter affecting the practice of moving for returns. Experience has taught us that in many cases hon. members move for returns which have been previously moved for and obtained. Many of these returns involve a great deal of clerical work and consequent expense, and hon. members will assist very materially in the desire to save money and to prevent waste if, having moved for returns, they get in touch with the depart-

ment concerned in order that they may advise as to the particular information which they require. If hon. members will communicate with the proper officers of the House before moving for returns, they can ascertain whether returns previously brought down cover the information which they desire. By exercising care in this respect hon. members can assist very materially in saving public money.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DISTURBANCES IN QUEBEC—REPORTS FROM THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES READ BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

On Motions being called:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): As the Orders of the day may not be reached until rather late, I think it desirable that I should give to the House the information which I promised yesterday with regard to the recent very regrettable events in the city of Quebec.

The first document which I shall read is a summary of a number of communications which have been received from the military authorities in the city of Quebec by telephone or by telegram. It is as follows:

Ottawa, April 2, 1918.

On 29th March information was received that on the previous night a clash had occurred between police and civilians at Quebec, in connection with the administration of the Military Service Act. It was reported that civilians had badly damaged the police station, in which three detectives had taken refuge from the mob, and that one of them had been severely injured. The General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5 (Brig. General J. P. Landry) was called upon for a full report and the Inspector General, Eastern Canada (Major General F. L. Lessard) was warned to hold himself in readiness to proceed to Quebec. Same day General Landry reported that there had been a disturbance that No. 3 Police Station had been stoned and wrecked, and that four men had been injured. The Mayor thought he could deal with the situation and that military asistance was not required. The Mayor was assured that military assistance in case of urgency was available, but he stated that he expected to be able to cope alone with any outbreak. Reports were received from other sources throughout the afternoon and evening that the situation threatened to become more serious and the General Officer Commanding was ordered by telegram to work in cooperation with the civil power but in case of urgent necessity to act on his own initiative, avoiding a collision if possible. About 10 p.m. General Landry reported by telephone that the offices of the Quebec Chronicle had been attacked and that a large mob was destroying the Registrar's office. The Mayor had requested him to call out troops but as the requisition was not in order he (the Mayor) had left to obtain further signatures. As reports were of an alarming character General Landry asked for instructions. He was directed to use his own discretion and to take such action as he considered necessary to restore and preserve order. Accordingly the troops were ordered out. There was no clash and by 10.30 order had been restored, the annex of the Auditorium Building having been set on fire and the offices of the Chronicle having been wrecked.

About mid-day March 30, the G.O.C., M.D. 5 reported that situation was getting worse and he required 1,000 men additional to the 800 already available. Orders were at once issued to move the number of troops called for to Quebec, and General Lessard was directed to proceed from Halifax to Quebec, there to assume general command. On the night of the 30th there was further disorder; the mob was very unruly, the troops were ordered out, several soldiers were injured, and a hardware store was looted in search of arms.

On 31st a report was received that riots had broken out during the day, pickets were attacked on duty while removing arms and ammunition from the stores; two officers were injured, revolver shots were fired at a street car, and another store was looted in search of arms and set on fire. On this day General Lessard arrived and assumed command.

On Monday, April 1st General Lessard took the precaution to cause notices to be placarded and published in the press advising the public against taking part in unlawful assemblies, pointing out the risk they ran of being killed or injured, if they did so, and notifying all concerned that the authorities, should necessity arise, would use every means at their disposal to maintain peace, and order. Citizens were at the same time warned not to leave their dwellings and not to mix with the rioters who were causing disturbance throughout the city.

At nightfall, however, in spite of the notices which had been published, a large crowd assembled; and from house-tops, side-streets, snow banks and other places of concealment the rioters opened fire point blank on the troops who as on the previous nights displayed great steadiness, and forbearance under severe provocation. But at length, after several soldiers had received bullet wounds, it became absolutely necessary for the troops to return the fire—in self defence, for the protection of the public and to prevent the situation passing entirely beyond control.

Five soldiers were wounded, and of the crowd four were killed, many were injured and fifty-eight were arrested.

By 1.20 a.m. next morning order had been re-established and by 5 a.m. the troops had returned to barracks.

We have information to-day that perfect order is still maintained in the city under military direction.

The next report is from Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. Machin, Director of the Military Service Branch. It is dated Ottawa, April 2, 1918, and is addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Justice, Ottawa::

Sir,

I have the honour to report that, in obedience to your instructions, I left Ottawa on Friday the 29th ultimo at 4.30 and proceeded immediately to Quebec, arriving there early the following morning. I was met by Captain Desrochers, the Inspector of Dominion Police, at that point.

This officer had suffered at the hands of the mob the previous evening and was still showing evidence of having been very severely handled.

It appears that on Thursday night, the 28th ultimo, two Dominion constables named Belanger and Evanturel were, in pursuance of their duties, searching for defaulters in St. Roch, and visited a bowling alley where a young man named Mercier was asked to produce his exemption certificate or papers to show why he should not be in uniform. He stated that he had received a certificate of exemption but did not have it with him and that it was at his house. The police then took the young man to the police station, telling him that he would be released immediately when his papers were forthcoming. The certificate of exemption was sent for by a friend and afterwards produced and Mercier was liberated.

Shortly afterward, the Dominion Police to the number of fifteen were mobbed by a crowd which had gathered, it is stated, at a bowling alley in St. Roch which, it is alleged, was the headquarters for the agitators. The Dominion Police took refuge in No. 3 Municipal Police Station and the mob, which by this time had grown to very large numbers, possibly two thousand, proceeded to demolish the building and finally over-powered the Municipal Police who had refused the mob admission to the police station, seized about twelve of the Dominion constables and started to wreak their vengeance on them, seven or eight of whom were wounded, two quite seriously and Captain Desrochers himself being badly battered about. This affair lasted for nearly two hours during which time Captain Desrochers telephoned from the police station to the G. O. C. for a military escort to come to the rescue of the Dominion Police and take them away from the mob. Captain Desrochers was referred to the Mayor with whom he had previously been in touch and as a result the Mayor came to the police station and made a speech, but without effect, the crowd subsequently taking the action I have just related. The Municipal police at this station tried to keep the crowd out but lost control, mob rule resulting.

Captain Desrochers states that he requested the Chief of Police to call out all available Municipal police to the aid of the Dominion Police, who had sought refuge in No. 3 police station, but this was not done, twelve police only being placed on this duty and this number was not increased, although Captain Desrochers pointed out how inadequate this force was.

Captain Desrochers telegraphed the full facts here and by three o'clock on Friday the 29th ultimo, it was known here that an attack was contemplated on the Registrar's office at Quebec, that night. On my arrival in Quebec on Saturday the 30th ultimo, I found that the rumour had been carried into effect with the result that two newspaper offices had been wrecked and the Registrar's office had been set on fire. The contemplated action of the mob had been repeatedly communicated on Friday by Captain Desrochers to the Mayor and the G. O. C. Captain Desrochers informs me that no adequate protection was afforded by the Municipal authorities to save the Registrar's office and that a small force of the city police who had been placed in front of the Registrar's office were not only inadequate for its protection but were quiescent when the mob started to attack the place. On Friday the 29th ultimo, Captain Desrochers, although himself injured, remained all day at the Central police station in company with the Chief of the City Police to whom he repeatedly urged that all available Municipal police be placed on duty, giving information as to the rumours which had reached him concerning the proposed attack on the Registrar's office. It is stated that a force of from sixty to seventy men might have been sufficient to have prevented, at the outset, the ransacking and burning of the Registrar's office. The Chief of the City Police received reports from patrolmen with the result that he persisted in his opinion that no trouble was to be anticipated and that Captain Desrochers was unduly alarmed. At eight p.m. on Friday the 29th ultimo, the Chief of Police being absent and supposed to be with the Mayor, a message was received at the Central Police Station to the effect that a crowd was marching up from St. Roch to the Auditorium. This message was repeated over the telephone to the Mayor, Captain Desrochers being present when the telephone message was sent. The mob marched up town and back to St. Roch. Following this move, twelve police, all that had been provided by the city police, were sent to the Auditorium. The crowd returned up town from St. Roch in very increased numbers and proceeded to smash the two newspaper offices, which were practically demolished. The crowd then proceeded to the Registrar's office at the Auditorium,—this would be about 9 p.m. Captain Desrochers telephoned the G. O. C. and informed him of the situation, when he was asked where the Mayor was. Apparently the G. O. C. contemplated that the Mayor would be at the scene of disorder. Captain Desrochers then went from the City Hall to the General Post Office and to Military Headquarters, and was there informed that the Auditorium had been attacked, the windows, etc., being smashed though the rioters had not then penetrated the building. After a short interview the G. O. C. succeeded in communicating by telephone with the Mayor, who immediately proceeded to Headquarters, where he was handed a prepared copy of the Riot Act, and requested to proceed to the scene of riot and read it. The Mayor left in company with the Chief of Police for the scene of the riot. It appears that the Mayor and Chief of Police, in their trip to Military Headquarters, had passed the Auditorium, as Captain Desrochers was informed by the Chief of Police that the crowd were then in the building and throwing the records into the street. Captain Desrochers is of the opinion that both the occurrences would have been avoided if the civic authorities had taken notice of his repeated warnings and a proper display of protection had been made by civic police as requested by him.

The facts as to what transpired between the military authorities and the Mayor must be obtained from the former as I have no knowledge of it other than hearsay. After the Registrar's office had been set on fire, the fire brigade were called out, but owing to the action of the mob in preventing the firemen from performing their duties great damage was done to the building and records before the fire was brought under control.

After careful investigation I find that the greater portion of the most important records were saved, as they had been locked away in a back filing room and were apparently overlooked by the mob, smoke and water being the cause of damage to these documents which with the exception of possibly one thousand names will be saved and from which new records can

be made up. All the office furniture, Chief Public Representative's files and documents, stationery and supplies—in fact everything except the small filing room already spoken of—have been totally destroyed. Steps are now being taken to re-establish the Registrar's office at Quebec and I contemplate having this office in full working order at an early date.

As the lives and personal property of the Dominion Police had been threatened I instructed Captain Desrochers to have his men scattered and for the present to make no arrests. The work of the Dominion Police in Quebec, therefore, for the moment is suspended. Captain Desrochers informs me that there has been, since the commencement of activities by the Dominion Police, threats made against individual members of the force and what work they have been able to accomplish has been done in the face of a hostile attitude from practically every source.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) H. A. Machin.
Director, Military Service Branch.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Detailed statement of remissions of customs duties and the refund thereof, under section 92, Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, through the Department of Customs, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Detailed statement of all bonds or securities registered in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada since last return (31st January, 1917) submitted to the Parliament of Canada under section 32 of chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Memorandum of conferences between representatives of labour and the War Committee, January, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

COUNCIL FOR THE INDIAN TRIBES OF CANADA.

Bill No. 30, to incorporate a council for the Indian Tribes of Canada—Mr. Porter—introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

THE STEAMER COURCELETTE.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the Quebec Harbour Commission owner of a steamship called the Courcelette?
2. If so, when was this boat bought, from whom, and at what price?
3. For what object was it bought?
4. For what object has it been used?
5. What was the number of persons who composed the crew in the months of July and August, 1917?
6. What salary was paid to each?
7. What excursions were made by the said steamer during the months of June, July and September, 1917?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. September 28th, 1916; Canadian Salvage Association Ltd.; $27,000.
3. General service boat for inspection of port and harbour, and harbour works.
4. As general service boat for inspection of port and harbour, and harbour works.
5. July, 13; August, first two weeks, 13, 2nd fortnight, 12.
6. Captain $92.40; mate, $46.20; 1st engineer, $101.60; 2nd engineer, $65.30; fireman, $18; fireman, $23.25; fireman, $15; steward, $46.20; cook, $51.30; mess boy, $11.25; sailor, $24.50; sailor, $24.50; sailor, $24.50.
7. The boat was used for visiting the port of Quebec, two or three times by the commissioners and guests; twice by the Lieutenant-Governor and guests, three times by ministers of the Crown and guests; once by Mr. T. W. Lamont, member of the firm J. P. Morgan & Co., to Moisie river at the request of the Department of Marine; expenses of this trip were paid by Mr. Lamont. It was used in connection with the putting up of the Quebec bridge, and twice in connection with shipbuilding plant at Island of Orleans, and once visiting the harbour with Mr. K. Yamagishi, representative of the Mitsubishi Shipbuilding Company of Tokyo, Japan.

OLEOMARGARINE LICENSES.

Mr. LEDUC:

1. How many firms have asked for licenses for the manufacture of oleomargine?
2. How many firms have been granted such licenses?
3. What are the names of said firms?
4. What are the names of shareholders?
5. Are the licenses limited?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. 15.
2. 2.
3. The Harris Abattoir Company., Ltd., and the Swift Canadian Co., Ltd., both of Toronto.
4. The Department of Agriculture has no information.
5. The licenses are not limited, the only conditions being comformity to the law on the part of those holding them.

OTTAWA POSTMASTER.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What commission, if any, did Mr. A. G. Acres, Postmaster at the City of Ottawa, receive from the Government, for the purchase by him for the Government, of the land situate

on the North side of Wellington Street and on the West side of Bank Street?

2. Did Mr. Acres, or the real estate company with which he was connected before being appointed Postmaster of Ottawa, ever act for the Government in connection with the purchase of any other property?

3. Did Mr. Acres hold any position in the Militia of Canada, or in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces overseas?

4. If so, what was the position, and what was the salary attached thereto?

5. How much did he receive for allowance, living and travelling expenses?

6. How long was he overseas?

7. Did he go to France? If so, how long was he there?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. $22,260.42.

2 No information.

3. Yes.

4. Hon. captain and paymaster, 77th Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force, with pay as follows: Regimental pay, $3 per diem.

5. Field allowance, subsistence allowance and travelling expenses $867; separation allowance from 1st August, 1915, to 31st December, 1916, at $40 per month $680.

6. On strength overseas, three months and eleven days.

7. No.

DISTRIBUTION OF FRUIT AND VEGETABLES.

Mr. GAUTHIER:

1. Has the Government appointed an agent of Transportation to control a regular distribution of fruits and vegetables?

2. If so, when was such appointment made?

3. Who has been appointed to this position, and what is his salary and duty?

4. Under the direction of which Department of the Government is he acting?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes.

2. On the 26th September, 1917, for a period of four months.

3. H. H. Schaefer; $200 per month; to assist in the movement of the apple and potato crops.

4. He is no longer in the employ of the Canada Food Board, his duty ceasing on the 26th January last.

CUSTOMS INQUIRY; NORFOLK COUNTY.

Mr. CAHILL:

1. Did the Customs Department, or any other Department of the Government, hold an inquiry at Simcoe, or elsewhere in the County of Norfolk, at any time since January 1st last? If so, where, and on what dates?

2. Was such inquiry the result of charges or of complaints made to the Government or to any Department thereof? If so, by whom were such charges or complaints made?

3. Were the Dominion Canners involved in such inquiry or investigation? If so, were their books gone into?

4. Did such inquiry relate to Government contracts or drawbacks? If not, to what did it relate?

5. What was the result of such inquiry?

6. Was a report made? If so, to whom, and will the papers be brought down?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Officers of customs held an inquiry at Simcoe on February 5th, 1918, and subsequent days.

2. Confidential information received by the customs led to this inquiry.

3. Yes. Their books were examined.

4. The inquiry related to drawback claims of the Dominion Canners.

5. The result of the inquiry was that some errors were found in the claims, and these were rectified.

6. A report was made to the Department of Customs. The papers will be brought down as usual when ordered.

PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL DEBENTURES.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Was the subject relating to the issue, sale and negotiation of provincial, municipal and other debentures, as set forth in the Order in Council dated 22nd December, 1917, considered by the Provincial Premiers of Canada and the Federal Government, at the Conference held at Ottawa, in February, 1918?

2. If so, what was the decision arrived at?

3. If not, why was the subject not considered?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is my impression that the report containing the conclusions of the conference has been laid on the table of the House. The report contains all the information available.

CONFERENCE OF PROVINCIAL PREMIERS AT OTTAWA.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to produce before this House copies of the proceedings of the Conference held at Ottawa, in February, 1918, between the Provincial Premiers of Canada and the Government; also, copies of the resolutions adopted and the remarks made in relation thereto?

2. If not, why?

3. If so, when will the said copies be produced?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The report has been laid on the Table, about two weeks ago, I think.

ARRESTS UNDER THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Out of the 3,895 men arrested by the police in virtue of the Military Service Act, 1917, how many were arrested in each of the provinces and the Yukon Territory?

2. Out of the 7,946 men enlisted in the United States, under the operation of the said Act, how many were from each of the provinces, and the Yukon Territory?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Following are the figures of men apprehended under the Military Service Act, divided into military districts:

Military	District	No. 1	295
"	"	" 2	471
"	"	" 3	507
"	"	" 4	710
"	"	" 5	108
"	"	" 6	292
"	"	" 7	105
"	"	" 10	447
"	"	" 11	378
"	"	" 12	405
"	"	" 13	177
Total			3,895

Information is not available in this department as to how many were apprehended in the different provinces, except in so far as they are co-terminous with the territorial limits of the districts.

2. No men have been enlisted in the United States under the operation of the Military Service Act.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the commissioned officers employed at Quebec by the Military authorities in connection with Recruiting Branch, Army Service Corps, The Royal Canadian Engineers, The Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery and The Royal Canadian Artillery?
2. How long have they been connected with each branch?
3. What service is each of them performing?
4. What salary is each one of them receiving?
5. Who are those among them who have performed service overseas and how long have they been actually at the front?
6. How long were they in the trenches?
7. To which battalion did they belong when overseas?

Mr. W. H. WHITE:

1. How many local tribunals were established throughout Canada under the Military Service Act?
2. What remuneration per diem was allowed each member of such tribunal?
3. What was remuneration per day for Secretary of tribunal and also for constables or caretaker of the Tribunal Sessional Chamber?
4. What has been the total expenditure to date on account of tribunals under the Military Service Act?
5. Are there any outstanding claims unpaid?

[Mr. Trahan.]

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. How many Victoria Crosses have been awarded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force to date?
2. What is the name, address, battalion, and rank of each recipient?
3. What is the official respective record in respect of which each decoration was given in each case?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

For a copy of all judgments rendered up to date under the operation of the Military Service Act, 1917, by the Central Appeal Judge.

OLEOMARGARINE.

MOTION BY MR. J. E. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Order in Council governing the manufacture, importation and sale of Oleomargarine should be amended and more strictly enforced, in order that the great dairy industry of Canada should be adequately protected.

He said: I feel I should preface my remarks by stating my position on this question. I do not intend to oppose the manufacture, importation or sale of oleomargarine in Canada at the present time, but I shall endeavour to show hon. gentlemen that the regulations are of such a nature as to allow fraud and deception to to be perpetrated. I do not believe that the ex-Minister of Agriculture was responsible for these regulations. I am sure we all appreciate the efforts he put forth on behalf of agriculture, and I am satisfied that no man ever filled the portfolio of agriculture in the Dominion with greater satisfaction to the farmers and all interested in the farming industry than did the ex-minister. As to the present Minister of Agriculture, I am sure the people of Canada must feel deeply indebted to him for joining the Cabinet, and offering his services in the development of our greatest industry. He, too, had nothing to do with the framing of these regulations, because they were already framed and placed before him a day or two after he took office. The men who, in my opinion, were responsible for these regulations were the oleomargarine manufacturers in Canada and the United States, and I think I shall be able to show that the regulations are framed entirely in their interests. The first Order was dated Tuesday, 23rd October, 1917, and the second clause of it reads:

For the purpose of these regulations, "oleomargarine" shall mean and include oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or any other substitute for butter which is manufactured wholly

or in part from any fat other than that from milk and cream.

This opens the door, not only to oleomargarine but to margarine, butterine or any other substitute for butter. I do not believe that the dairymen of Canada understood that the Government intended to allow all kinds of butter substitutes to come into this country free. I respectfully urge that the words to which I have called attention other than the word "oleomargarine," be struck out of these regulations, namely, the words, "margarine, butterine, or any other substitutes for butter which is manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than milk or cream". If you are going to allow margarine products to come into Canada, you open the door to a condition of affairs such as exists in the United States to-day. Last year there were over two thousand prosecutions in the United States having reference to the manufacture of oleomargarine, and over 4,000 men were summoned before the courts. This has been going on in the United States for years and years, and we have been very fortunate in Canada to be in a position not to permit this condition of affairs to exist. I will take the case of nut margarine. In the United States there are eleven different kinds of nut margarine manufactured. Not one of those products can be manufactured, as I understand, without introducing into it benzoate of soda, a most injurious constituent of food, in order that it may be preserved. Clause 5 of the regulations reads:

> Oleomargarine shall not be manufactured in any premises used as or connected with a butter factory, and no butter manufacturer or any person who handles butter for the purpose of re-working or mixing it, shall be given a license to import or to manufacture oleomargarine.

It simply means that the butter manufacturers of the country are forbidden in any way to take oleomargarine into their plants, or to take any of the oils to manufacture the products that are being used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. I am confident—and I speak for the dairymen of Canada—that they do not want privileges extended to them of using, in their process of manufacture, the oils that are mixed in the oleomargarine, but, on the other hand, they ask that their industry be surrounded with sufficient safeguards, so that their products may be reasonably protected. Clause 7 of the regulations reads:

> No person other than a manufacturer of oleomargarine shall mix oleomargarine and butter.

On the one hand, while the butter manufacturers are not allowed in any way to mix the oils, the oleomargarine men are allowed to import butter into their plants and mix it in any way they choose, bring it in, as they have been doing, in a coloured state, and turn it out as a substitute for butter, and make it as palatable as they possibly can. The dairymen do not believe that it is reasonable or fair that the butter should be taken into the margarine plants for the purpose of manufacturing an article which is supposed to be a substitute for butter, and which is made palatable by the very butter itself which is the product of the dairy farms of this country. Another clause to which I wish to call the attention of the minister reads:

> In all hotels restaurants and public eating houses where oleomargarine is used there shall be prominently displayed in some conspicuous place a placard containing the words "Oleomargarine served here" in capital black letters not less than one and one-half inches long.

I understand this clause is not being enforced in any way whatsoever, and that there are mighty few places that are carrying out the instructions laid down by the minister in this regard. We are either going to enforce the regulations, or else we are going to do an untold amount of injury to the public and to the dairymen of Canada. Further, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that the customs regulations allow oleomargarine to be imported into this country in a coloured form. I hope the Minister of Customs will undertake to instruct his officers in regard to the meaning of the word "tinted." The outcome is that this oleomargarine is coming in, and if they are allowed to use a considerable amount of butter to make it palatable, then the butter is put into the oleomargarine in the United States to be shipped into Canada. The dairymen of Canada thought they had a protection of four cents a pound on butter coming into Canada from the United States, but in that regard this protection is largely wiped out, especially if you allow them to mix the butter fat with the oleomargarine in the United States, colour it, and send it into Canada in that condition. I feel that these clauses of the regulations should receive the most careful attention of the minister, and I am sure they will.

Has the minister taken into consideration the enormous number of inspectors that would be required to investigate the conditions in regard to the manu-

facture, sale and importation of oleomargarine? I can hardly believe that he will attempt to say that the laws are being enforced by these inspectors. I am satisfied that he will not say that they are enforced. If the minister will be good enough to tell me how many inspectors are looking after our interests in this matter I would appreciate it very greatly. I will call attention to a further Order in Council that was passed on Monday, the 19th November, 1917, clause 4 of which reads:

> That the probable output of the proposed establishment will be sufficiently large to justify the employment of an inspector.

While it is true the Government intend to appoint inspectors where the manufacture of oleomargarine is carried on, yet it is quite evident that the manufacture of this product will be entirely in the hands of the large packing companies. I understand that the oleo oils cannot be obtained from the Canadian packers. I am so informed by men who have been anxious to enter into the manufacture of oleomargarine. In clause 6 of the more recent regulations I find the following sentence:

> No milk shall be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine unless it is from tuberculin tested cows or else has been pasteurized before using, and no butter shall be used in such manufacture unless it is free from rancidity or any objectionable odour.

The original Order in Council did not allow milk and cream into the oleomargarine manufactories, but this order allows the milk and cream to be taken into the oleomargarine manufacturing plants and to be there used in any way they care to use it, in order that they may perpetrate a fraud upon the public and undermine the dairy industry.

This great industry of Canada, the dairy industry, has developed to such an extent that the production last year amounted to over $200,000,000. We have in Canada cattle and milch cows that are valued by the department at $544,000,000. Surely this is an industry that is worthy of our very best attention. I thought that possibly I might be able to amend these regulations in some way, but I find that the rules of the House debar me from doing so. Therefore I can only offer to the minister the following amendments to the regulations governing the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine. In clause 2 of the Order in Council dated October 23, 1917, I propose that the words "margarine, butterine or any other substitute for butter," in the second line, and the words "or any part" in the third line, be struck out, and that clause 7 be struck out. Further, I propose that the Order in Council, dated October 19, 1917, be amended by striking out the last three lines in clause six, and that the words "or butter" be added after the word "milk" in the ninth line. These are some suggestions which I wish to place before the House.

I am sure that the minister is deeply interested in this question. He must be interested in the dairy industry of our country, because the great Northwest has been developing along these lines to a wonderful extent. Take for instance the province of Alberta. Mr. George H. Barr, of the Dominion Dairy Division said that winter creamery butter from the province of Alberta was equal to the June make of Ontario in quality and flavour. The extent to which t he dairy industry has developed is noteworthy. Dairy Commissioner Marker estimates the value of the output in his province as follows: in cheese, creamery, whole milk, cream and home dairy butter at $25,000,000. Since 1911 the number of milch cows has increased from 147,000 to 326,000 and during that time the total value of dairy products has increased from $7,855,000 to $25,000,000 per annum. The make of cheese has advanced in that time from 40,000 pounds to 1,250,000 pounds per annum. The cry of Alberta is that when Alberta is farmed as Denmark is farmed Alberta alone will be able to feed the whole British Empire. Similar statements might be made in regard to all the western provinces showing the enormous development of this industry owing to the encouragement it has had in years gone by. Look at the estimated dairy production in Canada in 1917, as shown by the following figures:

ESTIMATED DAIRY PRODUCTION IN CANADA 1917.

	Pounds.	Value.
Cheese	192,000,000	$ 41,760,000
Creamery Butter	74,000,000	31,080,000
Dairy Butter	150,000,000	60,000,000
Condensed Milk & Milk Powder.		8,000,000
Value of market milk and cream, including ice cream		50,000,000
Total Value		$190,840,000

EXPORTS.

	1916. Pounds.	1917. * Pounds.
Cheese	180,733,426	174,000,000
Butter	7,990,435	3,709,392
Condensed Milk	15,858,622	30,000,000

* Estimated.

This merely goes to show the enormous development and possibilities of this industry. The people have not a proper conception of the large capital involved in this industry. The dairymen have increased Canada's production of cheese by 45,000,000 pounds per year since the war broke out. In 1917 the cheese commission handled for export 1,860,237 boxes of cheese, or 155,662,463 pounds. The cheese crop exported through the regular channels before the cheese commission began operations amounted to 123,909 boxes weighing 10,656,174 pounds. There are 15,000 boxes yet to be delivered, making a total exportable surplus for the year 1917 of about 2,000,000 boxes, or 172,620,000 pounds of cheese valued at $37,544,850, an increase of over $4,000,000 as compared with 1916. These figures cover only the cheese shipped to the United Kingdom; shipments to other countries amount to over 1,000,000 pounds. In addition to this the amount of consumption has greatly increased. In 1914 our exports amounted to 135,000,000 pounds, while to-day the export is 180,000,000 pounds, or an increase of 45,000,000 pounds over 1914.

I am giving these figures to show that the farmers have increased their production of these commodities, and that they have improved the standard of our dairy products very materially. The present price of cheese in Canada is surely very low when you take into consideration the fact that the products the farmer feeds to his cattle have doubled in price, that the price of cattle has more than doubled, and that labour cost has very materially increased. In addition to that, all the other expenses connected with the development of the industry have materially advanced. Cheese at the price at which it sells to-day is perhaps one of the cheapest food products you can find on the market. The dairymen of Canada have practically control of the cheese market of the United Kingdom. They have had control of this market for many years. They have been assisted year after year to develop their industry and to bring it up to the greatest possible perfection in order that they might be able to create a profitable market abroad. Are we justified in doing anything to retard its development? I do not think we are.

Then, let us consider the butter industry. The total production of creamery butter in 1916 was 82,564,130 pounds, valued at $26,966,355, and the production of home made butter was 137,110,200 pounds, or 68 per cent of the total butter production of 201,808,365 pounds. At fifty cents a pound this production has a value of $100,904,182.50. The price of fifty cents a pound has been criticised to some extent, it is true, but if the people of Canada will take into consideration the increased expenses in connection with the manufacture of butter, I am sure they will not consider the price very greatly in excess of what it ought to be. In 1900 we only produced 36,667,739 pounds of creamery butter, while in 1916 we produced 82,564,130 pounds. We exported to the United Kingdom in 1916, 7,121,468 pounds of butter. Previous to the war we imported enormous quantities of butter from Australia and New Zealand to supply our demand.

Now, within the last few years we are not only able to supply the amount required in Canada, but we have been able to export over 7,000,000 pounds of butter. The Minister of Agriculture remembers, no doubt, that not many years ago we were exporting butter to the north-west provinces from the eastern provinces. Now, things have changed, and butter is coming to the eastern provinces from the West, and is sent out to the markets of the world in enormous quantities, increasing in volume year after year. The statistics of the Trade and Commerce Department for February 1916, page 34, give the value of milch cows at $274,081,000; and of other cattle at $270,595,000, making a total value of over $544,000,000. The increase in value of milch cows in three years is estimated at $76,000,000; the increase in the value of "other cattle" is given at $66,000,000; or a total increase of $142,000,000. The estimated number of milch cows in Canada is 2,666,846. We have 993 creameries in Canada, and 1,813 cheese factories, also 624 combined factories, making a total of 3,430. The patrons of these factories total 221,190. That means 221,000 families, or over one million people, engaged in the dairy business in Canada, with their cattle, barns, implements, cheese and butter factories, and all the appliances used in the operation of this industry. The Canadian exports of butter in February of this year, as compared with February, 1917, had increased from 50,000 pounds to 400,000 pounds; of cheese from 3,600,000 pounds to about 5,000,000 pounds; of eggs from 95,000 dozens to 134,000 dozens; of beef, from 1,500,000 pounds to 10,500,000 pounds; of bacon and ham from 15,600,000 pounds to 16,150,000 pounds.

4 p.m. I quote these figures to show the enormous development of the agricultural industry along

these lines, and to indicate the care that the Government should use to see that no legislation is put in force that would interfere in any way with the wonderful development of this branch of commerce in our country.

We are calling for increased production. The farmers, I feel, have answered the call. The national cry is: "More beef and more bacon." The dairy industry of Canada has been fostered for years by our farmers' institutes, our travelling dairies, our experimental farms, and by the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and it would be nothing short of a calamity if, by introducing legislation such as I have read, we were to discourage or to undermine to any extent the development of this great industry. What would a few million pounds of oleomargarine amount to, if by bringing it into this country we permanently injure the great industry to which I have called attention.

We are teaching agriculture in the schools. Our agricultural colleges are rendering great assistance. Both are doing everything possible to develop the live-stock industry. We have "better farming trains," demonstration trains, district representatives, co-operative societies, printing and publishing facilities, women's institutes, demonstration farms, experimental farms, and livestock associations, all assisting in the development of the dairy industry. Therefore, I respectfully urge upon the Minister of Agriculture the need of investigating the suggestions I have placed before him, and of immediate action being taken to safeguard the public of Canada. When you give the dairy industry of Canada proper protective legislation in regard to the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, you protect the public against being defrauded and deceived. I do not feel that I should resume my seat without again asking the Minister of Agriculture to see to it that he put forth his best efforts to have the regulations changed in such a way that they will protect the great dairy industry of Canada.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil) (translation) Mr. Speaker, last year I had the honour of laying before this House a petition signed by nearly 29,000 farmers of the province of Quebec protesting against the admission of oleomargarine into this country.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) speak so interestingly of that question here today.

[Mr. Armstrong.]

When we made our protest last year 800 agricultural societies of the province of Quebec adopted a resolution which they forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture. I myself went to see the hon. Minister and asked him to kindly consent to receive a delegation composed of all the higher personages, that is of the chairmen and secretaries of different societies, agricultural and otherwise, of the province of Quebec; at that time the hon. Minister of Agriculture made me this answer: "There is no need of coming in a delegation to Ottawa as the Government will not adopt any Order in Council before submitting the question to Parliament itself." Well, this was not done; and, when the Government recently adopted this Order in Council, I came back to Ottawa in company with certain agricultural authorities of the province of Ontario; but so far our efforts have been fruitless.

I realize that as things are at present the farmer cannot suffer a great deal through the introduction of oleomargarine into the country, because we cannot make enough butter for export overseas. The danger is not immediate; but the danger will become really serious if this measure is persisted in after the war, and the strongest proof of this was demonstrated by the hon. member for Lambton. We have at present in this country a material organisation worth millions of dollars represented in factories and herds; and if you remember well it is not so very long ago that we had to import from New Zealand the surplus of butter that we required for our own consumption. We have directed all the efforts of the farmers towards a greater production of butter and we have succeeded in bringing this production to the point where it is today.

This Order in Council, as the hon. member for Lambton explained so well, is too broad, it is too pregnant with danger, it opens the door far too wide to wrongful uses.

We have first the product called oleomargarine; next we have margarine; and finally, butterine. There is a little difference between these three products. Margarine is manufactured exclusively from beef suet; butterine is derived in part from beef suet and in part from a mixture of half milk and half butter, while oleomargarine is made from beef suet and cotton-seed oil. This last has the most nutritive value and is the best substitute for butter.

Now, if these products are allowed into the country free of duty; if, still further, their manufacture is permitted here; if this measure remains in force after the war,

the results will be disastrous for the farmer. The departments of agriculture in the different provinces have done a great deal towards persuading the farmer to give more attention to butter manufacture; and if today their efforts are opposed and favour shown these butter substitutes, we will discourage our population and that will be the end of dairy industry.

As my hon. friend from East Lambton so well established a moment ago, the nature of butterine, of oleomargarine and of margarine is not the same; there is a decided difference between each one of these products; and if we continue to allow the manufacture of certain substitutes which in reality are products of very inferior quality, and which will be thrown on our markets in great quantities, what will happen? We will discourage our farmers and they will almost entirely abandon this industry; all that we have accomplished to create and develop the dairy industry will be wasted effort and, moreover, our markets will be glutted with inferior products which, no matter what may be said, can never replace real butter made from pure cow's milk.

Let us come now, Mr. Speaker, to the principal reason put forth to justify the permission granted for the manufacture of these substitutes. We were told that it was in the interest of the working-classes on account of the high price of butter. That is not so; I believe that it was rather to insure greater profits to a few canning factories; and the enormous profits derived from this manufacture will be limited to these few canners, while in the case of butter the profits go to an entire class of the population, the agricultural class.

Now, Mr. Speaker it is said that the farmers have no reason to complain of this measure since it was endorsed with a view to their protection. That is false; the measure is entirely to their detriment.

I remember that before this measure was adopted the women's societies in certain cities asked the Government to pass this law on the pretense that it would reduce the cost of living. Let's get at the truth in this matter. Oleomargarine sells for 37 cents a pound and butter is selling just now for 50 cents. The manufacture of the first of these products costs in the neighbourhood of 12 cents a pound; and still it is sold for 37 cents. Now I wish to ask any man of common sense if there is such an enormous margin between the cost price and the selling price of a pound of butter as in the case of oleomargarine. No, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are the victims of robbery, pure and simple, when the market price of a substitute composed of grease fat, cottonseed oil and other animal products is 37 cents per pound, while the cost of manufacture is merely 12 cents, and I declare further that the Government which legalises this robbery is as guilty as are the manufacturers themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this product is sold for 37 cents a pound, is it because it really has this value? No, if it brings that price it is only so as to swell the profits of the manufacturers.

What danger theatens the country, if the manufacture of this product continue to be allowed? Precisely the same which threatened and which injured certain States of the Union. The sale of these substitutes on the markets of the States had for effect the discouragement of the dairy industry; and this is so true that immediately following the adoption of this measure by the States the stock in the milch herds fell away, on account of the strong competition that these substitutes brought to bear against dairy products. Not very long ago merchants from these same States travelled through the province of Quebec and through Ontario and the different eastern provinces buying what milch cattle they could procure in order to fill up the gaps in their own dairy stables at home in the States. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, these same States today form a group which vigourously opposes and always has opposed the authorization by the United States Government of the manufacture of oleomargarine and of butterine. They met with some success; but the united interests of the American manufacturers were so powerful that they succeeded in having the authorisation of the manufacture of these products continued. Now as to taste, there is not an enormous difference, since it is always possible to impart to this product the flavour of real butter. You can't give it the aroma of butter but you can come very near to giving it the butter flavour.

Well, things remained at that stage with the American Government for several years; and then the manufacturers of these substitutes got busy again and asked the legislature to permit them to colour their oleomargarine. They said to the legislature: "Put on a tax of 10 cents a pound if you wish, but let us colour this product." They want to make it easier to fool the public, for no one but an expert could tell the difference between real butter and this product.

In the United States they allowed this change, but they put on a tax of 10 cents per pound. Do you know what happened? To elude the law the manufacturers continued to sell their product without colouring; but they took the precaution of putting in the same wrapper which enclosed the brick of margarine capsules containing a solution which, mixed with a certain quantity of water, gave to the margarine the appearance of butter. That is how the public and the Government were fooled for several years. According to an official bulletin the American Government was mulcted of several million dollars in this way.

We have allowed the importation of oleomargarine into this country and we have authorized its manufacture here.

I say now, after the study that I have made of the matter, that this industry will remain in the hands of a few people. Before long these people will control the oleomargarine market just as was done in the United States.

Some will answer: but in England, in Denmark and in other European countries aren't these substitutes manufactured and imported? I admit that; but England's population is so dense that she cannot manufacture all the butter she needs for her own consumption. The Danes manufacture an enormous amount of butter and also oleomargarine, and they prefer to eat margarine so as to export a greater quantity of their products; but here where we have a tremendous expanse of territory, the best of grazing lands and a climate which is favourable to the dairy industry, to authorize the importation and the manufacture of these butter substitutes is to put a stop to the progress of the dairy industry, in order to meet the demands of the manufacturers of these products.

As the hon. member for Lambton said a moment ago, we have equipped the entire country for the dairy industry. This represents a considerable outlay of capital. What will become of this capital if tomorrow this organisation is opposed by the oleomargarine factories?

Now, the strongest argument in favour of oleomargarine is that the sale or the manufacture of this product will reduce the cost of living. I am willing to admit that, even at 37 cents a pound oleomargarine still costs less than butter at 50 cents; only for 50 cents you do get a pound of butter, whereas for 37 cents you do not get the value of a pound of butter, you do not even receive the cash value of your 37 cents, since it does not cost that much to manufacture oleomargarine.

As the hon. member for Lambton said a moment ago, the Order in Council is too wide, because it allows the importation of all the products which resemble butter.

I will be glad to vote for the resolution of the hon. member from Lambton because I believe it to be wise and I feel sure that all those members who represent agricultural communities believe as I do. We are here to protect the farmers' interests, and to shield the dairy industry which we have established in this country after a great deal of ceaseless striving. This is not the time to offer the public a product which is not butter and which cannot replace butter; before long, oleomargarine will be sold not for 37 cents but for 50 cents; in the long run it is still the poor down-trodden consumer who will bear the burden.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (Perth South): Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, an agricultural constituency, one of the leading dairy districts of Canada, I need offer no apology for giving expression to a few thoughts on the subject which has been brought to the attention of the House so well this afternoon by the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong).

The history of the county of Perth relates that some eighty or ninety years ago there were transplanted from good old Scotland to a certain township of the county of Perth representatives of the clan Crerar. Those representatives took root and grew in our county, developing into some of the leading representatives of the live stock industry in western Canada. I have confidence that any member of that clan, later transplanted to the prairies of the West, would not be a true representative of the clan should he not retain a very great interest in the live stock and dairy interests of Canada. Believing that, I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar) has a deep interest in the dairy industry, and it is no evidence of lack of interest on his part that steps have been taken by the Government to permit the importation into and the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country.

I need not emphasize the importance of the dairy industry, which has been brought to the attention of the House by the member for East Lambton. We in this country all recognize the great importance of that industry, and believe that it should not be interfered with in any respect without good cause. We know, too, that the cost of producing dairy products in the last few years has increased about seventy-five per cent. The increase in the price of dairy products

has scarcely kept pace with the increase in the cost. As the statistics given by the member for East Lambton go to show, there is no scarcity of butter in Canada. The argument put forward in support of permitting the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine—that it is required because of the shortage of butter—is not based on fact. I repeat that there is no scarcity of butter in Canada; more than that, dairy foods are among the cheapest, even at the present high prices, which the people of Canada can use. Let me give you the cost of various dairy products, at present prices, per one thousand energy units or calories: butter, at 43 cents a pound, 14 cents; cheese, at 30 cents a pound, 13 cents; milk, at 10 cents a quart, 15 cents. Compare these prices with the prices of some of our meats. Sirloin steak at 32 cents will cost 23 cents per one thousand energy units. Pork chops at 36 cents a pound will cost 25 cents per one thousand energy units. We see, therefore, that dairy products are very much cheaper than the meats which we love so well. If we except cereals, there are among the leading foods which we consume no cheaper foods than dairy products.

With these facts before us, it is only reasonable that we should inquire why oleomargarine was demanded in this country. The demand came not from the consumers to any great extent—although a limited number of the consumers of butter did ask for it—but largely from the firms and interests who were anxious to enter upon the manufacture of oleomargarine. For months a continuous stream of articles and advertisements appeared in the newspapers calling the attention of the people of Canada to the necessity for oleomargarine and to certain arguments why this product should be used. I say that the demand came from these parties, who are not interested in the dairy industry, but who are rather competitors with our farmers in the production of dairy foods.

It is most important that Canada maintain the standard of purity and the reputation of her dairy products. We have built up a reputation in this respect which is possibly unsurpassed by that of any other country in the world, and it is most important that we should maintain it. This we can do only by looking after the standard of purity of these products. The United States lost their export trade when they began to dabble in adulterates of their dairy products and to offer substitutes therefor, and the same thing will happen in Canada if we permit a similar system to be adopted here.

A condition exists in Canada which does not exist in other countries where the demand for oleomargarine has been great. In the European countries, and possibly in the United States, the production of dairy products and butter does not supply the demand, but in Canada our production is greater than our requirements—and we have not yet nearly reached the limit of that production.

One of the arguments put forward by advocates of oleomargarine was the price of butter. I have pointed out that butter, even at present prices, is one of the cheapest foods that our people can use. Another argument was the scarcity of butter. I have shown that butter is not scarce in Canada; the fact that we have been able to export from eight to ten million pounds during recent years goes to show that there is no scarcity of that product.

The third argument is a rather peculiar one: that there is necessity for additional fats for our people. If the manufacturers of oleomargarine can show us that they are producing for the people any additional or increased quantity of fats, then we may say that there is something in the argument; but as a matter of fact they are not. There are no more fats now than there were before the manufacture of oleomargarine was commenced; the only change is one of form.

Oleomargarine is put forth as a substitute for butter. It is not and never can be a substitute for butter. Butter has many advantages over it; I will not take time at present to set them out in detail. It is, however, recognized by every one that butter is more easily digested than oleomargarine, and that for children it is incomparably better than oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is not a substitute for butter, and was never intended as such; it is intended only as an imitation, and the manner in which it is manufactured and put up is evidence of that. For instance, it is coloured to look like butter; it is flavoured to taste like butter, and it is priced so as to come as near to butter in that respect as the market will permit.

What is the composition of this substance known as oleomargarine? The manufacturers use very nice terms to describe its composition, but, using ordinary every-day language, I would say it consists chiefly of tallow, lard and cotton-seed oil. Nor is the composition always uniform. We have from twenty-two to forty-seven per cent of tallow in different samples. Of lard,

we shall find from six to twenty-eight per cent in the different samples. Of cotton oil, we shall find from fifteen to forty-nine per cent in the different samples. You see, therefore, there is a very great variation in the composition. If oleomargarine is allowed to be made in Canada, there should be some uniform formula which the Canadian manufacturers shall follow, so that the consumers of this substance will know exactly what they are eating.

Butter is used to some extent in oleomargarine. I doubt, however, if it is used to the extent to which some manufacturers claim it is used. Why is butter used in oleomargarine if the fats therein are as good as butter fat? Butter is used rather to defraud and deceive the people. It is used to make the oleomargarine look like butter, because the manufacturer recognizes that one of the strongest claims which oleomargarine has upon the people of Canada is that it looks like butter.

When oleomargarine is allowed to be manufactured in this country, we are building up competition with the production of dairy products. With that competition there will necessarily be a reduced production of butter and cheese. Reduced production of dairy products means a vast loss to the Dominion of Canada, especially in these days. It means a reduced production of butter, and that means a reduction in the amount of fat in the world, and we know the world is calling for fat. It means not only a reduction of fat in milk and butter, but a reduction in our dairy herds. The more keen the competition, the more difficult it is for our dairymen to maintain their industry, and the more difficult it is for our dairymen to maintain their industry the more temptation there is to reduce their dairy herds. With the reduction in our dairy herds, there follows a reduction in our livestock industry and our meat producing animals. There follows also, a reduction in our hog industry. These are results which we in Canada, I am sure, do not wish to see at the present time. Not only does it mean a reduction in our meats and daily food, but, as the dairy industry is essential to the fertility of the soil, it means lessened cereal production. That, I am sure, is felt by the farmers of Ontario as well as by farmers throughout the remainder of Canada.

There is another reason—and this resolution to-day deals with it very directly—which seems to me is a strong one why oleomargarine should not be permitted to be manufactured in this country at all. We find that in all countries in which it is manufactured it is surrounded by many regulations, but we find also that, notwithstanding all the regulations that are brought forward, there are very great numbers of violations of the law and very great numbers of frauds perpetrated by the manufacturers and by those who deal in oleomargarine in either a wholesale or a retail way. In 1914, in the United States there were 2,705 prosecutions for violations of the oleomargarine law. In 1915, there were 2,777 prosecutions. In 1916 there were 1,882 prosecutions. Those prosecutions included manufacturers, wholesale and retail dealers, and forty-four of the violators of the law were sent to jail. Since 1902, it is estimated that the United States has lost $27,000,000 in revenue owing to frauds perpetrated in connection with the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, and that in the same time there have been sold about 200,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine as butter. The manufacturers of oleomargarine have frequently a distinct objection to putting their product on the market before the people as the article which they manufacture, but they have a strong desire to put it before the people as butter, knowing that after all, the people have a preference for butter over oleomargarine.

In Great Britain there are no regulations against the colouring of oleomargarine, so that the frauds in that country are even more numerous than they are in the United States. Under our regulations, if oleomargarine is allowed into this country coloured it means that the difficulties in the way of our protecting the dairy industry against the imitation will be that much greater, and we shall have the same condition as exists in Great Britain.

Under the Order in Council, oleomargarine is now admitted into this country, but there is no reason at all why, under the regulations, the manufacturers of oleomargarine should have a preference over the manufacturers of butter. It seems to me that the framers of the regulations now in force must have been impressed by the science of eugenics and they decided to adopt that science in administering the importation and manufacture of this article, for this reason, that while the manufacturer of oleomargarine may add butter to his product, the manufacturer of butter is not allowed to add oleomargarine to his product. How does that work out in eugenics? It means that if you mate oleo-

margarine with butter you improve the oleomargarine, but if you mate butter with oleomargarine you impair the quality of the butter. It is a new science adopted by the department. I hope they will not carry it very much further along this line.

Another matter which I think the department should insist upon in connection with the manufacture of oleomargarine is that while there should be a uniform formula followed by the manufacturers, the price of oleomargarine should also be set. There are objections to that, I know, but if the intention of the manufacturers is, as they state, to give to the people of this country who are unable to pay the higher prices for butter, the fats which they require for the replenishment of their bodies, then those fats should be supplied at a price which is not exorbitant. The Department of Agriculture should fix the price of oleomargarine so that it will not be put on the market only a few cents, say six or eight cents, below the price of butter, just a sufficient difference to attract people who want a cheaper article. I am glad to know that this Order in Council was put through as a war measure, and I trust that when this war is over it will be removed, and that our dairy industry will not be any longer threatened with the competition and the frauds which will exist under the Order in Council that has been passed regarding the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I am very sorry that while I have had an opportunity for some years in listening to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, I still could not this afternoon follow my hon. friend opposite who spoke on this question. I rise merely for the purpose of endorsing what has been said by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) with reference to oleomargarine. If the regulations are in any way loose they should be made absolutely tight. If oleomargarine is imported into this country it should be imported in such a manner that it can be guaranteed to be pure and manufactured in a first class manner. There was undoubtedly a demand from the people for oleomargarine on account of the high price of butter. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Steele) says he comes from one of the best dairying districts of Canada; that is quite true, but I come from the very best district.

Mr. McMASTER: Question!

Mr. NESBITT: There is no question about it. I confess that the farmers of my constituency were very much opposed to oleomargarine being imported, but the townspeople wanted it, and so long as this Government is here to represent the interests of all classes of the people, they will have to act according to their best judgment. We may as well face the truth that workingmen in the cities and towns cannot afford to buy butter at its present price; but it is also true that if oleomargarine is well made it cannot be sold very much cheaper than butter, though it can be made more extensively, if I may use the word, because it is manufactured in a slightly different way. Personally, I do not believe that oleomargarine, if well made and sold under proper regulations, will decrease the price of good butter to any considerable degree; and if the butter is not good, it is no better than oleomargarine, if as good. I am happy to say, however, that in Ontario, at all events, and I hope in all the other provinces, the butter that is made nowadays is very good. Before the war it could compete in Europe with the very best Danish and Irish butter, and that is saying a good deal. I shall not take up longer the time of the House. I only rose to say that I absolutely endorse the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that the regulations, if too loose, should be tightened, and the greatest possible care taken to see that the oleomargarine is well made and to prevent fraud of any kind in its sale. If we are to import oleomargarine, the conditions surrounding it up to the time of its importation should be absolutely first-class in every way. The farmers who are opposed to the importation of oleomargarine fear that it may reduce the price of butter to some extent, but, so far, I have not heard of its having had that effect in the section of the country where I live. I believe as firmly as I believe I am standing here, that if the Government are cautious and surround its importation, manufacture and sale with proper regulations, good will accrue rather than harm to the people generally.

Mr. F. H. KEEFER (Port Arthur): I wish to concur in what has been said by my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) with regard to the good results that may be expected from the importation of oleomargarine into this country. The reason why it was introduced was to supply the poor man's table with the fats that are essential to the human constitution. The price of butter, not through any corner in the dairying industry, not that the dairymen were getting too much—in fact, they were not getting enough—had gone up very considerably, because of the immense de-

mand by the Allies, chiefly for evaporated milk for the soldiers. The milk that was used for that purpose came into competition with the milk used in the manufacture of butter, and forced the price of butter up. The price of butter was not too high; it rose to fifty-two, whilst formerly it was down to thirty or thirty-five cents. Complaints were coming in from various directions that working people were compelled to do without the animal fats which they absolutely needed. It was therefore deemed advisable in the interests of the working man of this country to allow the importation of oleomargarine as a war measure. The objections which have been raised on account of any possibilities of fraud were met by the Order in Council. The frauds in connection with the revenue of the United States were incurred because of the excise duty on the manufacture of oleomargarine. In drawing up the regulations it was thought advisable not to have this duty, and thereby avoided the difficulties they have had in the United States, and we are also getting the oleomargarine at the cheapest possible price. That also answers the argument that it was the interests who urged the Government to allow the entry of oleomargarine. If that were so, why let it come in free of duty? Any householder to-day in Canada—he does not have to be a dealer—can apply for a license to import oleomargarine and obtain it without having to pay any fee. The sole reason for allowing the importation and sale of oleomargarine is to supply the necessary fats for the poor man's table. With regard to manufacture and fixing a price, it it not advisable to put a maximum price on anything if it is possible to avoid it. That is the very reason why oleomargarine has been brought in; two courses were open: one was to fix a maximum price for butter, which would have been most detrimental to the farming interests of the country, or secondly, to help out the situation by importing oleomargarine. If we fixed a maximum price for oleomargarine, we should be defeating the very object of the regulations allowing it to come in. With regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country, the regulations are not unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and Persians, but are in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, who have the dairying industry of the country most at heart. If the regulations are found to be too loose they can easily be amended, but in my opinion they are most stringent, far more stringent than in the United States, where many complaints have been received on account of the strictness of the Canadian regulations. I should like any member of this House who has any doubts to see some of the letters which have come in since oleomargarine has been allowed to be imported—letters of gratitude from workingmen who heretofore were unable to buy the necessary fats—thanking the Government for what has been done.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE: We have heard from the member from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) this afternoon that in the interests of the farmer the importation of oleomargarine into this country should be prohibited.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I did not say that.

Mr. NICKLE: I will change the word to regulated. The reasons given in support of their argument are these: First, that if the product is improperly manufactured it is detrimental to health, and secondly, that there should be regulations because there is a possibility of the importation interfering with the dairying industry. In so far as they assert that every protection should be thrown about the commodity to see that the people are not given food that is injurious to them, I am in hearty accord with them, but when they assert that there was in this country prior to oleomargarine being permitted to be imported sufficient fats to meet the ordinary requirements of the people, I must differ with them, and differ most radically.

In a constituency which has no rural electorate, I know as a fact that butter has reached such a price that it is impossible for the poorer-paid class of the community to purchase it at all, and this class is using dripping and other sorts of fat to take the place of butter and similar commodities, which have hitherto been used on their table. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) argues that, because Canada prior to the war exported butter, there was more butter manufactured in Canada than we actually required. I am quite prepared to admit that, if Canada was manufacturing more butter than she can consume and was exporting butter, there might be something in the hon. gentleman's argument, but the figures are there; for the year ending March 31st, 1914, Canada exported 1,228,753 pounds of butter, and during the same period she imported 7,000,000 pounds of butter, which would lead us to the conclusion that Canada was not making

enough butter to supply her wants, and had to import a large quantity. For the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1917, Canada exported 7,990,435 pounds of butter, and the reason she was exporting such a large amount of butter, as compared with what she exported in 1914, was that in England the price of butter had been fixed at somewhere over 53 cents, and in the United States I think the price was 50 cents a pound. In other words, the price of butter was determined by the export price, and you could obtain in Great Britain, owing to the necessities of the case, a sufficiently large price to justify exporting the article to that country. The result was that so much butter was exported from Canada that a sufficient quantity to normally supply the needs of the country was not retained in Canada. The price rose from 35 cents to 50 cents a pound, and the foreign market was practically unlimited. In 1914 Britain imported 446,000,000 pounds of butter, and in 1916 she imported 224,000,000 pounds. In the year 1913-1914 England imported from Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands 250,000,000 pounds of butter, and in 1916 she imported from other countries 132,000,000 pounds of butter, and there is now an embargo on exportations from those countries, which would lead to the conclusion that the demand for butter from Canada will increase. You might say, "Oh, you are only directing your argument to present day conditions." True, that is the position I have taken so far, that the conditions of the war have increased the price of butter, and the conditions in the cities are bearing so heavily on the working classes, and the necessity of people obtaining an article to take the place of butter is so great that the people are entitled to have a cheaper product. I regret we are only importing at the present time 1,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine per month from the United States. From the constituency from which I come, we get oleomargarine at 32 cents a pound. I think butter sells from 45 to 48 cents. I have used oleomargarine.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: How did you like it?

Mr. NICKLE: The Minister of Trade and Commerce asks me how I liked it. Used on bread, I may say that oleomargarine was not as satisfactory to me as the commodity I got in England with him, at one of the hospitals, but for shortening purposes I am informed by those of my household, that it most satisfactorily takes the place of the higher priced article.

Now, in regard to the war—What are the conditions in Europe to-day? The herds of Europe are being depleted, and it is going to take time to restore the conditions which existed prior to the war, and it seems to me that high prices for a long time are bound to prevail in regard to butter. At the present time I understand that Canada is supplying less than 2 per cent of the requirements of Great Britain in the matter of butter, and supplying, on the other hand, somewhere about 67 per cent of the cheese requirements. If these figures are correct in regard to Canada's position as an exporting and importing country, and if the suggested conditions exist after the war, it does not seem to me unreasonable that we who live in the city should ask of those who live in the country that, for the present, at least, the importation of oleomargarine into Canada should be allowed, but under such conditions as will ensure that the imported or manufactured article shall be sanitary and safe as a food product.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The reason I desire to say a word on this subject is that I represent a constituency which, in the matter of cheese production, stands fifth or sixth in the counties of the province of Ontario. In eastern Ontario we are not so much concerned in regard to the manufacture of butter as they are in western Canada. Eastern Ontario and western Quebec are vitally concerned in that part of the dairying industry which has relation to the production of cheese, and anything which has a tendency to prejudicially affect the dairy industry in regard to the production of cheese in those portions of the two provinces is entitled to the very earnest and careful consideration of the Government. For a great many years the farmers of the eastern part of Ontario and the western part of Quebec have worked long, earnestly and intelligently to build up an industry which has made a name for this country, and an industry on which the farmers of those parts to which I refer depend, I might say almost entirely, for their revenue and their sustenance. I wish to commend the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for the information they have given the House this afternoon. They have given us figures with regard to the amount of capital invested in the dairy industry and the amount of the product of that

industry, and those figures must impress every person in this House with the very great importance of that industry to the Dominion of Canada. Therefore, I approach this question from this standpoint: how will the importation and the manufacture of oleomargarine in the Dominion of Canada affect the people engaged in the great dairying industry? I am not going to raise any objection to the regulations which have been passed by the Government as war regulations allowing the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine. While the people in my part of the country do not altogether like the regulations which have been adopted, as they are not in accord with their ideas of what is in the best interests of dairying, they have raised no serious objection regarding it as a war measure, being prepared to abide by the result until such time as the war is over. But I would raise a very strong objection to the permanent adoption of any regulation or the passing of any law which would allow the importation or manufacture of oleomargarine in the Dominion of Canada after the war is over. I cannot agree with the argument which has been advanced by the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) with regard to a portion of the people in that city being unable to provide their table with butter because of the high price. If it can be shown that the fats which are unquestionably needed for the health of our bodies cannot be otherwise obtained, I will admit that his argument is a proper one, but I am not prepared to accept the statement that there is justification for permitting the importation and manufacure of oleomargarine in Canada because of the high price to which butter has risen in this country.

I am not prepared to accept that, because, while it is true that the price of butter in 1916-17 was a few cents higher than it was in 1912 or 1913, the consumer, taking into consideration the wages that he was receiving in 1916 and 1917, was in a better position to purchase butter at the price at which butter was selling in 1917 than possibly he would be able to pay the price they were charging for butter five or six years ago. I do not believe that a workman in Kingston, or in any other city in Canada, was deprived of the use of butter because of the price of it. I may be wrong in that; of course, we all have the right to our opinions.

There is another point I want to call attention to. Large quantities of oleomargarine are in use in Great Britain, about 1,000,000,000 pounds a year. I believe the consumption in the United States is some 500,000,000 pounds a year. My information is that in 1911, of the 500,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine produced in the United States only 92,000,000 pounds was actually sold over the counter as oleomargarine. Over 400,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine was sold over the counter in the United States as butter. Let me give an illustration. Here is a storekeeper and he is handling butter and oleomargarine. A farmer comes along with his basket of butter in the morning, he has 25 pounds of butter, and he says: "What will you give me for the butter?" The storekeeper says: "I will give you," we will say, "48 cents a pound for your butter." "Very good." He takes the farmer's 25 pounds of butter, pays him 48 cents a pound, and he puts it on one side. Then he buys 100 pounds of oleomargarine at what price I do not know—we will say 20 cents a pound, if you like, or at very much less than he paid the farmer for the butter. He also puts that on one side. A customer comes in and says: "I would like to buy five pounds of butter." This customer is one who pays his accounts regularly and it will not do for the grocer to take any chance on fooling him, so he goes and gets the butter which he bought from the farmer; he weighs the customer out five pounds and makes a profit of about ten cents. Another fellow comes along, a poor labouring man, and he also wants to buy five pounds of butter. He is not very expert in telling the difference between oleomargarine and butter, he does not pay his accounts quite so regularly and the storekeeper can take a chance on fooling him. So he hands him out five pounds of oleomargarine as butter and gets the price of butter, pocketing a profit of 30 cents or 20 cents a pound. That is no fairy tale. It illustrates what is actually taking place throughout the United States. They have an excise tax on oleomargarine over there and the manufacture is under government inspection. They are thus enabled to know how much is produced in that country. There is an excise tax on every pound that is sold and in that way they arrive at the quantity of oleomargarine which is sold as oleomargarine. The United States, in order to prevent the storekeepers from selling oleomargarine as butter, which he could not very well do unless he coloured the oleomargarine, because oleomargarine when manufactured is white and its colour is very different from that of butter, imposes a tax on coloured oleomargarine. But they get over the difficulty by using colouring matter and they colour the oleomargarine so as to make it look

very much like butter. You could not tell the difference from the appearance. The United States put a tax of ten cents a pound on coloured oleomargarine with a view of stopping the sale of oleomargarine as butter, and they have a tax of only one-quarter of a cent a pound on white or uncoloured oleomargarine. The storekeeper on the other side of the line, who is handling perhaps thousands of pounds of oleomargarine, provides himself with colouring matter done up in little gelatine capsules. A man who comes into buy some oleomargarine, and who is on to his job, so to speak, is going to get the white article. He knows his oleomargarine, and he gets it at a lower price. He gets several pounds of this oleomargarine and the storekeeper hands him out one of these capsules of colouring matter, because the man who is buying this article may have some visitors in to take dinner or to take tea with him and he does not want to put what appears to be oleomargarine on the table. He wants to put on the table something that looks like butter. So the customer gets a little capsule of colouring matter whereby he can convert the oleomargarine into butter and use it for his visitors.

I understand that in the United States they have a standard for oleomargarine. I believe the standard they have in the United States—the minister may probably be in a position to correct me if I am wrong—is as follows:

	Per cent.
Oleo oil	34.26
Constituents of milk	28.09
Neutral lard	16.27
Cotton seed oil	14.26
Salt	7.12

In looking over the regulations which my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) read this afternoon, I did not see anything in regard to the standard of oleomargarine in this country. Of course, we know that all imported oleomargarine coming from the United States will be of the standard adopted in the United States, because it is all manufactured there under Government inspection. But I cannot see in the regulations anything which places any restrictions upon the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada. I think there should be restrictions. I think the manufacturer here should be strictly limited in regard to the amount of butter or cream which he is allowed to use in the manufacture of oleomargarine. In Great Britain they do place a restriction in that regard, and I think they are not allowed to use more than ten per cent of butter fat in the manufacture of oleomargarine. If more than that quantity of butter fat is used it is not called oleomargarine but must be called by another name, and I think it is called butterine. In the regulations, as I read them very hastily, there seems to be no distinction. Oleomargarine is defined as:

> Oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or any other substitute for butter which manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that from milk and cream, which contains no foreign colouring matter and which does not contain more than 16 per cent of water.

If the people are to be permitted to use oleomargarine, they should know what the constituents of that oleomargarine are, and what percentage of butter or cream is used in the manufacture of it and what the other constituents are. I wanted particularly to call the minister's attention to that. There may be some regulation in regard to that in so far as Canada is concerned, but if so, I have not noticed it and I thought it of sufficient importance to direct his attention to it.

Before taking my seat, I would like to say that when the war is over and we get back to normal conditions, before the Government considers allowing the manufacture or importation of oleomargarine permanently, the whole question ought to engage their very serious attention. It is all right to refer to what they do in countries like the United States and England but we must take conditions as we have them in Canada where the bulk of our population is a farming population. Another feature is that in the West our farmers engage principally in the raising of grain. To some extent, especially in Alberta, they have gone into dairying, and I hope that they will go more extensively into it, but the great work of the West is in the production of grain. In the East our farmers have been obliged to depend upon dairying to a very great extent. Their future wellbeing depends upon the success of dairying, and that fact must not be overlooked. It should not be overlooked also that in this day and age of the world we do not estimate or measure our distances by miles; we estimate and measure distances in minutes, or the time it takes to go from one place to another; and the farmers in Ontario and Quebec are up against climatic conditions which place them at a very great disadvantage in producing many articles with which they have competition in the markets of the world. That is something which should be taken into consideration before we allow the permanent introduction of an article which might jeopar-

dize the future of a great industry, built up with very great labour and care, and the exercise of great intelligence.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): I am a voice from the East. I desire to say a few words on this question. In my province, particularly my constituency, we have one of the great dairying centres of Canada. I might say that our people have not only to depend upon the dairy industry as such, but the very basic necessity for successful agriculture with us is the maintenance of the dairy industry, because of the value tied up in the herds used in that industry. The same conditions do not apply so much to the West, because the western farmer, as yet, is simply skimming the virgin soil of that great country. But, in the eastern provinces, it is absolutely necessary to maintain the dairy industry because of its manureal value. Therefore, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), that the Government should be very careful about how it handles this matter. By all means, it should not create such a vested interest in the manufacture of oleomargarine and that class of goods that there would be the necessity to maintain it after the war. Let us import oleomargarine if we have to, but let us not create manufacturing industries in Canada in such a way that we cannot get clear of them after the war is over.

I want to draw attention to some fallacies in connection with this matter. For instance, one hon. gentleman stated that we were importing more butter than we were exporting. That would appear as if Canada could not make enough butter for its own needs. Butter and cheese are both made from milk, and if we produce a very large quantity of cheese we produce that much less butter; and the reason why we do not produce enough butter for ourselves is on account of the high price of cheese, due entirely to war conditions. Cheese, as we all know, is particularly the Englishman's food. It is one of the most concentrated foods that we have, and because of the difficulties of transportation it is one of the most desirable products that Canada can produce for the purpose of winning the war. In so far as the importation of oleomargarine will enable us to produce more cheese, we are helping to win the war by allowing it to enter, because cheese is what is wanted at the front. It is one of the easiest things to transport, is highly nutritious, and one of the most highly concentrated foods that they could get at the front. Therefore, while we are producing cheese for the armies of our allies, we should by all means produce as much of it as we can.

In this connection I would like to say a word with regard to the fixing of a price on cheese this season. The price of cheese this season ought to be raised considerably above that of last year, and so far as our Government has control of the matter in negotiating with the Imperial authorities, who, I presume, will be taking our cheese, they should draw the attention of those authorities to the fact that the high prices they pay are pure fallacies. The man who gets 22 cents a pound for his cheese to-day is not getting any more than if he were getting 11 cents in ante-bellum days, because it is the value of the dollar that has gone down and not the price of cheese that has gone up. I was out in British Columbia a couple of weeks ago visiting some of my friends, and I was astonished to find that nearly all the gold mining had been suspended, and I enquired why the people were not mining gold. They said: "Oh, it does not pay us to mine gold; it is far better for us to mine copper and lead, because the price of gold remains where it was before, and these other metals have gone up." Gold has gone down, as a matter of fact, for it has a fixed value or price, and as everything else has advanced, it has left the gold relatively low.

One hon. member spoke about the high prices the farmers are getting for their products. He must remember that these high prices are purely fictitious; they are based upon a gold standard that is fixed, while, as a matter of fact, the value of gold has gone down, and a dollar is worth only fifty cents intrinsically.

Now, I want to say a few words with regard to estimating distances. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) spoke about measuring distances not in miles but in time. We do not measure distances with regard to transportation either in miles or in time, but in freight rates, and one of the things hon. gentlemen should always remember when they are discussing questions in connection with transportation problems is to measure all distances by the rate of freight per ton, per bushel, or per pound as the case may be, because it makes a great deal of difference if you talk about transportation in miles or in time, when it is the freight rate which really represents distance. I am in favour of

this resolution in so far as it draws the Government's attention to the fact that this matter is of very serious importance to the farming population of the Maritime Provinces, as well as of Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I do not differ from the statements made by the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) and the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), because their grounds are well taken in so far as they desire to protect the great dairying industry of Canada. At the same time, I agree with the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that many people cannot afford to pay from fifty to sixty cents per pound for butter and the vast majority of the people desire that oleomargarine, under proper regulations, be admitted into Canada.

During my two years' service at the front I used oleomargarine in place of butter. In England to-day they use oleomargarine indiscriminately, except in the high-class hotels or aristocratic homes. Almost any one in England who uses oleomargarine of a good brand could not tell the difference between it and butter. Many times I have sat at table in good hotels and in good messes when arguments arose whether we were eating oleomargarine or butter, and nobody could tell the difference. I do not believe that the soldiers from Canada, from the other dominions or from the British Isles get anything else in the front lines but oleomargarine, because it is cheaper, and the men cannot tell the difference. There may be a slight difference in the food value of the two products; in that respect I would not dispute the word of the member for East Lambton or of the member for South Perth. But after all, the amount of butter that one eats is not so very important as to its food value. As to its taste, palatability, and appearance—because they use colouring over there—there is no difference between good oleomargarine and butter. I believe that the use of colouring matter in the manufacturing of oleomargarine is not permitted in this country; probably that is a good regulation, because it prevents the sale of oleomargarine as butter. That point is very strongly insisted upon in England, with a view to protecting the dairying interests and preventing dealers from selling oleomargarine as butter. As you walk down the streets of a city in England you see in the dairy stores oleomargarine advertised for sale as such, at so much per pound.

Since the importation of oleomargarine into this country was commenced one disappointment to me has been that the price is almost equal to that of butter. Here the price is about three-quarters the price of butter, while in England it is about one-half. The member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer), who is on the Food Board, informs me that oleomargarine offered for sale in Canada must be distinctly marked as such, and certainly this regulation should be strictly enforced. The ordinary person who can afford butter may not wish to substitute oleomargarine for it, but the workman who is getting a low wage will use oleomargarine if he feels that he can use it economically in the place of butter. I believe that something which is good enough for the daily rations of the soldiers in the battle line should not be too bad to be imported into this Dominion. I agree that the regulations should be very strict, but I do not agree that the people do not want oleomargarine. It is my view that the importation of oleomargarine into this country should be permitted in proper quantities and under proper regulations.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): I have been much impressed, in listening to the addresses that have been delivered on this subject, by the words of a good judge of human nature, who once said:

> When self the wavering balance shakes
> It's rarely right adjusted.

It is quite natural that the members of the House should represent the views of their constituents as nearly as it is possible for them to do so. The Government, I suppose, has to look at matters from a different standpoint and endeavour to legislate for the benefit of the whole people. I have always been prepared to give the Government full credit for using their best judgment in all matters of legislation, and if I say some things this afternoon that are in conflict with what the Government has done, I assure the House that I do so from a feeling that proper safeguards have not been provided in this particular instance.

I was somewhat impressed by the statement of the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), that what is good enough for the soldier ought to be good enough for the people who are at home here in Canada. His desk-mate, the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) said that one of the reasons why butter has become so expensive was that so much milk had been evaporated for the use of the soldiers. We have listened to a soldier—a man who has served a couple of years in the trenches, and knows what he is talking about—who states that oleomargarine is used by the soldiers in place of butter. I believe that instead of evapor-

ated milk or condensed milk the soldier receives skimmed milk or klim.

Mr. MANION: He receives evaporated milk or condensed cream most of the time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think you will find that very little cream reaches the soldiers; the product is made almost entirely from skimmed milk.

Mr. MANION: The finest evaporated cream I have ever taken was in the lines.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That is not the case on this side of the water. I believe that what the soldiers receive is not the whole milk, but skimmed milk. I know factories where it is being manufactured for that purpose. I do not say that is good enough for the soldiers, for I think they are entitled to the best we can give them. Condensed milk is becoming more extensively used in this country; but I think you will find that very little, if any, of the whole milk reaches the soldier. It is doctored up in a manner that may possibly deceive, and that is the strong objection that I have to oleomargarine. It is a deceptive; it is a counterfeit; it is not sold on its merits; and that is why I voice my objection. Oleomargarine is coming into competition with and endeavouring to replace an old established article of food in this country. The injustice creeps in in the endeavour to place oleomargarine before the consumer under the guise of butter under butter trademark? That is the trouble in the United States where they have permitted the manufacture of oleomargarine for a great many years. As the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) pointed out, in the United States in 1911, when upwards of 500,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine were manufactured, only 92,000,000 pounds of it were sold as that commodity. Why? Because of the fact that in that country coloured oleomargarine has to pay a tax of ten cents per pound whereas the uncoloured oleomargarine pays a tax of one quarter of a cent per pound. In order to evade the payment of that tax, the manufacturers resort to the colouring of this food article with a view to deceiving the people, and you may say what you like about the matter, if they were honest, they would not endeavour to evade the United States regulations in that way.

With regard to the regulations which have been passed by this Government, this is number 1:

> No substance intended for the colouring of oleomargarine shall be imported into Canada in packages containing oleomargarine, and no manufacturer, wholesale dealer, or retail dealer in oleomargarine shall deal in, sell, or give away any substances intended for colouring oleomargarine.

That covers what? It covers the importation into Canada of colouring to be used for that purpose, but it does not prevent the importation into Canada of coloured oleomargarine. That is quite permissible. I think in 1884 regulations were passed regarding the purity of butter and the manufacture and sale of butter. In 1914, the Dairy Act was consolidated and those safeguards were still retained, but from time to time pressure was continually being brought to bear by those interested in the manufacture of oleomargarine to permit its manufacture in this country. It is pointed out that this is a measure under the War Measures Act, owing to the abnormal demand for and consequent high prices of butter. If the importation of oleomargarine into this country was permitted in order to relieve a stringency or a condition that had become unbearable, I do not think any very serious objection would be raised to it, but the price of butter has not gone up in proportion to the advance in price of many other food products. Statistics have already been given in that regard, but when you stop to realize that the manufacture of butter is part of an industry in which upwards of $500,000,000 are invested by the people of Canada, it is a very serious matter to interfere with an industry which is so extensive and which means so much to successful agriculture in this country. You may make comparisons with some of the congested countries of Europe; you may say that oleomargarine is admitted into those countries; but we have here a vast extent of country, a country which has enormous possibilities, particularly with regard to agriculture, and at this time when food is of such vital importance to the world at large, we ought to be very careful with regard to any legislation that will affect an industry so extensive and important as this one. What does dairying mean to this country? Dairying as I have said, is the very foundation of successful agriculture in this country. Our friends from western Canada, with that rich and fertile soil which they have in the West, may exploit that soil for a number of years; they may reap enormous crops; they may mine the fertility of that soil, but the day will come as it has come in the older provinces, when they will have to resort to scientific agriculture in order to maintain and increase the production of the land. That is unquestionable. Look at the investments

that have been made in the industry of agriculture, the buildings that have been erected, the factories that have been established by little bands of men who have co-operated for that purpose, and yet here, without any regard for that industry, or for the rights of those people, you drive a dagger into the industry in which they have invested their all, regardless of the effect such action will have on successful agriculture in this country. Take, for instance, the county from which I come. Reference has been made to other great dairying districts. I believe the first cheese that was manufactured in Canada was manufactured at South Oxford at a little place called Salford. I know the place very well. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Read) referred to the fact that by decreasing the amount of milk used for butter, you were going to increase the output of cheese. It is rather significant that at the present time, under the regulations passed by the British Government, fixing the price of cheese here last year, cheese factory after cheese factory in South Oxford is being closed up and put out of business. The butter factories, or creameries, are also being put out of business. This is an opportune time for the large manufacturers of condensed milk to step in and put up a price with which the butter or cheese maker cannot compete, and they consequently capture that trade, and those factories, after remaining closed for a number of years, will depreciate to such an extent that it is questionable whether they will be able to go on again or not when conditions again become normal. Many have already been closed or shut down as a result of fixing prices and other regulations. At the present time some of them are going on in the hope that the price of cheese will be so fixed as to enable them to manufacture profitably.

Mr. BURNHAM: If some good wholesome commodity were put upon the market for the benefit of the consumer, which commodity was considerably cheaper than butter, would my hon. friend still insist that that commodity, which was cheaper than butter, should be prohibited?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If it was a substitute that was going to be sold on its merits, I do not think any serious objections would be raised to it. As I pointed out at the outset, my strongest objection was to a deceptive counterfeit being foisted on the people of this country and not being sold on its merits. It is an article that is put up, according to the regulations under the Dairy Act, in one pound prints, wrapped in wrappers identical with those in which creamery butter is being put up, and it is being coloured also with a view to deceiving the public, and the public are not protected by the regulations which have been enacted here with regard to the matter. My hon. friend asks if I would object to a substitute being brought in to take the place of butter. No, I would not. Butter is something that can take care of itself in competition with anything else; but when you bring something of that kind in, and you add to it from fifteen to twenty-five or thirty per cent of butter, when you churn it with milk in order to take the flavour from the milk and add it to that commodity, then I say: You are not in a legitimate business, and you are not engaged in a business that this or any other government should countenance where agriculture is regarded as being of importance.

That ought to be clear to the mind of every one. Although you make regulations that oleomargarine shall not be manufactured or mixed in factories where butter is being manufactured, yet you permit milk and butter to be taken in for the flavour to be extracted from it in order to make this grease palatable with which to deceive the people and capture the market. Then I am asked if I object to a legitimate business! I say that this is not a legitimate business; it is an entirely illegitimate business, and it is a significant thing that the promulgation of these regulations was almost the very first act of the present Union Government. In that Government we have quite a number of men who have not been in this House before, and who possibly did not realize the insidious appeal that had been constantly made by those interested in the oleomargarine business. The big packing house manufacturers think this is the opportune time to get this industry established in this country, knowing full well that once it is established it will be almost impossible to uproot it after the war, because those who are engaged in legitimate dairying have individually only a small amount of capital invested in it compared with the capital of those engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine. The farmers had absolute confidence that the Government would not do anything that would imperil the industry in which they were engaged. They expected that if the importation of oleomargarine was to be permitted under the War Measures Act, safeguards would be thrown around its importation, which I am sorry to say I cannot see in

the regulations. We talk about how we are going to take care of the soldiers who return from the war, and what the Government is going to do to re-establish them in civil life. Was there a business or branch of agriculture that offers a more inviting opportunity to these men than the dairying business? Yet we have permitted an injustice to be done which may possibly imperil that industry for all time to come. The cheese industry has been crippled so seriously that it will only be a short time before something will have to be done if the British Government are going to get cheese from Canada for the soldiers during this war. I am pointing out these things for several reasons. One is the danger of interfering with and fixing prices, and I quite agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) with regard to price-fixing. Fixing a price for cheese has jeopardized the industry to such an extent that the outlook is a very serious one indeed for those engaged in the business. This fixing of prices has a bearing on other industries. Someone may say: "Why, look at the precautions that have been taken by the Food Board, with regard to feed for dairy stock. They have fixed a price for bran, shorts and mill feed and prohibited the exportation of screenings to the United States, in order to provide feed for our stock." True, all this has been done and provision has also been made for inspection of all the articles that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine in the United States and Canada. But in spite of what has been done, bran is selling between $40 and $45 per ton in Ontario, and shorts between $45 and $50, and the farmers cannot get it at those prices; they are prepared to pay almost any price. Weed seeds are being ground up and mixed with the mill feed to such an extent that stock is being poisoned and have died in many instances as a result, and protests have been lodged with the Government against this crime that has been committed against those engaged in the dairy business. There is no reason in the world why ground weed seeds should appear in mill feeds, such as bran and shorts except by fraud, yet there it is, and that is only one of the things that the man engaged in the dairying business has to contend with to-day. The intention of the Food Control Board may have been good, and they may think they have accomplished their purpose, but the fact is the farmers are being charged an exorbitant price, and the regulations are not being observed or enforced. The Government should also see that those who are willing to pay the highest price for mill feed do not get it in the face of those regulations.

I have spoken longer than I intended. I would not have said what I have were it not for the fact that the district from which I come is largely agricultural and industrial, about evenly divided in that respect, and consequently I am inclined to look at this matter from both sides. I say again that if we are going to permit oleomargarine to come into Canada let us see that it comes in in its pure state, uncoloured, and is not mixed with butter, or churned with milk, and that it be not put up in pound prints of identically the same size and shape, and in wrappers identically the same, with the exception of the name, as the creamery butter, because there is no occasion for it. I am not going to dispute with those who say that oleomargarine is as palatable as butter, because I do not think I ever tasted the stuff in my life, and I am not in a position to express an opinion as to that. But it is a significant thing that the wealthy people of this country and of the Old Country do not want to eat oleomargarine. It is good enough for the poor people, they think, and they would let them have as much as they want. " Give the poorer people all the oleomargarine," they say, " and leave the cream for us; we shall get it all the cheaper." And that is about the case with skim milk to which I have already referred, which is put up for consumption by the poor and the soldiers. There are many large factories engaged in condensing milk and manufacturing milk powder in the county from which I come. I believe the cost of the production of butter has increased more since the war began than the cost of production of any other article of food. Oats are selling to-day from $1 to $1.10 a bushel; mill feed is also at a higher price, and labour is not to be had; and at a time like this, when greater production is being urged, one of the old established industries of this country —an industry that has done more to enrich the fertility and productivity of the soil of Canada, and to establish agriculture on a sound and lasting basis than any other branch of agriculture—is being jeopardized by passing legislation of this kind without adequate safeguards. I feel that I would be recreant in my duty to my constituents if I did not record my protest on behalf of those I represent.

Mr. F. S. SCOTT (South Waterloo): I should like to add one further argument to those advanced in opposition to this Order in Council permitting the impor-

tation of oleomargarine. I approach the subject from a somewhat different standpoint from that assumed by other hon. gentlemen, and I will not go over the arguments already so well advanced this afternoon. It seems to me a very short time since the Order in Council was passed. The effect of that Order in Council was to allow the importation of an article from the United States into Canada. And yet, while this action was taken, only comparatively speaking, a short time ago, we are told at the present time one of the most important problems that confronts the people of Canada from a trade standpoint is the rectifying of the balance of trade between Canada and the United States. It seems to me this action is a mistake, because it disturbs a well-established and a great industry, when, to-day, we are told that the War Trade Board has under consideration a recommendation to the Canadian Government regarding the prohibition of the importation of certain articles into this country. I do not want to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of oleomargarine as against butter, but it does seem to me that the Government should consider whether it is not a mistake, to encourage the importation of an article, when the result will be the disruption of a great industry, and then to attempt to rectify the conditions, which they have deliberately brought about, by regulations prohibiting the importation of certain articles, which will mean the disruption of other industries. I do not refer to the importation of luxuries, which may be all very well, but it is proposed also to prohibit the importation of certain articles that cannot be considered as luxuries, and I believe, in addition to that, to make up for the revenue that will be lost in that way, to put a special tax upon certain articles. It seems to me that the Government might very well give that aspect of the case serious consideration.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the whole range of the business of agriculture, in all the countries where it is carried on, there is perhaps no question which has given rise to more controversy than the question of oleomargarine. Therefore, it is not surprising that we should have had a discussion such as the House has listened to this afternoon in connection with this subject. It is perfectly proper, I think, that the House should be given the considerations which led the Government, to change the policy which had been adhered to in this country for so many years with respect to this product, and to permit not only its importation into Canada but its manufacture in Canada as well.

We have had given to us this afternoon a considerable amount of statistics relative to the dairy industry of Canada and the great importance it holds in our agricultural activities. I have taken the trouble to gather some information with respect to the production of dairy products in Canada, particularly in relation to our exports and imports during the past few years. I am not going to detain the House by giving figures running back over a series of years, but I do desire to place before hon. gentlemen a few facts. I have a statement here showing the following results:

EXPORTS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS.

	Cheese lb	Butter lb.	Condensed Milk lb.
1913	155,216,000	828,232	335,849
1917	180,733,426	7,990,000	15,858,000

If we take the imports for these two years we find that, while in 1913 the total imports of butter in Canada amounted to 7,989,000 pounds, in 1917 this importation into Canada had dropped to 997,000 pounds. The reason for this rapid increase in the exportation was alluded to by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon. The war has made very heavy demands on America for supplies of this kind as it has for almost all kinds of agricultural supplies. Great Britain normally imported from Holland, Denmark and other continental countries the greater part of the butter and cheese that she used prior to the outbreak of war. Since then this has been very largely shut off and consequently Canada has had to make up the deficiency. The higher prices that were paid there led to a rapid rise in the exportation from Canada during the period to which I have referred. That had one effect in so far as Canada was concerned; it reduced, and reduced very considerably, the amount that was available for consumption by the people of Canada. It was also the fact that, due to the war, prices had increased very considerably and it was increasingly difficult for the poorer people in the towns and cities to get the nourishment in fats that they required. Throughout the year 1917, I find, various requests were made to the Government for the removal of the restrictions upon the importation of

oleomargarine. I find, for instance, that the board of health of the city of Toronto placed a recommendation before their city council, and which was in turn placed before the Government, that the importation into Canada, and the manufacture in Canada, of oleomargarine should be permitted. We find, too, that the civic authorities in Montreal made a similar request of the Government. We have also a resolution that was presented to the Government by the Anti-tuberculosis Association of Ottawa, which is as follows:—

> Whereas the war is emphasizing more and more the need of increasing our efforts against the ravages of tuberculosis; and
>
> Whereas the statistics from France, Belgium, Germany and other European countries show an alarming increase in the number of civilians suffering from tuberculosis, due in a large measure, to the lack of nourishing food; and
>
> Whereas animal fats are essential to the healthy growth of our Canadian boys and girls; and
>
> Whereas the present price of butter is practically prohibitive;
>
> Resolved, the Ottawa Anti-tuberculosis Association hereby respectfully recommends that everything be done by our Government to make it possible for our people to purchase nourishing food at reasonable rates, and as one step toward this much-to-be-desired end, that the Government should forthwith remove the ban upon the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.
>
> It is further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent at once to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to modify the regulations governing the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine had been reached before I became a member of the Government. Immediately after that the regulations were drafted, and the regulations that are to-day in effect were prepared practically by the Dairy Commissioner in the Department of Agriculture. Any person who knows the Dairy Commissioner is quite aware of this fact, that the dairy industry in Canada has a splendid champion in him. And he was very careful to draft these regulations so as to conserve and protect the dairy industry to the very greatest degree possible.

Now, I want to draw attention to the fact that the Order in Council with regard to oleomargarine sets out that it is to be regarded as a war measure. In the preamble we find these words:

> Such regulations to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, as provided in the said regulations, and as a war measure only.

The regulations were drafted with a great deal of care. I do not pretend for a moment that they are perfect, nevertheless, I do think that they afford a very fair measure of protection to the dairy industry in Canada. The statement was made, I believe, by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), who introduced the resolution, that the demand for the removal of these restrictions had emanated largely from people in Canada who desired to manufacture this article and offer it for sale. Well, if such is the case, they have not, so far, taken very great advantage of the opportunity that was presented to them, for up to the present time only two licenses have been issued for the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada. I believe there are two other concerns equipping their premises to conform to the requirements of the law relating to this manufacture. But I venture to say that there will not be any great number of manufacturers in Canada engage in this business, and, I believe, for the reason that they realize that it is a war measure, and that there is no assurance of permanency in it.

Mr. NESBITT: May I ask the minister if the Government refused to allow others who conformed to the regulations to engage in manufacture?

Mr. CRERAR: No; any person in Canada who will conform to the regulations laid down is open to manufacture this article. The hon. member for East Lambton also stated that there was a possibility of fraud in the importation of this article, inasmuch as the importation was not restricted alone to oleomargarine. I am told that oleomargarine and margarine are practically interchangeable terms. In Great Britain the article is known as margarine, in the United States it is known as oleomargarine, but it is practically one and the same article. As far as nut margarine is concerned, that is not permitted to be manufactured in the United States, I am told, or to secure the certificate that their laws require, and I understand that it is not, under this condition, imported into Canada.

There is one other point which the hon. member for East Lambton referred to that I desire to deal with. He stated, and I believe the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) also referred to this point, that the manufacturing establishments now permitted to manufacture oleomargarine had an advantage over the creamery industry in the country which was not permitted to manufacture and offer it for sale. To-day, oleomargarine is manufactured in

two of the large packing houses in Canada. They have to sell it as oleomargarine. They do not deal in butter, and, consequently, the possibility of fraud or confusion is reduced. On the other hand, they are also subject to close inspection, absolutely close inspection, in the manufacture of this article. If we threw the manufacture wide open and permitted the creameries also to manufacture it, we would have to provide an immense staff of inspectors to supervise the work in the 1,600 creameries now producing butter in Canada. In addition to that, I, for one, would be very sorry to see this, for the reason that it would be the most severe blow, in my judgment, that could come upon our butter industry. If it had gone abroad throughout Canada and the world that our creamery butter was being produced in establishments where oleomargarine was also being manufactured it would do more than anything else to destroy the reputation of our article.

There was also a suggestion that the regulations in regard to the display of placards in restaurants and other public eating places were not lived up to. Well, the regulations are very definite and very explicit in that respect. They read:

> In all hotels, restaurants and public eating houses where oleomargine is served there shall be prominently displayed in some conspicuous place a placard containing the words: "Oleomargine Served Here," in capital block letters, not less than one and one-half inches long.

The regulations are very definite and explicit that wherever this article is consumed in a public eating house a placard shall be displayed showing that fact.

Now, in respect to the manufacture, what are the regulations that govern it? They read as follows:

> No oleomargarine shall be manufactured in Canada unless it has been manufactured under the supervision of the Minister of Agriculture of Canada and no oleomargarine shall be imported into Canada unless it has been manufactured under the Government supervision in the country of production and is accompanied by satisfactory evidence of such supervision.

The supervision over the manufacture in Canada and over the importation lies with the officials under the Veterinary Director General. As hon. members are aware, the control of packing houses, the inspection of meats therein manufactured, the supervision of the slaughter of animals—all these matters are under the jurisdiction of officials of this department, and it was simply an enlargement of their duties to charge them with the responsibility of seeing also that proper supervision and proper methods are employed in the manufacture of oleomargarine. The sale of the article in retail stores is under the direction of the Dairy Branch of the Department of Agriculture, and it is the duty of the inspectors of the Dairy Branch, who visit the various stores and places of business with a view of seeing that the standards of butter are maintained, to see that the regulations in respect to the sale of oleomargarine are fully and thoroughly lived up to.

The member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) desired to know what restrictions were placed upon the manufacture of oleomargarine to insure that only wholesome ingredients entered into the product. That is set out in the following regulation:

> All material entering into the composition of oleomargarine shall be subject to inspection, and if not approved by an inspector shall not be used. The inspector shall have power at any time to take samples of any such material for analysis. No oleo oil or neutral lard shall be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine unless it is the production of an abattoir under the inspection of the Minister of Agriculture of Canada and bears the Government inspection mark, or has been manufactured in the country of origin under inspection satisfactory to the minister, and is at the time of importation covered by the official markings and export inspection certificate of the country of origin.

That means that as far as the manufacture in Canada is concerned, no ingredient can enter into this article unless such ingredient is passed upon by the inspector who is present.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is there any definite standard as to the percentage of ingredients, such as they have in the United States?

Mr. CRERAR: There is no such standard, but there is a limitation as to the quantity of water that oleomargarine shall contain. There is also a provision that no preservative except salt shall be used in the manufacture, without the permission of the Food Controller. We rely on the inspectors in these establishments to see that only wholesome ingredients enter into its manufacture.

With regard to price, I am not apprehensive that the dairying industry in Canada will suffer by the provisions of this Order in Council designed to meet a condition that has arisen directly out of the state we are in as a result of the war. I have shown that our exportations, particularly of butter and condensed milk, have never been as high as they have been during the past year. It is true that ten or twelve years ago exportations of cheese were larger than they have been in the past year, but the exportation of cheese during the past year was considerably higher than it has been for many years past. There is

no doubt that during the period of the war and for several years after our dairy industry in Canada will have a splendid market and at remunerative prices. The prices that have obtained since the promulgation of this order have not decreased, so far as butter is concerned. On October 1, the finest creamery butter was forty-five cents per pound. It ranged in this vicinity until October 29th, when it was forty-four and one-half cents per pound. On November 26th it dropped to forty-one and three-quarter cents per pound. On December 10th, when the regulations permitting the importation of oleomargarine went into effect, the price was forty cents. On January 21st it had gone up to forty-four and one-half cents per pound; on March 4th, forty-seven and one-half cents; on March 26th, forty-nine cents. At the same time oleomargarine was selling in the same market at from thirty-two to thirty-four cents per pound. I think these figures show conclusively that up to the present time the dairying industry at any rate has not suffered as a result of the introduction of these regulations.

The member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) stated that in the sale of oleomargarine improper practices were very likely to be introduced, inasmuch as oleomargarine was a counterfeit of butter. I do not see that there is any reasonable foundation for this charge. If oleomargarine is sold in a brick or a print the same as butter, it must be distinctly marked as oleomargarine —I believe that it has to be marked on all sides of the package in large, legible letters. Consequently, a person who comes to buy it sees directly and at once what he is buying. If the practice obtained of marking oleomargarine as butter and selling it as such, then the charge of counterfeiting would be quite a proper one to make. I do not think, however, that there is very much danger of that. The inspection is very rigid, and we have endeavoured in drafting these regulations, to make it perfectly clear to the person who desires to buy this article just what he is buying and to prevent the sale of an article as butter, that is not butter.

The hon. member for South Oxford also referred to the price of mill feeds. While this is not strictly relevant to the discussion, I wish to refer to it for a moment because there is some information that I think would be of interest to the House. Under an Order passed on the 17th December by the Food Controller, the price of bran and shorts was fixed on a definite basis at Fort William, bran on a basis of $24.50 per ton, and shorts on a basis of $29.50 per ton. The invoice covering a shipment of bran or shorts to an eastern Canadian point had to show the amount of freight that was paid on the shipment and the cost of the bags, if it was placed in bags. Consequently, the absolute cost to the dealer in eastern Canada could be established without any question. By a subsequent Order passed on the 19th January, the margin that the dealer could take on the sale of these articles was also fixed, and it was ordered that in the case of dealers distributing ex-warehouse or premises to consumers, not more than ten cents per bag of one hundred pounds mights be added to the cost, as set out in Order number 5, issued on 17th December, 1917, to which I have just referred. Where delivery is ex-car by the purchaser from the dealer, not more than five cents per bag of 100 pounds may be added to the cost at the dealer's railway station. Where the miller sells at the mill direct to the consumer, in quantity or quantities less than ten-ton lots, not more than five cents per bag of 100 pounds shall be added to the price at which the miller is permitted to sell under Order No. 5. Where, however, the purchaser brings bags to the mill and such bags are filled at the mill, then not more than $2 per ton shall be added to the price of bran and shorts in bulk, as directed by Order No. 5. Consequently, that fixed absolutely the margin of profit that the dealer was entitled to get. I am quite aware of this, that there may have been dealers throughout eastern Canada who have taken a larger margin of profit than that allowed. But those cases cannot be reached unless they are reported, or unless some person takes action against them under the Order in Council which provides penalties for violation of the regulations. An effort has been made to bring the cost of this feed within reasonable limits to the farmers who require it. There is no doubt whatever that a very serious situation has existed for several months past, particularly in eastern Canada, in respect to the matter of feed; feed for stock, feed for dairy cattle, and I quite sympathise with the position of the hon. member for South Oxford. That difficulty arose practically altogether on account of the difficulties in the matter of transportation which exist at the present time and which have existed for several months past. An effort has been made to bring corn from the United States to feed dairy cows, hogs and other live stock in Ontario, Quebec and

the other eastern provinces. Cars could not be had to carry this corn, and we had the spectacle of tens of millions of bushels of corn out of condition in farmers' hands in Illinois, Iowa and the other corn producing states across the line, and a dearth of that article in Canada and inability to get it here on account of lack of transportation.

I am very glad that this matter came up this afternoon. I followed the discussion with a great deal of interest, and I think perhaps some suggestions have come out in the debate that may be of great value. I can assure the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) that his suggestions will be taken into consideration. It would be most unfortunate if, at this time, anything should be done to cripple or injure in any way our great dairying industry. I am one of those who believe that in the future we have to look, even more than we have done in the past, to the development of our agricultural resources for the well-being of the country. The dairy industry is one of the greatest of these, and it seems to me that right here in eastern Canada, in Ontario and Quebec, provinces peculiarly and splendidly adapted for the development of this industry, a great future lies before it. We know what has been done for the dairy industry in Denmark. If we go back fifty or sixty years, we find in Denmark a population of illiterate peasants, ignorant of almost the first principles of agriculture. To-day we find in Denmark, and also in Holland, the finest dairy industries in the world. There is no reason, in my judgment, why we cannot create in Ontario and Quebec just as fine a dairy industry as they have in those two countries. If we can establish and maintain the quality of our product—and there is no reason why we cannot—we can get into the best markets of the world. We have the markets of Great Britain; more than that, we have the markets right across the line that will be open to us in the future, because with the growth of population in the United States east of the city of Chicago and with the distance the people in the East are from the Western States, I am convinced that, as their industrial population increases, they must look more and more to Canada for the food that they require. Consequently, I think the hon. member for East Lambton may rest assured that this Government is not going to do anything that might harass, or disturb, or destroy the dairy industry. It is true that, to meet the shortage that has arisen in Canada, for the reasons I have already stated these regulations were promulgated and permission was given to manufacture this article and to import it into Canada. I believe that up to the present time some 400 licenses have been issued. Of these perhaps not more than one-third are actively engaged in the importation of oleomargarine, and the total imports up to the end of February were a little over 1,800,000 pounds. I do not know that there is anything more I can add to the discussion. I frankly confess that on the question of oleomargarine I am not an expert. I realise, however, that it is a very vital question in respect of the industry that has been under discussion. If the hon. member for East Lambton will let his resolution stand, or if he will be good enough to withdraw it, I can assure him that the suggestion that he has made in his address and the suggestions made in the other admirable addresses that have been delivered this afternoon will be taken into serious consideration.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Speaker, I am sure, after listening——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must direct hon. member's attention to the fact that, if the mover of the resolution speaks now, other hon. members will be precluded from speaking to the resolution.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): Before the hon. gentleman replies, I would like to ask the minister in reference to the price of feeds fixed for the farmer or consumer. He has pointed out to us very well how the interest of the consumer has been guarded in fixing the prices, the conditions on which the consumer may go to the miller and obtain feed. The one difficulty I see, and the difficulty that has been presented to me by those who are interested, is that the conditions imposed upon those millers are not honestly carried out, and the consumer does not get the advantage that it is the intention of the Government he should receive. It is said that the Order in Council leaves it open for the individual to prosecute the miller. My hon. friend no doubt knows that a small consumer, going to a mill for half a ton or a ton of bran, even if he be imposed upon to some extent in the price, is not going to prosecute the miller or to institute legal proceedings which might, in the end involve him in more expense than the little difference in price. Why cannot it be arranged that the price shall be fixed from time to time, monthly or bi-monthly as the case may be, and that it be understood and established and published so that the consumer may know exactly what he has to pay? In

reference to that point, a large number of farmers who were encouraged, and who were almost persuaded to go more extensively into the hog industry, were dissuaded from following that up by reason of the very fact that I have presented—that, while they were promised cheap feed on terms that seemed reasonable if the Order in Council were properly carried out, they were deprived of that benefit simply by reason of the fact that millers evaded the law or practically paid no attention to it. Some means might be devised by which the consumer, the individual purchasing his feed from the local mill, might be protected by a monthly or bi-monthly bulletin, or by publication in the agricultural papers, of the prices to be paid.

Mr. CRERAR: It is rather a difficult matter to get out a schedule of prices week by week governing the sale price of these articles. I still believe that the regulations which have been promulgated, if enforced, will bring the relief that is desired. Of course, they will not make up the deficiency in the quantity of the feeds we have been discussing, for there has undoubtedly been a great shortage. But, so far as controlling the price is concerned, I believe the regulations will be effective. Not very long ago, in one of the counties of western Ontario—I believe the case was mentioned in a return brought down the other day—a prosecution was entered against a local miller by the president of a co-operative farmers' society, and a conviction secured, and on the word of the president of that society the prosecution succeeded in remedying the conditions in the county in which he lived.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire very briefly to make a few observations, but not by way of criticism of the introduction of oleomargarine into this country, for the Government are in the favoured position of having all the criticism come from their followers. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in introducing this resolution took very great care to clear the previous Minister of Agriculture and also the present minister from all responsibility for the Order in Council admitting oleomargarine free into this country, and he seemed to make out a case that was satisfactory to those who supported him. He put all the blame on the food controller, and the thought occurred to us on this side of the House, as it must have occurred to hon. gentlemen opposite. Who is looking after the rights of the agricultural interests of this country? If neither the previous Minister of Agriculture nor the present Minister of Agriculture is responsible, which one of the twenty-three Cabinet ministers to whom we are paying salaries is safeguarding the country's dairying interest? I leave that thought with the minister in the hope that upon some future occasion he may be able to explain it satisfactorily to the electors. My hon. friend from East Lambton then proceeded to find all manner of fault with the administration of the regulations, and he was followed during the afternoon by other supporters of the Government all condemning the administration of the regulations; so I will leave that to hon. gentlemen opposite.

My hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) made the statement that throughout this country cheese and butter factories were being put out of business, but he did not go to the root of the trouble and say why they were being put out of business. That story goes back as far as 1911, when, by virtue of a trade arrangement with the United States, we could have had free entry for our butter, milk and cream, and milk and cream products, to the markets of the United States. The people of Canada refused to accept that proposal, so in 1913 the United States revised their tariff along lines to suit their own people. They said, "If you don't want to trade with us on the basis of the proposed arrangement of 1911, we are going to fix the tariff to suit ourselves and ourselves only." And they proceeded to put milk and cream on the free list. The result of that legislation was that milk and cream from border towns and counties in Canada immediately began going to the United States.

Mr. EDWARDS: For how long? Not more than six months anyway.

Mr. ROBB: It is going there still. Farmers in the county of Huntingdon are shipping milk to the United States to-day because they can get $3 a hundred there as compared with $2.70 in Canada. The result has been that the butter and cheese factories of the western part of the province of Quebec, at all events, have been shut down, and there is consequently a smaller production of butter and cheese in that section.

There was one feature which, so far as I could observe, the minister dodged very cleverly this evening. He did not attempt to explain to the House why we allow oleomargarine to come into this country free of duty when we place a tax upon butter, and

I think the people of this country are entitled to an explanation of that point. Furthermore, I am told that by virtue of some arrangement oleomargarine does not come into this country as freely as people are led to believe, and that its manufacture in Canada is limited to two big companies which have a considerable pull with this Government. I am not going to name them, for I think all hon. gentlemen know who they are. That is also something about which the people of this country will require an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture.

This afternoon several hon. gentlemen opposite in turn, claimed that their part of the country was the best dairying county in Canada. I thought that a little strange, especially on the part of my hon. friends from Ontario, because I had under my hand the prize list of the Toronto Exhibition, which shows that nearly all the prizes for butter went to the province of Quebec, and a few to the province of Manitoba. I might as well put the list on Hansard, so that my hon. friends from Ontario, when they want to buy good butter, will know where to go. The Journal of Agriculture states that in the class for creamery butter, in salted solids, Joseph Dansereau, of Vercheres, carried off the first prize with a score of 97; the second, third and fourth prizes in the salted class also went to Quebec. In the unsalted class, Quebec was again first, Achille Fournier, of Gentilly, scoring 97 points. In this class a Manitoba exhibitor took the third prize. The Challenge Trophy for the highest score for creamery butter on exhibition was also won by Achille Fournier, of Gentilly.

We will leave that feature of it and refer to the closing remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in reply to the hon. gentleman from East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) about the price of bran and shorts. The history of the fixing of the price of bran and shorts is perhaps not now known to all hon. gentlemen in this House. I got it first hand from a gentleman who was present at the fixing of the prices, and that gentleman is a supporter of the Conservative party, and, I believe, contributes largely to the campaign funds.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no such party.

Mr. ROBB: Well not now, but there was once. When they came together to fix the price it was proposed they should fix it at $24 a ton in bulk, but some said: Why fix this price in bulk; the trade is accustomed to buying in bags and why not fix the price, bags included, so that people will know the cost? They said: We are getting near a general election and it would look better to fix it in bulk because it would be $24 instead of $30. And they fixed it at $24, to look better. That is the history of it, and the price was not long fixed when the friends of the Minister of Agriculture on the Food Control Board who fixed the price down low, and took good care that they should keep all the bran and shorts in western Canada, and a member of the Food Control Board absolutely prohibited the mills of western Canada shipping to eastern Canada. That is the simple story, which explains why we have a shortage of bran and shorts in eastern Canada. They fixed the price low and kept it all to themselves. I have the evidence here, and will be glad to show it to the Minister of Agriculture. I think I can satisfy him that it is correct. I submit, however, to the hon. minister that that is not a fair way of treating the dairy interests. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) complains of the lax administration of the oleomargarine regulations. As a member of a dairy constituency, I submit that the hon. minister is not dealing quite fairly with the dairymen and the stock raisers of eastern Canada in attempting to fix the price of these foodstuffs away down low, and keep them all for western Canada. We are all one country, and we know that the people of western Canada are desirous of promoting the stock industry. I know that the province of Manitoba has made progress in recent years along the line of the dairy industry, but I ask the Minister of Agriculture if it is fair to expect the people of eastern Canada to eat the flour, that tney in western Canada may have cheap bran and shorts. Let me remind him that, according to regulations fixed by himself, you only get 26 bags of bran for every 74 bags of flour. That is important. You cannot run a flour mill unless you sell your flour, and it is eastern Canada that eats that flour. Is it fair that we should be asked to pay the high price for flour and get none of the bran and shorts? I leave these thoughts for the consideration of the Minister of Agriculture, in the hope that as Minister of Agriculture for all Canada he will take a broader view of it, and not attempt to narrow things down. If western Canada expects eastern Canada to help them along in the legislation they require from time to time they must be prepared to deal fairly with eastern Canada.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) seems worried about the position taken by the members for Ontario. Last year petitions with no less than 29,000 names of farmers in his own province were presented to this House in opposition to oleomargarine being allowed in this country. In addition to that, 800 members of the Farmers' Institute of his province sent in petitions along the same line. I am sure, after listening to the splendid statements made this afternoon and to the very generous remarks of the Minister of Agriculture, that we may expect that the regulations that surround the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine in Canada will be dealt with effectively. As I stated at the outset, if oleomargarine is manufactured out of oleo oil and the proper oils that should go into its manufacture, and if it is brought into Canada under the War Measures Act, I am not objecting to it at the present time. Not a man to-day has suggested that he would take objection to it under such conditions. But when you take those oils and also take in to the oleomargarine factory butter, cream and milk, and manufacture any kind of preparation that the oleo men wish to make, you humbug the people. Judging by some of the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen in this House, you would think the people of Canada were anxious to be humbugged.

9 p.m.

An hon. MEMBER: Sure, they are.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Let the oleomargarine manufacturers stick to the manufacture of that article. Do not allow butter, milk and cream to go into their factories in order that they may prepare it so that it will not only look like butter, but taste like it. If this course is adopted you will not find very serious objection to oleomargarine being imported or manufactured in this country, as a war measure. I appreciate, along with other hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, the splendid and generous remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar). I feel confident in leaving the matter with him, that the dairy interests of Canada will be properly protected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to withdraw his motion?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

Motion withdrawn.

[Mr. Robb.]

PRIVILEGE.

MR. DUFF CONTRADICTS STATEMENTS MADE IN CERTAIN NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. W. DUFF (Lunenburg): I rise to speak to a question of privilege. I regret that it is necessary for me to do so, but the matter to which I desire to refer is a very important one and affects my honour as a gentleman, my standing with my fellow members of the House of Commons, and my loyalty as a subject of His Majesty the King. If I were not a new member, it might not be necessary to take this step, but I wish to retain the good opinion of hon. gentlemen in this House with whom I am acquainted, and also to attain the respect of a great many hon. gentlemen with whom I am not acquainted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not taking the proper course. I assume that he purposes submitting his case by a document which he has in his hand. If he desires to make an explanation, he may do so, but he cannot make an extended speech.

Mr. DUFF: The procedure of the House is new to me. I do not intend to make any extended remarks. I shall make my statement as brief as possible, and endeavour to keep within the rules of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Upon what ground does the hon. member rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. DUFF: On the ground that false statements are being made against me in the press of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will read the statements and make his denial, he may proceed.

Mr. DUFF: I wish to finish the sentence I had commenced. I feel it incumbent upon me to make explanation of certain statements published in a newspaper in the city of Ottawa. These statements are contained in issues of the Journal-Press of March 21st, March 26th and April 3rd. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, in order to make this matter as short as possible, I will not read the articles, unless you, Sir, or the House wishes me to do so. I have made a short summary of the contents of the articles, and with your permission I ask to have the statements contained in the newspaper placed on Hansard, and then I shall deal with these statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to have any printed matter that is not read

included in Hansard. If the hon. member will summarize it, he is quite in order in doing so. It would not be in order to read any extended articles from newspapers.

Mr. DUFF: I did not intend to read any more than this summary and I was trying to save the time of the House by not reading these articles. But, in my defence it is necessary for me to say something about them. Consequently I think I should be allowed to read a citation from these articles.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member purposes to enter into a defence, he will not be in order. If there is any statement that he wishes to deny, he can do so, but he must not enter, or attempt to enter, into an argument or to make an ex parte defence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I suggest that he cannot defend himself unless he reads the matter of which he complains?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has a specific article which he wishes to read and in regard to which he wishes to make denial, he will be quite in order but if he should read every paper in Canada which published that article, he will not be in order.

Mr. DUFF: The article in the Journal of March 21 says:

> Mr. Duff was surety on a mail contract which it is claimed disqualifies him from taking his seat. As there is a fine of $100 a day penalty for a disqualified member sitting in the House, Mr. Duff has evidently decided not to take chances. Mr. E. N. Lewis, now Judge Lewis, was similarly disqualified in 1904, when he was elected for West Huron.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. If the hon. member purposes to deny that he was surety on a mail contract I do not see how it can be regarded as a question of privilege. It may be a question of law as to whether the hon. member is entitled to take his seat but it is not a question of privilege.

Mr. DUFF: This article continues:

> Unionist members claim that he not only never gave any assistance to recruiting, but that he discouraged enlistment and that his utterances were responsible for many young men trying to evade the Military Service Law. Some, it is claimed, have since been put in jail as a result of the encouragement given them by Mr. Duff.

A correspondent writing in the Journal March 21 says:

> Mr. Duff is not clear in connection with the Military Service Act and no Government, particularly a Union Government, should pass an Act permitting such a man to sit in this war Parliament until the charges made against him are disproved.
>
> It is a known fact, admitted by Mr. Duff, that he refused, when Mayor of the town of Lunenburg, to allow Rev. Mr. Campbell to speak on recruiting at a fisherman's picnic.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To what is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Duff) speaking?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. member wished to make a personal explanation. Had he followed the course which he proposed when he consulted me this afternoon, and made it a brief statement, it would have been quite sufficient. I have been endeavouring to assist the hon. member in doing that. If he does not see fit to pursue that course I shall have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Speaker——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I submit that the proper time for any explanation is on the Orders of the Day and that the rules of the House ought to be observed in that respect. This is the first time within my experience in which a question of this kind has been interposed in the midst of an order for motions.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question of privilege is always in order provided another hon. member is not upon his feet. But the hon. member for Lunenburg is not taking the proper course in rising to a question of privilege. If he did so he would ask that the article about which he complains should be read at the Table by the Clerk of the House and there should be a motion founded upon that. But there has arisen in this House in recent years the indulgent custom of permitting hon. members to make personal explanations which have been treated as matters of privilege. As long as they confine themselves within reasonable bounds, in view of that custom, I am disposed to give hon. members every latitude, but the hon. member must not proceed in the course he is at present pursuing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN; As far as my recollection goes, such personal explanations as those to which you allude, Sir, are always made in the ordinary course before the Orders of the Day are called. I have never known any deviation from that practice and I would think it undesirable that we should begin a deviation now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I might observe that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was not in the House when the matter arose, and when Mr. Speaker permitted the hon. member (Mr. Duff) who

complains to make a statement and explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should explain to the House that the hon. member for Lunenburg consulted me this afternoon and I advised him that he could not take the course which he has been endeavouring to take. I told him that if he would read a paragraph in the newspaper which contained the substance of the matter about which he complained, and make a denial, he would be in order. If the hon. member does that, he will be permitted to proceed; otherwise I shall have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. DUFF: I regret that I have not been able to keep within the rules of the House, but my apology is that I am not sufficiently acquainted with them. Perhaps I can put it in this short form and it will enable me to conclude in just about a minute. These articles say that I discouraged enlistment; that I was hindering recruiting; that I was opposing the enforcement of the Conscription Act in my public speeches; that I was interfering with the chief of police in the town of which I am mayor; that I was advising young men not to register; that my utterances were responsible for men evading the Military Service Act; that some men were placed in jail as a result of the encouragement given them by me; that I refused to allow Mr. Campbell to speak at a fisherman's picnic; that I was opposed to sending soldiers overseas; that I advised the bringing back of our boys fighting overseas, and that I was involved in unpatriotic acts. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; I must ask the hon. member to resume his seat. The hon. member is exceeding his right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman wants to qualify these statements, and I think he should be allowed to quote them.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member had proceeded to read the article and to make his denial, I would have permitted him to proceed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He has just done it.

Mr. DUFF: I wish to give an absolute and unqualified denial to these statements. There is absolutely no truth in them at all. I also wish to say that my loyalty and my attitude in regard to the war are called in question. I am as loyal as any man in Canada. With regard to the war, I wish to say that I believe in the principles for which the Allied Governments, and especially the Governments of Great Britain and the United States are fighting. I believe the cause is a noble one, and is in the interests of democracy, liberty, truth and righteousness, and that every effort should be put forth by the people of Canada to back up the stand which the British Government has taken in this war. As far as I am personally concerned, whether as a private citizen or as a member of the House of Commons, I will do everything in my power, either by my vote or by my personal influence, to bring this war to a successful conclusion in favour of the cause of the Allied Governments.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Noble sentiments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; the hon. member is going beyond reasonable bounds.

PREVENTION OF FUEL SHORTAGE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the present inadequate coal supply in Canada makes it imperative on the part of the Government to take immediate action with a view to prevent the possibility of any fuel shortage during next winter season.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on many occasions during the twenty-two years that I have had the honour to sit in this Parliament, stock has been taken of our natural resources, but I must say that the speeches which were delivered on those occasions were more of an academic than of a practical nature. Last year my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) moved a resolution on the very subject which I intend to discuss this evening. His speech on that resolution was supported by statistics and by most valuable information. This year, I do not wish to steal a march on that hon. gentleman, although he has a motion on the Order Paper in regard to the question of coal. But as I do regard the present situation as most serious, I would like to test the views of the Government on the present fuel shortage in Canada.

We have just passed through a very severe winter, and we know now what troubles are ahead of us if we do not at the present moment take stock of our situation as regards coal and if we do not foresee the consequences attendant upon a further shortage. I must say first, Mr. Speaker, that I was pleased to learn of the appointment of Mr. C. A. Magrath as fuel controller for Canada. Every body regards Mr. Magrath as a most deserving and con-

scientious official, and I believe that during the few months he has held that office he has made good. I noticed the other day a press despatch from Washington, dated March 23rd, stating that Mr. Magrath had obtained some very valuable concessions from the American Government. By arrangement with the United States Fuel Administration, he has been granted for Canada a considerable tonnage, and he has the privilege, for the period mentioned in the order, of calling upon the Fuel Administration in the United States to issue permits to any shippers who apply to him; and it is stated further in the despatch that allotments of coal to Canada during the past season were made upon the same basis as if Canada had been one of the states of the Union. This expresses a splendid sentiment towards Canada on the part of the United States Government, and we are all pleased that Mr. Magrath has been able to obtain such excellent results. But, Mr. Speaker, we had very, very trying times last winter in our country. We had heatless days, a condition unknown in Canada before last winter. I happened to be in New York on the 31st December last, and when I saw so many large skyscrapers absolutely closed, and when, reading the New York Post on my way home, I learned that during that day in twelve hours eleven persons in that large and enterprising city had died of exposure because of the coal shortage, the shortage being caused partly by railway congestion and partly by scarcity of labour, it dawned upon me that we in Canada were exposed to hours of great anxiety in the near future. As we are in a large degree dependent upon the United States for coal, especially we of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, it seems to me that it is the paramount duty of the Dominion Government to provide for future emergencies. Now that the winter is over is the time for the Government to really govern, because to govern means to foresee. My resolution, I am pleased to say, is not presented in any carping or hostile spirit; I simply want some information from the Government.

Two days ago I noticed in the press that the United States Government had taken very stringent measures for the coming season. And we must remember that it is from the United States that we import such large quantities of bituminous and anthracite coal yet necessary. The coal business in the United States is now under the exclusive control of the Federal Government, so that there will be no more price pirating; the selling agent is to be forced out; licenses are to be issued, and coal zones are being created within which the distribution of coal will be localized. This is a very drastic measure. As regards our dependence on the United States with regard to fuel generally, let me say what, after all, is a truism, that we are practically at the mercy of any strike in the American coal mining districts or any industrial disorganization in the United States over which we have absolutely no control. A coal or railway strike in that country would seriously, if not fatally, affect the Dominion of Canada. But leaving aside the matter of labour conditions in the United States, there is another eventuality which we must face. The coal fields of that country are far from being inexhaustible, and the time may come when the American Government will put an embargo on the export of coal. In 1908, when President Roosevelt convened at Washington a meeting of the Governors of the various States and some of the leading officials and industrial experts of the Union, he used the following language:

> This nation—

His words apply to Canada as well.

> This nation began with the belief that its landed possessions were illimitable and capable of supporting all the people who might care to make our country their home; but already the limit of unsettled land is in sight, and, indeed, but little land fitted for agriculture now remains unoccupied save what can be reclaimed by irrigation and drainage. We began with an unapproachable heritage of forests; more than half of the timber is gone.

And, Mr. Speaker, he added the following ominous words:

> We began with coal fields more extensive than those of any other nation and with iron ores regarded as inexhaustible, and many experts now declare that the end of both iron and coal is in sight. The enormous stores of minerals, oils and gas are largely gone.

This warning of the ex-President to the Governors of the various states of the Union brought into existence the Conservation Commission of the United States, and, indirectly, by reaction, the Conservation Commission of Canada. I need not dilate on the beneficial effects of the conservation of natural resources or the splendid work done by our Conservation Commission. But we are nevertheless facing a very serious problem—that of coal shortage. Apart from food, raiment and shelter, nothing is so necessary or so essential as fuel for the maintenance of life and for the carrying on of commerce and transportation. Though we are not dependent on the United States for our entire fuel supply, we must obtain

from them fifty-five per cent of our coal requirements. This is a matter of grave import, as artificial heat must be supplied in this country during seven or eight months of the year, if only for the purpose of maintaining life.

Let us see in just a few sentences what are the present fuel requirements of Canada. I borrow my figures from a very interesting paper read before the Mining Engineers' Association in Montreal a few weeks ago by Dr. Haanel, one of our officials here. In 1916, nearly 30,000,000 tons of coal, 299,426,121 imperial gallons of crude and refined oil products, and firewood valued at about $60,000,000 were required in Canada. During that year the railways burned 9,000,000,000 tons of bituminous coal; 7,000,000 tons were required for generating power and a large quantity was used for town gas, heating large buildings, and manufacturing coke. Anthracite coal to the amount of 4,000,000 tons was burned in domestic and other heating plants and for industrial purposes. In normal times, however, anthracite is largely used for heating purposes. Compared with these fuel requirements of Canada, what was the production of fuel in this country during the same year? In 1916, 14,483,395 tons of bituminous coal were produced in Canada, of which we exported 2,135,359 tons. Canada produced 6,934,288 imperial gallons of crude oil, and wood fuel was burned to the value of approximately $60,000,000. So that to meet our requirements it was necessary to import 17,580,603 tons of coal and 292,426,100 imperial gallons of crude and refined oil product. This indicates the extent of our dependence on the United States for these essential commodities.

I said a moment ago that the coal fields in the United States are not inexhaustible, and I quoted the words of President Roosevelt in 1908, at the time of the creation of the American Conservation Commission. I have, in the report of our Commission of Conservation of 1917, the opinion of a gentleman well known in Canada, Mr. W. J. Dick, mining engineer, which confirms the assertion made by President Roosevelt. Mr Dick, in a paper on problems relating to the mining industry of Canada says:

> The supply of anthracite coal in the United States is limited and there is no assurance that its export to Canada will be long continued. In 1913, it was estimated that there were 16,153,000,000 tons of anthracite coal in the United States. In 1913, 91,524,922 tons were mined and, as it has been estimated that for every ton of coal lost, a ton and a half of coal is sold or used, the exhaustion is proceeding at the rate of over 152,000,000 tons per annum. If production continued at the same rate, it would exhaust the anthracite of the United States in little over 100 years. We must, therefore, expect that the price will gradually increase. Coincidentally with the rise in price, production will decrease, thus prolonging the life of the mines.

We have here confirmation of the words uttered in 1908 by President Roosevelt. Mr. Dick predicts that within a century there will be no more anthracite coal mined or exported from the United States. Canada has seventeen per cent of the world's coal reserve. Yet our production is relatively small. We import more than we produce. Are such conditions to remain as they are, or must they not be changed? I do not wish to weary the House with any statistics because they can be found in any blue-book. Suffice it to say that the fuel resources of Canada exist in the vast coal-fields of the extreme eastern and western portions of Canada, in the lignite fields of the western provinces, in the natural gas fields of western Canada and Ontario, in the petroleum oil fields of Ontario, in the oil shales of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in the standing forests, and, finally, in the peat bogs in great areas, chiefly in central Canada. As to the distribution of our fuel resources, there are four classical districts, if I may so speak, each of which has an abundance of fuel peculiar to its own area. The first district is that portion of western Canada which can be economically supplied with bituminous and anthracite coal. The second district is that portion that can be supplied with lignite. The fourth district is that portion which is richly served by Nova Scotia coal. But the third district cannot be supplied with the above coals; it must thus be dependent upon the United States, or must develop and utilize its excellent peat bogs, and this is the case of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. What shall we do? Here are, in my humble judgment, some of the remedies that suggest themselves. First, we can proceed—and I am speaking by the book, because I have read some literature on the subject in the Commission of Conservation report and in some of the papers which have been read lately before the Institute of Mining Engineers—with the intensive exploitation of our peat bogs. In yesterday's Globe, I find that a special committee was appointed by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to study that phase of the subject of fuel supply. I find here, summed up, the estimated peat resources of Canada:

> The engineers of the Department of Mines entertain no doubt as to the enormous extent of our peat deposits.

Seven bogs within convenient shipping distances of Toronto are estimated to be capable of producing approximately 26,500,000 tons of fuel; and seven bogs in the vicinity of Montreal could supply that city with 23,500,000 tons of fuel.

Five bogs along the lower St. Lawrence, conveniently situated as regards water transportation to the city of Quebec, can, it is estimated, supply 16,250,000 tons of fuel and 5,700,000 tons of peat litter.

The bogs examined in Nova Scotia can produce 6,200,000 tons of fuel and 500,000 tons of peat litter, and those of Prince Edward Island can produce, 1,250,000 tons of fuel and over 1,000,000 tons of peat litter.

In Manitoba the aggregate fuel contents of the bogs is estimated at less than 2,000,000 tons. One bog alone, however, it has been estimated, is capable of furnishing 2,500,000 tons of peat litter.

Dr. Haanel, who is our great expert, speaking on the economical operation and utilization of our peat bogs—I do not wish to inflict on the House the reading of all his suggestions, but I may be pardoned if I just give a few lines—says:

The only economic process in existence to-day—

That is, in order to utilize economically the peat bogs.

—is that which employs the forces of nature—the sun and the wind—for the removal of the moisture. The process employing these forces is called the "wet process," and the product obtained is termed "machine peat." This is the process which the Mines Branch, Department of Mines, demonstrated at the Government peat plant at Alfred, Ontario. We not only have the process for manufacturing peat fuel, but also sufficient detailed information concerning peat bogs of immediate importance, to make a good start in the formation of a peat industry. During the period covering the past ten years, the Mines Branch has completely investigated and mapped 58 Canadian bogs, all of which are situated conveniently with respect to inhabited and industrial communities, and also well situated with respect to railway and other transportation facilities.

He concludes by saying:

Excellent bogs are likewise conveniently situated with respect to thickly inhabited communities in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and other parts of Canada.

After describing the rich peat bogs of Central Canada he advises that the Government should take the matter in hand at the earliest opportunity in order that this fuel may be utilized.

He says:

Not until the utilization of a natural substance is forced by absolute necessity will the most sincere and earnest efforts be put forth to successfully and economically convert it into a usable product. It appears to me the time is at hand when necessity will decide that we Canadians utilize our peat resources, and in the most efficient manner.

There the alarm bell is sounded, and the Government should pay heed to the advice given by this well-known expert and start in at once to utilize our peat bogs. Another course which suggests itself for the utilization of our resources against the eventuality of an embargo on coal from the United States is the treatment of lignite, which is found in such large beds all over the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Haanel deals with this question also in his pamphlet. He says:

The utilization of certain of the lignites for some purposes is possible without any subsequent treatment. With others, notably those of Saskatchewan, the lignites as mined are not suitable for use. This is due to the physical and chemical properties peculiar to this type of fuel. The characteristics of lignites must be altered before they can be converted into a satisfactory fuel. Experiments on a commercial scale have demonstrated beyond a doubt that our lignites cannot be briquetted in the raw state without the addition of a binder. Briquettes made in this manner appear on casual examination to be entirely satisfactory, but when submitted to a water test or when burnt they will invariably disintegrate. The establishment of briquetting plants at strategic points throughout the lignite provinces of the west would very greatly help in reducing our dependency for fuels upon other sources. While the domestic fuel is of course of first importance, lignite briquetting industries would prove also of great value to the railways traversing the lignite belts. It would even be within the realm of possibility to economically supply at least a portion of the province of Ontario with this class of fuel.

Another remedy which suggests itself in the way of more intense production is the development of our oil resources. Professor Haanel in this paper says:

Our domestic production of oil cannot be increased without great effort and the expenditure of considerable money, but provision must be made, and immediately to provide against the time not far distant, when the United States will be compelled to cease exporting her crude and refined oil products.

I have already said that Mr. Roosevelt, backed by Mr. Dick, has stated that within a hundred years there will be no more anthracite coal mined in the United States, and therefore no more anthracite coal to export, and Mr. Haanel now states that within 30 or 35 years no more oil will be exported from the United States; which means we must tap our own resources and develop them as economically as possible. Mr. Haanel says:

The United States up to the year 1915 had exhausted 32 per cent of her possible petroleum resources. If the present annual production is maintained, but not increased, her total crude oil supplies will be exhausted in less than thirty years. But if the present rate of increase of production is maintained, total exhaustion will occur in a much shorter time.

With regard to oil possibilities in Canada he says:

We can scarcely hope for some time to come to produce oil on a scale comparable with our demands, but we can appreciably reduce the quantity which must be imported. Our total oil production from all sources might probably be increased to 120,000,000 gallons, by erecting oil shale distillation plants in New Brunswick, with a combined capacity of 100,000,000 gallons and by increasing the quantity of coal coked in by-product ovens or by carbonizing large quantities of bituminous coal at low temperature, and briquetting the carbonized residue. The low temperature carbonization and briquetting of Nova Scotia coal either in Nova Scotia or at some centre of distribution favourably situated with respect to water transportation, as Montreal, for example, would not only appreciably increase our production of oils but would also be the means of supplying for domestic purposes a coal equal in many respects to anthracite. The fuel situation of some parts at least of Ontario might in this manner be much improved. If this idea were carried out our oil production would be: From oil shales 100,000,000 gallons; from coke ovens and low temperature carbonization 14,000,000 gallons, and from Ontario petroleum fields 6,000,000 gallons, making a total of 120,000,000 gallons.

We could also help to alleviate the present fuel shortage by developing our water-powers and our hydro-electric energy. I do not wish to bore the House with this question, as we shall hear about hydro-electric energy in the course of this session, but perhaps I might be permitted to remind my hon. friends that Mr. Roosevelt has sounded the alarm not only with regard to the coal fields of the United States, but also with regard to the water-powers, and his words apply equally to the water-powers of Canada.

Mr. Roosevelt said:

The people of this country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. A single generation will see the exhaustion of our natural resources of oil and gas, and such a rise in the price of coal as will make the price of electrically transmitted water-power a controlling factor in transportation, in manufacturing, and in household lighting and heating. Our water-power alone, if fully developed and wisely used, is probably sufficient for our present transportation, industrial, municipal and domestic needs. Most of it is undeveloped, and is still in National or State control. To give away without conditions this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly.

The question of state ownership, as regards hydro-electric energy, is one which might engage the attention of Parliament. I wish only to call to the attention of the members of the House the importance for Canada, as a quid pro quo, in case of a coal embargo, of public ownership of our water-power system. The total possible horse power of Canada is estimated to be 18,203,000, and the developed horse power of Canada is only 1,813,200. I think the greatest national wealth of Canada to-day, bar none, is the water-powers of the country. We have in Ontario and Quebec, and partially in the West, if properly harnessed and if controlled by the Government, an asset of inestimable value.

Now, another remedy which suggests itself for this fuel shortage is not only the exploitation of our peat bogs, the treatment of our lignites, the treatment and development of the shale rocks of Canada, and the development of our hydro-electric system, but also the elimination of customs duties, war tax, etc., upon material and machinery needed for the exploitation and development of those different resources. Some time later in the session I will make a motion, just to test the views of the Government with regard to this question of tariff on material and machinery used for the development of our natural resources. It is a tentative motion; I placed it on the Order Paper last year, but it came to grief.

During the present session I intend to make the following motion:

That it is the opinion of the House that His Majesty's Government should make provision to prevent any recurrence of the late threatened scarcity of fuel.

That the present import duties and war tax, levied upon the material and machinery required for the construction of new hydro-electric power development, and for the desired electrical equipment of certain of Canada's steam railroads, also for the construction and equipment of works to produce peat fuel, fuel from lignite and to recover the oil contents of certain Canadian deposits of shale carrying oil, prevents the construction of such much to be desired plants and works.

That it is desirable that such power plants and fuel producing works should be developed and constructed, without further loss of time, and that to secure and encourage such development and construction, it is hereby resolved that during the continuance of the present war in Europe the import duties and war tax, now levied upon such material and machinery as are required for the development and construction of said power plants and fuel producing works shall no longer be so levied.

Here are, in a few words, the suggestions I have to offer the Government on this question of fuel shortage. It is a very serious question for Canada and we shall have to face it very soon as the spring and summer will pass away in less time than we imagine. We shall be confronted next winter with a situation which might well appal the people of Canada. We know how certain homes suffered last winter. In the city of Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, there

10 p.m.

was misery, and if it had not been for the City Council of Ottawa and its worthy Mayor we would have had people actually freezing in many a home. The winter will soon be upon us, because we have practically no spring in Canada. We are actually at the opening of summer, but we know it is of short duration. Winter will come and I beseech the Government that this is a proper time to study this question and to solve it, if it is possible of solution. The Government have appointed a Scientific Research Commission composed of some of the most distinguished scientists of Canada. I know Professor Macallum, a man who is imbued with the idea of service to his country. I hope that the Government will give Professor Macallum and his colleagues of the Scientific Research Commission the widest scope possible, in order to experiment and find a solution to the very serious problem I have placed before the House this evening.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), in whose department this subject falls, is not able to be in the House to-night. It is a matter of regret that, under those circumstances, the hon. gentleman should not have thought convenient to postpone the moving of the resolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was asked by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Reid) if I would not postpone it. At first I did not yield, but a few minutes afterwards I told him that, if he wished me to postpone it, I was quite ready to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is unfortunate, from the point of view of the members of the House, in that the response of the Government will not be so efficiently made. The subject is one that only in a very remote way comes within the purview of the department with which I am connected. The hon. gentleman's resolution, as it appears on the Order Paper, would be a resolution demanding the attention of Parliament if the steps taken by the Government up to the present time had not been adequate to meet the exigencies of the day, but I fear the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered has very little relation to the terms of the resolution. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the present inadequate coal supply in Canada makes it imperative on the part of the Government to take immediate action with a view to prevent the possibility of any fuel shortage during next winter season.

In these highly critical days it is still of importance, and of great importance, that everything be done that can be done to provide fuel during our cold winters in Canada. But the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered had more to do with the requirements of the country in the way of coal seventy-five or one hundred years from now, and in the way of oil thirty-five years from now, than with the immediate needs of the coming winter. But so far as the question as set out in the resolution is concerned, this is a subject that has engaged the attention of the Government, and that long before the resolution appeared on the Order Paper. I am not certain of the date, but, from memory, it was some time in the month of June, or early in July, 1917, that, as a result of deliberation, an Order in Council was passed appointing a Fuel Controller. Mr. Charles A. Magrath, a former member of this House, and now chairman of the international waterways commission, was asked to undertake this duty and accepted the task. The problem that confronted him was mainly to secure from whatever source it could be secured from and, of course, mainly from the United States operators, a supply of coal for the homes, factories and other uses of this country for the winter which has just gone by, to provide in advance that such shipment should be directed to this country as, supplemented by our own production, would ensure us against hardship so far as that could be ensured against, and at the same time to take whatever steps might be in his power to advance production within this country. It was realized at the time that while, of course, the maximum of coal production in Canada was a matter of primary consideration, it was inevitable that for the purposes of the winter that followed, and the one that was to follow that again, we should have to look for a large portion of our supply to the anthracite and bituminous coal fields of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Magrath set about the work, and I believe I only speak to the judgment of the people of Canada when I say that, having regard to the conditions that obtained throughout the coal using areas of the United States as compared with the conditions that obtained in Canada, he did not fail at his task. True, there was a coal shortage in this country, true there was hardship, or something approaching hardship as a result, but much the same was the condition of the coal using states to the south. Keeping in mind the delicacy of the task that was entrusted to the com-

missioner, I believe it will be the common judgment that we were fairly treated as between the United States and ourselves, and that Mr. Magrath succeeded and succeeded well.

The coal operating year ends on the 31st day of March. Mr. Magrath has undertaken this duty; at all events he still occupies the post and I sincerely hope that it is his purpose to continue to undertake the duty for the year that is now upon us. In this connection we have not been idle in the way of endeavouring to enhance the coal production within our own borders, and the use of substitutes for coal as well. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has referred to our great peat deposits. Careful attention has been given to that subject. It has come under the review of the international scientific resources commission to which it has been referred. I cannot speak in detail as to what has resulted. I do not think there is anything in the way of immediate relief to be looked for in that direction.

Attention has also been given to the subject of lignite. It has been under review at repeated meetings of the Council and at repeated meetings of the chairman of the Council and the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Government. I will mention one result that has already been reached. An arrangement has been arrived at as between the Government of Canada and the governments of two of the western provinces—at all events it has been formally agreed to on behalf of this Government and, I understand, informally on the part of the other governments,—whereby a sum of money is appropriated on the part of each for the establishment at a suitable point in the lignite coal fields of Saskatchewan of a plant for the briquetting of lignite, the purpose being to demonstrate its commercial feasibility and to make available for the anthracite coal users of the West, this substitute which it is said will take the place of anthracite.

I intimated a moment ago that the same commissioner has in charge the same task in relation to the coming winter. In this connection I would call attention to the more thorough organization which he has already effected looking to the immediate control of the coal importations into this country. By an Order in Council which appeared in the Canada Gazette of the 21st of last month, there was confirmed a set of regulations wherein is worked out in the most thorough manner a scheme of organization for the control of the coal and fuel industry of Canada. That scheme was arrived at after a conference with the provincial governments concerned. The whole plan, as I understand, is approved by these governments, and they intend to co-operate in order to see it to its successful utilization. It provides for the appointment of a fuel administrator on the part of each of the provinces and of the provinces as a whole. The duties of the fuel administrator are clearly set out. They are, in brief, to undertake responsibility for the distribution of such coal as may be imported or produced or made available within the limits of both provinces, and to assist the fuel controller and all others concerned in the greater production of coal and fuel, and the greater utilization of wood and substitutes for coal within the limits of the province. The regulations also provide for the appointment of a fuel commissioner, or a board of fuel commissioners, by municipalities. The powers of these commissioners are also set out. They are within the limits of the municipality concerned, parallel with the powers of the fuel administrator within the limits of the province. Provision is made for the removal of fuel administrators so appointed whenever it appears necessary to do so. The Order in Council further provides for the issue of licenses to importers of coal, operators of coal mines, to brokers in the coal business and to retail dealers as well. In that way the entire coal industry is brought under the supervision of the fuel controller, and the regulations set out the scheme of profits within which all operators, as well as all brokers and all dealers, wholesale and retail, must limit themselves if they are to continue to enjoy their license and do business in this country. The margin of profit is fixed, or rather the maximum margin of profit is fixed, in each case, and each operator is compelled to enter into an agreement with the fuel controller which binds him in this matter of profits and also in the matter of distribution; the whole question of distribution is brought within the control of the administrators or controller and of the board of fuel commissioners. That in brief, is the general scheme of regulations, which, at the recommendation of the fuel controller, have been embodied in an Order in Council under the War Measures Act and are now in the shape of statutory law. So that not only has the question of production, so far as production can be pushed with a view to the requirements during war time and the immediate future at all events, been given attention to. Not only

has the question of importation been given attention to so as to secure what is a fair allotment for this country from the coal fields to the south, but also the question of distribution and of coal production in this country is now well in hand and should work out fairly under the regulations that are set out. In this connection I might further say that a conference has been arranged for between the coal operators of this country in all the provinces and a member of the Government which is to take place, I understand, some two weeks from now; at all events it is very shortly to be held. The purpose of that conference is to consider ways and means to increase coal production within this country. The question of coal production is, like many other matters of production in Canada, one in which the controlling factor is, in the main, the question of labour. It would be an easy matter to multiply coal production in Canada if labour could be found to do the work, but labour is scare for coal production just as it is scarce for farm production and almost every other kind of production; and one of the chief problems in coal production that will confront this continent will be that of labour.

We have, undoubtedly, as the hon. member well points out, very large coal resources in our country. We are the possessors of about 17 per cent—I think that was the figure he gave—of the remaining coal resources of the world. The United States, even in the face of the tremendous depletion that has taken place during the last half century in that country, are far in advance of us still. I do not know the exact percentage of coal the possession of which they enjoy, but from memory it is not far from the neighbourhood of 50 per cent of the remaining coal resources of the world. So, on the North American continent we are favourably situated, compared with the other nations of the world in the matter of coal resources and in the matter of fuel resources generally; and it will be one of the problems of the future, one of the problems of the present in proper subordination, to see that the development of our coal resources is proceeded with. That problem the Government has attacked, and, I think, successfully, in so far as it was our duty to attack it. The problem of coal and fuel for thirty-five years, or two generations from now, will also receive attention, but it will be subordinated for the present to the more important questions that are in front of us and to the far greater question of the conduct of this war.

I am sorry that I cannot in greater detail follow point by point the very excellent speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. I have attempted to indicate broadly, and with some reserve—because I cannot pretend to any great familiarity with the question—the efforts the Government has made not to neglect the problem which is the heart of his resolution, and the efforts the Government is making now to continue successfully to cope with it for the immediate future at all events.

Mr. S. E. ELKIN (St. John City): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this motion, reserving any remarks that I intended to make for the motion on the Order Paper standing in the name of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). But there is a possibility that his motion may not be reached for some time, and I think, in justice to the people of Canada, especially those in the lower provinces, for whom I speak at the present moment, it is time that the Government take upon themselves seriously the matter of the fuel controller. The fuel controller is a joke, and we might as well face it. Last fall we had a visit from the fuel controller in our section. I may say frankly that owing to his visit to the Maritime Provinces, in the city of St. John alone we started in the month of November and continued throughout the very severe winter 15,000 tons of coal short. Why? Because the fuel controller said that he was going to reduce prices, and he scared the people from buying coal. The result was that the coal remained in the bins of the coal merchants. They did not have room to put any more in; they could not import any, and we found ourselves this spring without the coal that normally would have been in the bins of the householders. Now, in January I took the trouble to take this matter up in Washington with Mr. Magrath. I pointed out to him the difficulties that we were going to face in the Maritime Provinces for coal in the coming winter of 1918-19. He informed me that we would have to burn soft coal in the lower provinces this coming winter, and that it would be just as well to go home and tell our people to change their grates so that they could burn soft coal. I thought that was rather strange, so next morning I took the trouble to go down and see Dr. Nasmith, the Chief of Staff of the United States Fuel Administration, and I was informed that on and after the first day of April coal would be permitted to be ex-

ported from the United States, particularly anthracite coal, in the same proportion that it had moved for an average of three years previous to the war. I immediately acquainted our coal authorities in the lower provinces with that fact, and they got busy to secure their coal supply. What did we find not later than last Friday? That the fuel controller in this country has made absolutely no arrangements for Canadian schooners in the port of New York, waiting for coal, to get their cargo. He should have made that arrangement with the United States Shipping Board, and now is not the time to consider it. He had fair warning two months ago. The result is that at present we have no coal in St. John, and there is very little in the province. This is the time of year when, as a rule, we begin to put in our anthracite coal for the following winter. For some reason or another, the fuel controller is playing into the hands of the big interests in Nova Scotia who produce coal. If we are to have a fuel controller, let him be a fuel controller. I listened with much interest to what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Meighen) said about the wonderful machinery that has been laid out for the fuel controller. That machinery was in operation last June.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. ELKIN: Absolutely, that machinery was in operation last June. I could point to two or three men who were appointed by the fuel controller in the different provinces to act as his deputies. It is the same machinery exactly. I repeat that the fuel controller should be a fuel controller. Why was it that last year we in the lower provinces had to wait for bituminous coal while the Canadian Government railways imported the coal in their own steamers and handed it over to the Canadian Pacific rather than put the Canadian Pacific to the expense of taking it out of their bunkers? Why was it that last winter, when we needed coal that was consigned to our dealers in the lower provinces, simply because the Canadian Government railways did not have bunkers to put it in, they took the coal from the cars, and our people went without it? That is not fuel control; I think we ought to have a real fuel controller. It was reported some time ago that our Mr. Magrath was to resign, and the view was expressed that he should stay on. We should have a fuel controller, and if Mr. Magrath is not the man to do this work, the appointment of another man to take his place should be seriously considered.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Union Government.

Mr. ELKIN: I have in my possession a statement over the signature of as reliable a man in the Maritime Provinces as you would want to know, that instructions have been issued by the fuel controller that coal may be moved to Ontario points, but not to lower province points.

I have not at hand a good deal of what I had intended to say this evening, and it will be necessary for me to curtail my remarks. I did not feel, however, that I could allow this motion to go by without calling the attention of the Government and of the House to the seriousness of this situation. It will not do to say that this matter will be taken up in April, in May, or in June; it will be too late then. Our production of bituminous coal must be looked after. If we cannot get the labour in this country to get the coal out, we will have to import the labour. I understand that the matter has been before Council; certainly it has not come before the House since I have been here. But we have to face the situation; unless we get bituminous coal, and get it quickly; unless we get production under way, half our industries will be closed next year. It is a well known fact that the fuel controller is a member of the War Trade Board; it would be interesting for Council to know how often he has attended the meetings of that body, with which he is supposed to co-operate. I have it on good authority that he has hardly attended a meeting of the War Trade Board, under the jurisdiction of which all these matters are supposed to come. I hope that the Government will not consider these remarks of mine as a criticism of the Administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ELKIN: Mr. Magrath was appointed before the formation of Union Government; nevertheless, a certain amount of responsibility rests on this Government to see that if Mr. Magrath's department is not administered as it should be, a remedy is applied very quickly.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, to one from Nova Scotia, where the coal is, this discussion is very interesting. It is rather disappointing and embarrassing to me to observe the course that has been adopted by the Government. They seem to have a great knack for the multiplication of intricate machinery, and if they are asked to do

anything further about it, they just put another wheel here and another set of strings and belts there, making the machinery more intricate than ever, so that you do not know where it begins or where it is going to end. That sort of machinery, however, gives the Minister of Interior (Mr. Meighen) splendid play for his talent in the use of words and the representation of conditions according to the style and standard to which we have been so well accustomed in this House now for a good many years. He gave a great display of that ingenuity to-night in speaking of this wonderful machinery about the coal. I have often heard an old story about some peculiar tricks of a cat—and I am not, of course, extending this analogy to the minister. When this cat is going to catch a mouse at the front door, she will go upstairs, then down the back stairs, then outside, then in again, and finally land in the porch where she wanted to get the mouse. It would have been much better if that cat had taken the manly and straightforward course of going right to work and starting at the beginning of the performance. That is the sort of difficulty we experience when we want this Government to do anything. They take every step in connection with the coal except that of dealing with the men who have it, the men who produce it, the men who own it, the men under whose direction it exists in abundance. There are probably more than one hundred men in this House who have very little conception of the extent of the splendid coal fields that we have in Nova Scotia. Beginning in the western part of the province, in the county of Cumberland, close to the old home of the Speaker of this House, near the Spring Hill mines, the coal beds run down through Cumberland, Colchester, Pictou, Antigonish, Inverness, Cape Breton and Victoria counties, a distance, following the sinuosities of the coal beds and the course of the formation, of something like two hundred miles. The belt is at least three miles in width, there being three or four seams in some places, one underlying the other, and some of them thirty-six feet high. Imagine a coal seam thirty-six feet from top to bottom—higher, I suppose, than from the floor to the ceiling of this Chamber. This splendid face of coal can be converted into any kind of fuel that you want. If you do not like to burn bituminous coal as it comes fresh out of the mines, you can convert it into coke. The most aristocratic man in the country would be pleased to sit before a coke fire—it is a beautiful fire. But if he does not like the coal in that shape, he can make it into briquettes. If he is not satisfied with that and wants to be a little more aristocratic, he can convert it into gas—it is a splendid gas coal. If he is not satisfied with that, he can use it in the shape of electricity—and any of these things can be secured from Nova Scotia coal, which we have in inexhaustible quantities, inexhaustible measuring it according to the lifetime of a babe that is born to-night. I would point out to the minister that the people to go to about this coal are those who own it. If the Government want to make some arrangement for the purchase of coal, they should go to these persons and make contracts with them to deliver the coal at certain places throughout the Dominion where it may be available to the people. Mr. Magrath is a very estimable gentleman in every sense of the term and is possibly fitted for almost any walk of life except that of fuel controller. I remember well the night that he was appointed. The Minister of Labour was in his seat; I think the anouncement was made by him. I pointed out to him then that the proper thing to do was to make close contracts with those people who owned the coal, that the Government will buy from them at a fixed price every ton they can produce. In that way you have the coal miners and the coal managers and everybody going full swing to work, knowing they have fixed contracts and sale for every pound of coal they can produce.

If the Minister of Railways wants a number of cars from any car manufacturing concern in this country, he makes a contract with them for a certain number of cars at a fixed price, and they go to work and manufacture them. If the people of this country, as represented by the Government, want to get coal in large quantities, they will go to the people who produce coal and make a bargain with them that they will produce as much coal as possible for a fixed price. That is the way in which to handle the matter, and not by multiplying machinery without effecting any real good. Those men who own coal are willing to sell it. They will produce it as rapidly as it can be produced, if they know it is going to be sold and if they are certain of their prices. I pointed out then, and I point out now that, as has been stated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Elkin) the proper time for the moving of coal is now or as soon as navigation is open. I would suggest to the Government to use barges for the moving of coal. It is hard to get steamers now, but in the summer time it is quite easy to use barges

coming up the river St. Lawrence to the head of navigation, where the coal can be stored in large quantities, and from the storing places it can be distributed throughout the country when the proper time for distribution comes. If the Government take advantage of the navigation season they can collect this coal from Nova Scotia and from the West and other places and put it in a proper position so that the Government will control it. They will get their money for it. There is no trouble about that. The people will buy the coal, and it will pay them to give good prices for is now because you know, Sir, when the winter comes, when transportation is difficult and the roads are blocked, people have to pay extraordinary prices for their coal; whereas, if provision is made at the proper time and coal is stored at a place from which it can easily be distributed, exorbitant prices need not be extracted from the people. They will then be in a position to pay the Government a fair profit on its investment, and the country will be secure from distress caused by lack of fuel. I wish to point out that we have in this Dominion any quantity of coal. The mining of coal of course, requires many men, but the mining is not carried on to-day as it was twenty or twenty-five years ago; to-day we mine coal largely by machinery, and it does not require so many men now to produce coal as it did in former days.

Let me conclude by assuring the Minister of the Interior and every member of the Government of that concerning which I really need not assure them—because they know it now—that we have in the province of Nova Scotia in this magnificent belt of which I have spoken abundance of coal. From the plants and mines established there, we can produce splendid fuel; and while we have adundance of it, there need not be any suffering in this country, so far as warmth from fuel is concerned. As we have that fuel and the means of producing it, I hope the Government will go direct to the point, and, avoiding this multiplicity of wheels and schemes and Orders in Councils, that they will get the coal, put themselves in possession of it and be in position to distribute it to the people when they really require it.

Mr. T. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary West): I have listened with interest to the discussion on this question and in particular to the excellent address delivered by the mover of the resolution. While I agree with many matters that have been brought up, I cannot agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Elkin) when he said that the fuel controller of this Government was a joke, because I believe, if this Government has in its employ or under its jurisdiction a man who is worthy of the confidence of the Government and of the people of the Dominion of Canada, and a man who is held in high respect and esteem by all classes of the people apart from their political affiliations, it is Mr. C. A. Magrath, fuel controller of the Dominion. I have known Mr. Magrath for many years, and it is very unfair that any hon. member should make an attack on him personally when he has not the privilege of occupying a seat on the floor of this House, and is, therefore, unable to defend himself. For Mr. Magrath I hold no brief, but I speak of him only as I have personally found him, from my knowledge of his long connection with western life in Canada and the great service which he has rendered in the development of that country. He is a gentleman who has been successful in his own private life and in the public positions which he has occupied in this country, and he has rendered valuable services to this Dominion in connection with the international waterways and as fuel controller, the position he now occupies. The criticisms are not fair, because, if you examine them, you will find they are based on the simple fact that the Dominion Government has not had schooners in New York in order to take anthracite coal to St. John so that the people of that city may store it this spring, and then sit down and enjoy the heat next winter. The advice given by Mr. Magrath to my hon. friend was good, sound advice. Mr. Magrath told him: You had better go home and tell your people to fit their grates up for bituminous coal. Is that not sound advice? Are they not in the centre of a district which produces more bituminous coal than any other district in the Dominion? Have they not the coal fields of Pictou, Inverness, Victoria, Cape Breton and Cumberland to draw upon? Can they not go there at any time during the summer and can they not go to some of those ports, even in the winter and load their schooners with bituminous coal and take it to St. John, to keep the people in that city warm? If he was told by the director of fuel in the United States that there would be 2,500,000 tons of anthracite coal coming to this country, and if he was told by Mr. Magrath that none of that would be distributed in the Maritime Provinces, I feel that Mr. Magrath would be doing his duty, and this

Government would be doing their duty if they restricted the importation of that coal to the province of Ontario and that portion of the Dominion which lies west, including Manitoba and part of Saskatchewan. My hon. friend must realize that in Ontario we have no watercourses except some lakes, that in Manitoba and Saskatchewan we have no watercourses by which we can bring this anthracite coal from Pennsylvania. He must realize that one of the most serious problems we have had in the West in connection with the coal situation has been railway transportation, coupled with the labour problems which have been referred to by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). Does my hon. friend think that Mr. Magrath is going to give the people of the Maritime Provinces all that portion of the anthracite coal which they would like to have, because they have base-burners and because anthracite coal is cleaner to handle, and, perhaps, gives out more heat? He must realize that we have passed through a very strenuous period during the past winter when hundreds of ocean-going boats were held up in Atlantic ports because of fuel shortage. He must realize that difficulty arose in regard to transportation over which the fuel controller of this country had no jurisdiction or control. He must realize that every part of this country has suffered from want of coal. He must realize that manufacturing industries have doubled their output during the past year; that they have been working night and day, and that it is more essential to this country that those factories be kept working than that people in New Brunswick and the Maritime Provinces be allowed to get in their usual supply of anthracite coal in order that they may live a little more luxuriously.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): I do not represent a part of the country that is suffering from fuel shortage; in our part of the country we have all we require and are able to supply a good portion of western Canada. But I would like to offer a suggestion to the Government, and it relates somewhat to the question of anthracite coal mentioned by my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie). The mines of western Canada unquestionably could supply the demands of western Canada, if the transportation facilities were available, and if we could always be sure of the conditions of the labour market. Given those conditions, all the anthracite coal at present going into Manitoba and parts of Saskatchewan could go to Ontario, for instance, where the shortage is the greatest. But it is necessary first of all to make sure of the transportation facilities in order to get coal from the mines of Alberta east to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. It is also important that the labour market should be assured all the year round. The chief difficulty with the mines of western Canada at present is that they are not sure of an all-the-year-round market, month in and month out, and until that is remedied it will be impossible to have a steady supply of labour, because miners are dissatisfied if they can secure only four or five months' work with one mine owner, and during the rest of the year have to look around for employment at other occupations. If we could arrange to provide the mines of western Canada with the entire western Canada market, it would assist to a great extent in meeting the labour situation. Of course, there has been the difficulty that western Canada coal has lost some of its fuel value when in storage, and dealers have not been anxious to store it for that reason, but discoveries have been made that seem to promise success, and I would suggest to the Government that they inquire into these proposed storage remedies either through the Conservation Commission or through the Fuel Controller's Department. Once the storage difficulty is overcome it will be possible for the dealers throughout the prairie provinces to acquire coal during the summer months for use in the fall and winter, and when we can do that, we can keep the mines in operation the year round, and that will solve the labour difficulty. We have only tapped the coal resources of western Canada. The mines of western Canada at the present time have a greater capacity than the demand of that country, and there are unlimited areas of coal as yet untouched. If the difficulties I have mentioned could be overcome, western Canada could supply the demands of all Ontario, I believe. Of course, Ontario is accustomed to using a hard coal, and we are accustomed to using a coal that is called soft, but it suits our purpose in every respect, and I am sure Ontario would find it quite useful, especially to meet shortages of the kind that occurred during last winter.

Mr. R. H. BUTTS (South Cape Breton): It would be inadvisable for a Cape Breton man to hold his tongue when the coal question comes up in such a manner as it has to-night. I wish to review the observations made by the mover of the resolution (Mr.

Lemieux) and by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and the very first suggestion I would like to make to them would be that, as far as the coal areas of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia are concerned, they might bring a little bit of influence to bear upon their friend the Premier of Nova Scotia to see if he would not really do something tangible to right the wrongs perpetrated by the local legislature of that province during the past twenty years. In Cape Breton County alone there are areas containing hundreds of millions of tons of coal that cannot be touched, belonging to the Dominion Coal Company, held under long leases and unworked. There are also other vast areas that cannot be operated because the Dominion Coal Company properties are interlocked with those of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and vice versa. Would it not be better for my two hon. friends, instead of making suggestions to the Government, to go to their friends in the Nova Scotia government and see if something could not be done to break the deadlock between those two companies? Not only are the towns suffering for coal, but the annual production of coal is actually decreasing year by year at the rate of some half a million tons yearly, and this notwithstanding the fact that great improvements have been made in mining machinery and production methods. The mover of the resolution came out with scare headlines about the shortage of coal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In Central Canada.

Mr. BUTTS: I am afraid he got his information from an unreliable source. If he will look at the pamphlet that was issued by the coal barons of Nova Scotia at the time the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) and the late lamented Mr. Paterson, went to Washington to make a reciprocity pact, he will find that in the previous year the production of bituminous coal in the United States amounted to about 416,000,000 tons, and that coal from Newport News could be laid down over the side in Boston for $1.11 per ton. Those were the conditions; that was the price; do those figures indicate any scarcity of coal? There is a real difficulty in Nova Scotia regarding coal, and that difficulty is the lack of transportation facilities. One year before the war broke out, you could put Nova Scotia lumber over the side in Liverpool, England, at approximately 36 shillings a standard, but before the war had been on two years the rate advanced to 380 shillings a standard.

[Mr. Butts.]

You must remember at the same time that shipping has been depleted at such a rate that it is to-day one of the most alarming problems of the British Empire and the Allies. The question of transportation, even before the war, was one of the big questions, and we only began to solve it when the Norwegian ships came to this country with Chinese crews. We then became able to carry coal from Sydney harbour to the city of Montreal at prices around fifty cents per ton. That low rate was the only thing that made it possible for Nova Scotia coal to meet in St. Lawrence ports the importation of American coal. And speaking of water transportation I would remind the House that we have in Sydney harbour one of the four or five finest harbours in the world, where almost the combined navies of the world might float at easy anchor—all kinds of water. On both sides of the harbour we have large steel plants. We have the magnificent plant of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the somewhat smaller plant on the other side of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, but with very great potentialities. We have mines in the county of Cape Breton alone that are producing over four and a half million tons of coal annually. We have in the same county limestone,—unlimited. We have within the borders of our own county every constituent, and a big output of many lines of finished steel. We have produced and shipped to the seaboard of British Columbia cargoes of steel rails at prices lower than rival companies obtained, and have landed them there in competition with the steel plants of North America. We sent these rails round the Horn before the Panama canal was opened. All this goes to show the enormous possibilities of the steel and coal of Cape Breton county. The Government might very well look into the possibilities of Sydney harbour as a location for the building of steel ships. We have in Sydney harbour all these advantages together with the new steel-plate mill and the day is near when we shall be able to compete with any part of the world in steel ships. By undertaking there construction at once we will go far towards solving the difficulty of transportation which has been the bane of our coal and steel industry.

Speaking of the production of coal, let me again ask the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Lemieux) and my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) did it ever occur to them, between the time they conceived the idea of bringing in

this motion and the time they made their speeches, that coal mine after coal mine has been closed down in Nova Scotia, and all on account of the evil and ill-conceived legislation of their friends of the Liberal Government in Nova Scotia? Did it ever occur to them that my hon. colleague and I had been down in that local House for years, fighting with all our strength these ill-advised mining laws of the Murray Government?

An hon. MEMBER: Since Union Government?

Mr. BUTTS: I am speaking of Murray's Anti-Union Government of the last six years. Did it ever occur to them that the Port Hood mine was closed down, and that for about a week in that local House we fought for an investigation of the conditions prevailing at Port Hood? Did it ever occur to them that we had in Nova Scotia this last year two of the most terrible mining disasters that ever occurred in this country, which were only lost sight of on account of the overshadowing magnitude of the Halifax disaster? Did it ever occur to them to ask this House why it was that those disasters occurred? My hon. colleague and I can tell them that the accidents were due to the terrible mining laws and poor mining inspection existing in Nova Scotia. There was no more inspection of mines there than there is in the city of Quebec. Did it ever occur to those gentlemen that it would be well to look to their own household before they began to criticize others? A mine was closed down in the county of Pictou, at Thorburn, not long ago, and no one has been told why. Another mine in Westville was closed down and nobody has been told why. This very high vein of coal that my hon. friend from Cape Breton speaks of was not only 36 feet high, but it was 48, 50 and 60 feet, and it was closed down on account of bad mining laws and ineffective government inspection in Nova Scotia, and between 400 and 500 miners left the district. These are some of the matters that I suggest hon. gentlemen should think of before they begin to talk of the necessity of this Federal Government looking after the increased production of coal, which is primarily a provincial government matter. The increased production of coal in the eastern part of Canada is dependent upon the local government, and it is very greatly hampered by the local government, and I would say to these gentlemen that, at least for the sake of propriety, they had better withdraw this resolution and look to their own household. They had better go to Mr. Murray and Mr. Armstrong, and the worthy Attorney General, Mr. Daniels, in Nova Scotia, and ask them if they cannot do their share to relieve the coal situation.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crothers the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Thursday, April 4, 1918.

DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

APPOINTMENT OF LOUIS CHARLES PANET.

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

EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 2nd April instant, relative to the yearly increase in salary to certain Officers and Clerks and Employees of the House, and also a clerk in the Joint Distribution Office of the House of Commons and Senate, pursuant to Section 8 of Chapter 9, of the Statutes of 1917, be approved.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House has approved the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons for the payment to a clerk of the Joint Distribution Office of the House of Commons and Senate, of the yearly increase in salary, pursuant to Section 8 of Chapter 9, of the Statutes of 1917.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the names of the following members be added to the following Select Standing Committees viz:

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines—Messrs. Bolton, Harold, Long, Mewburn, Reid, (Grenville), and Ross.

Miscellaneous Private Bills—Messrs. Kennedy and Pedlow.

Standing Orders—Mr. Duff.

Public Accounts—Messrs. Duff, Mewburn and Ross.

Banking and Commerce—Messrs. Cowan, Johnston, Kennedy, Pedlow and Ross.
Agriculture and Colonization—Messrs. Bolton, Cowan, Harold, Johnston, Long and Sinclair, (Queens, P. E. I.)
Marine and Fisheries—Messrs. Duff and Sinclair, (Queens, P. E. I.)
Mines and Minerals—Messrs. Bolton, Johnston and Long.
Forests, Waterways and Waterpowers—Mr. Cowan.
Library—Mr. Harold.

I understand these additions have been assented to by the whips on each side, and the motion is due principally to members having been gazetted since the last motion was made.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the name of Mr. Mowat be substituted for that of Mr. McLeod on the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and that the name of Mr. McLeod be substituted for that of Mr. Mowat on the Select Standing Committee to supervise the official reports of the House.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 31, to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This Bill is similar to the Bill I introduced in 1915. The legislation is along the same line as that which I have asked the Parliament of Canada, during the last five years, to bring into force. It is for the purpose of bringing the boats engaged on our inland waters and our coastwise trade under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The railways in Canada are compelled to file their tolls, rates and tariff agreements with the Railway Board, and they are also compelled to do this with regard to boats connected with the railways.

I firmly believe it would be in the public interest not only to compel the boats on our inland waters and along the coast to file their tariff rates with the Board, but to bring them under the Board's absolute control. There are on the Canadian register 8,500 boats, with some 45,000 employees. In view of the fact that these boats are allowed to make use of our rivers, harbours, docks and canals free of charge, in which improvements the people of this country have invested over $350,000,000, I think hon. gentlemen will readily agree that it would be in the public interest for the Parliament of Canada to have control over these vessels. The Government of the United States, within the last two years, has passed most stringent laws and regulations governing the traffic on their inland waters and their coastwise trade. Practically every civilized country in the world, except the Dominion of Canada, has control of its shipping, and I hope when the Bill comes before the House that hon. members will assist in passing it, so that it may become law during this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

CHIEF JUSTICE SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Mr. MORPHY:

1. How much salary was paid last year to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada?
2. How much was paid last year to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as Deputy Governor General; (*a*) what are his duties in this office; and (*b*) how much was paid to his predecessor in office?
3. How much was allowed last year to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick by way of expenses for duties overseas?
4. Was Sir Charles Fitzpatrick paid such last-named allowance or any part thereof?
5. Is Sir Charles Fitzpatrick mentioned in the preceding four questions one and the same person?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. $10,000.
2. $5,000; (a) to act for or in absence of His Excellency the Governor General; (b) No predecessor.
3. Parliament voted $2,500.
4. No.
5. Yes.

FISHING TRAPS: ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is the Government aware that some farmers along the shore of the St. Lawrence river, are prohibited from fishing, or establishing and using encircling fishing traps, in front of their property, by reason of the heirs of Seigneur Fraser exacting from them an exorbitant rent amounting in certain cases to as much as forty dollars for each fishing season?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to give instruction to the Food Controller in Canada to cause an earnest inquiry in the matter with a view to determine a reasonable price for the establishment of said encircling fishing traps in that portion of the County of Temiscouata comprising Notre Dame du Portage, River du Loup, Cacouna and Notre Dame des Sept Douleurs?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No.

2. Not at present advised. The fisheries in the district mentioned are being administered by the provincial government.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNAL EXPENSES.

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Have all the local Judges attending to the exemption claims been paid?

2. If not, what is the number of those who have not been so paid, and for what reason?

3. Have all the court clerks and other employees of such tribunals been paid?

4. If not, how many claims are outstanding, and for what reason?

5. What is the total amount paid to Judges and clerks of the exemption tribunals to date, and what is the total expenditure to date of such tribunals?

6. What is the number of officials and employees connected with the Central Appeal Tribunal, and what is the salary paid to each of them?

7. What is the total amount of disbursements to date in connection with the putting into operation of the Military Service Act, 1917?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. 342 not paid; accounts in process of checking or not yet sent in.

3. No.

4. It is impossible to state how many claims are outstanding as the accounts of the tribunals have not all been sent in.

5. $268,749.63.

6. 96, as per statement attached.

7. $1,424,785.15.

STAFF OF THE OFFICE OF THE CENTRAL APPEAL JUDGE.

J. Lorne McDougall, Clerk to the Central Appeal Judge, $250 per month.

P. M. Roy, Secretary to Central Appeal Judge, transferred from Supreme Court. No special remuneration.

Five barristers, engaged as counsel, $70.00 per week salary and expenses.

Eight barristers, engaged as counsel, $84.00 per week salary and expenses.

One agricultural examiner, $105.00 per week salary and expenses.

One barrister, Office of Central Public Representative, $84.00 per week salarly and expenses.

One comptroller, $180.00 per month.
One stenographer, $150.00 per month.
Five stenographers, $110.00 per month.
Eleven stenographers, $100.00 per month.
One stenographer, $95.00 per month.
One stenographer, $90.00 per month.
Six stenographers, $85.00 per month.
Eight stenographers, $80.00 per month.
Three stenographers, $75.00 per month.
One stenographer, $70.00 per month.
One stenographer, $65.00 per month.
Two clerks, Filing Department, $125.00 per month.
One clerk, Filing Department, $70.00 per month.
Three clerks, Filing Department, $65.00 per month.
Ten clerks, Filing Department, $60.00 per month.
One clerk, Filing Department, $50.00 per month.
One index clerk, $90.00 per month.
Two index clerks, $60.00 per month.
One clerk, Record Branch, $90.00 per month.
One clerk, Record Branch, $85.00 per month.
One clerk, Record Branch, $50.00 per month.
Three copyists, $65.00 per month.
Six copyists, $60.00 per month.
Two copyists, $55.00 per month.
One messenger, $75.00 per month.
One messenger, $70.00 per month.
Two messengers, $60.00 per month.
Three messengers, $40.00 per month

IMPERIAL WAR GRAVES COMMISSION

Sir SAM HUGHES:

A report from Montreal says: "Imperial War Graves Commission has been informed that Canadian authorities have decided on a one-pattern headstone for all Canadian graves with the option of a special crest or motto for each battalion or a service design." Will the Government be good enough to give the particulars, if any, in this matter?

Major-General MEWBURN: The following cablegram has just been received from the High Commissioner in reference to this matter:

Imperial War Graves Commission decided there should be equality of treatment for graves of all officers and men abroad and that this principle should be carried out by Commission by erection over all graves in war cemeteries abroad of headstones of uniform dimensions though with some variety of pattern. English regiments may decide have distinctive pattern for each regiment but after full consultation with Canadian corps and military authorities here Kemp and I found general consensus opinion that we should have uniform headstone and inscription for all Canadians with right to have separate crest or motto for each battalion or service. Decision was therefore made accordingly through Imperial War Graves Commission but no design for Canadian headstone has yet been selected. Writing more fully.

PERLEY.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. TUCKER.

Mr. PORTER:

1. When was Mr. Tucker appointed as Agricultural Representative on the Leave of Absence Board, Military District No. 3, Kingston, under the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. Upon whose recommendation, or at whose request was he so appointed?

3. Has he any known special qualifications for such position?

4. What pay does he receive for his services?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. February 6, 1918.

2. He was appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, not upon recommendation or at request, but after satisfying himself by

inquiry that he possessed the necessary qualifications for the position.

3. Yes.

4. $5 per diem and expenses.

RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

Of the 105,250 wounded men mentioned in the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister on the 19th of March last, how many have returned to the Front?

Major-General MEWBURN: The information asked is not available, and if it were, it would not be in the public interest to give it.

OFFICERS OF MONTREAL BASE DEPOT BATTALIONS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the commissioned officers employed at Montreal at the Base Depot Battalion, No. 1?

2. How long have they been in this battalion?

3. What is their rank?

4. Who are those amongst them who have performed service overseas?

5. How long were they actually at the Front?

6. To which battalion did they belong when in the trenches?

Major-General MEWBURN: The answers are tabulated as follows:

1st Depot Battalion. 1st Quebec Regiment.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
M. A. Piche	24-9-17	Lt,-Col	No.	Information not available.		O. C.
C. M. McKergow	24-9-17	Major	"			2nd in Comm'd
C. W. Hewson, M.C	8-10-17	"	Yes.		5th C. M. R.	
N. Loring	28-9-17	"	No			
J. J. Walker	1-2-18	Captain	Yes.		73rd Batt.	
L. S. Yuill	6-11-17	"	"		18th Batt.	
L. A. Sewell	6-11-17	"	"		24th Batt.	
R. J. Campbell	6 11-17	"	"		25th Batt.	
J. T. L. Shum	13-11-17	"	"		42nd Batt.	
A. M. Gammell	18-10-17	"	"		P. P. C. L. I.	
H. Armstrong	6-11-17	"	"		14th Batt.	
J. H. Findlay	1-10-17	"	"		55th Batt.	
*W. H. Butters	26-12-17	Lieut.	No.			
J. Renahan	6-11-17	"	Yes.		13th Batt.	
F. W. G. Hale	18-2-18	"	"		42nd Batt.	
*G. B. Dorey	2-10-17	"	No.			
*W. K. Nelles	5-10-17	"	"			
*F. W. F. Whitehead	5-10-17	"	"			
*H. N. J. Dandurand	6-10-17	"	"			
*W. A. Ramsay	1-10-17	"	"			
*W. H. Harrison	15-10-17	"	"			
*H. K. Gorham	10-10-17	"	"			
*W. B. Clark	8-11-17	"	"			
*G. F. Macnaughton	8-11-17	"	"			
*L. St. G. Wilkins	8-11-17	"	"			
*T. B. Heney	2-1-18	"	"			
*R. Hampson	26-12-17	"	"			
*H. C. Howard	18-2-18	"	"			
*L. G. Bell	18-2-18	"	"			
*W. L. Darling	18-2-18	"	Yes.	(Conducting duty)		
*F. L. West	26-12-17	"	No.			
*G. O. A. Brown	31-12-17	"	Yes.	(Conducting duty)		
C. W. Rigby	1-9-17	Pay-Mr. & Hon. Capt.	"		218th Batt.	Attached.
A. E. Vipond	11-1-18	Med. Off. Captain.	"		A. M. C.	Attached.

*Temporary appointment, to be replaced by returned officers when available.

OFFICERS OF MONTREAL BASE DEPOT BATTALIONS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the commissioned officers employed at Montreal at the Base Depot Battalion, No. 2?
2. How long have they been in this battalion?
3. What is their rank?
4. Who are those amongst them who have performed service overseas?
5. How long were they actually at the Front?
6. To which battalion did they belong when in the trenches?

Major-General MEWBURN: The answers are tabulated as follows:

2nd Depot Battalion. 2nd Quebec Regiment.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
O. J. L. Daly Gingras	26-9-17	Lt.-Col.	Yes.	Information not available.	22nd Batt.	O. C.
E. Mackay-Papineau	1-12-17	Major	"		"	2nd in comm'd
M. Dubrule	12-10-17	Captain	"		"	Adjutant.
A. P. Grothe	5-11-17	Major	"		178th Batt.	
L. Gavreau	19-1-18	"	"		22nd Batt.	
L. N. Plante	1-1-18	Captain	"		163rd Batt.	
H. Dansereau	7-1-18	"	"		69th Batt.	
P. E. Leclerc	16-11-17	"	"		22nd Batt.	
L. Plante	15-2-18	"	"		"	
*T. A. A. Reeb	25-10-17	"	No.			
*G. Guimond	1-11-17	"	"			
H. J. Jolicœur	1-1-18	Lieut.	Yes.		22nd Batt.	
E. Dubuc	1-10-17	"	"		A. M. C.	
*H. Marquette	9-11-17	"	No.			
*L. E. Ranger	12-11-17	"	"			
*J. N. Provost	2-1-18	"	"			
*F. Dansereau	2-1-18	"	Yes.	(Conducting duty)		
*M. McKay	7-12-17	"	"		221st Batt	
*L. Beaudry	7-1-18	"	No.			
*M. C. Lalonde	7-1-18	"	"			
*A. M. LaRose	24-1-18	"	"			
*N. B. Cohen	7-2-18	"	"			
*J. M. Query	7-1-18	"	Yes.	(Conducting duty)		
E. J. Lalime	23-10-17	Qr. Mr. & Hon. Capt.	No.			Attached.
J. A. Archambault	20-10-17	Pay-Mr. & Hon. Capt.	No.			"
J. M. E. Prevost	5-11-17	Med. Off. Captain.	Yes.		A. M. C.	"

*Temporary appointment, to be replaced by returned officers when available.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETURNED OFFICERS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Minister of Militia and Defence received any request or resolution from the Great War Veterans' Association or any other body with regard to the employment of returned officers and promoted non-commissioned officers in the Base Depot Battalion raised under the Military Service Act?
2. If so, what action has been taken to comply with these resolutions?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. Representations dealing generally with employment of returned officers and other ranks have been made by the Great War Veterans' Association through its officials. Apart from such representations, it has for a long time been the policy of the department, having regard to efficiency, to give preference in military employment to officers and soldiers who have served at the front.

With special reference to depot battalions, instructions to the above effect were issued in September, 1917, to all districts, and these instructions have been complied with.

THE VICTORY LOAN.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Government appointed a special committee known as the Victory Loan Committee?
2. If so, when was it appointed?
3. What members constitute said committee?
4. What powers have been conferred upon them, and what are their duties?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. With the approval of the Minister of Finance, a committee known as the "Victory Loan Special Committee" was ap-

pointed by the Dominion Executive Committee of Canada's Victory Loan.

2. The membership of the committee was approved by the Minister of Finance on January 3, 1918.

3. G. H. Wood, Esq., Toronto; H. R. Tudhope, Esq., Toronto; J. W. Mitchell, Esq., Toronto; W. A. Mackenzie, Esq., Toronto; Sir Augustus Nanton, Winnipeg; P. McDougall, Esq., Montreal; R. A. Stephenson, Esq., Montreal; J. M. Mackie, Esq., Montreal.

4. The committee was formed for the purpose of assisting in organizing and stabilizing the market for Canada's Victory Loan, 1917. With that end in view, and in co-operation with the Bank of Montreal, financial agents of the Dominion, it lays down such rules and regulations to be followed by co-operating bond and stock dealers in connection with trading in Victory Loan bonds, and takes such other action as from time to time may be authorized by the Bank of Montreal with the consent of the Minister of Finance.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Do all the subscribers to the Victory Loan regularly pay their instalments?
2. If not, how many of these subscribers have failed to pay their instalments?
3. What is the amount of the arrears?
4. Of the total number of subscribers, what proportion are in arrears in each of the provinces, and in the whole country?
5. What is the proportion between the instalments in abeyance and the instalments due?
6. Has the Government exercised its right to forfeit past payments in the case of those persons who have been unable to meet their obligations when payments became due?
7. If so, in how many cases, for each of the provinces of Canada?
8. What is the amount, for each province, so forfeited?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The subscribers in addition to the 10 per cent paid on application were allowed five instalments in which to complete their payments. The last of these instalments is due on the 1st May. The department is not in a position to answer the questions categorically except to say that a very large proportion of the subscribers paid their subscriptions in full on the first three instalment dates. Including the 1st March instalment the amount of the loan payable was 60 per cent. On that date 77 per cent of the allotments had been paid in full.

6, 7 and 8. The answer is no.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

SILVER MONEY IN CIRCULATION.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What was the total amount of Canadian silver money in circulation when war was declared in August, 1914?
2. What was the total amount of silver money in circulation on the 1st March, 1918?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. Silver in circulation cannot be stated exactly. Is a matter of estimate.

THE GOLD RESERVE.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What was the total amount of gold in reserve in charge of the Receiver-General when war was declared in 1914?
2. What was the amount of said gold in reserve on the 1st March, 1918?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. $97,136,426.88.
2. $120,005,662.45.

DOMINION NOTES IN CIRCULATION IN 1914 AND 1918.

Mr. TRAHAN.

1. What was the total amount of paper money in circulation in Dominion Notes when war was declared in August, 1914?
2. What was the total amount of said Dominion Notes in circulation on the 1st March, 1918?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. July 31, 1914, $112,793,833.28.
2. February 28, 1918, $255,316,652.92.

FOREIGN LOANS.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. How many foreign loans obtained by the Government will become due during the fiscal year, 1918-1919?
2. What date will each of such loans become due?
3. What is the rate of interest upon each of said loans?
4. What amount of sinking fund has been provided by the Government for the payment of each of the said loans?
5. What course does the Government propose taking to meet such payments when said loans become due?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: No foreign loans maturing in 1918-19.

DOMESTIC LOANS.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Government made use of any of the various loans obtained since August, 1914, to this date, to meet the accruing interest payments upon War Loans?
2. If so, what was the gross amount for each of the years 1914, 1915, 1916 and 1917, so paid?
3. Does the Government propose to make use of future war loan funds for the purpose of meeting the accruing interest payments referred to in question No. 1?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:
1, 2 and 3. The answer is no.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. In connection with the money loans obtained previously to the commencement of hostilities, has the Government decided to suspend, during the continuance of the war, the discretion it exercised in respect to the sinking funds of said loans?
2. If not, for what reason?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. No.
2. It is not deemed necessary at present.

WAR EXPENDITURE.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What amount has been paid in connection with war expenditure by means of: (a) War taxes; (b) Treasury bonds; (c) Short term loans; and (d) Long term loans?
2. Were sinking fund provisions made in respect to the Government war loans issued since August, 1914?
3. If so, what is the amount of the sinking fund for each of the said loans and the rate thereof?
4. If not, for what reason have no sinking fund provisions been made?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Under the Audit Act all public moneys and revenues form one consolidated revenue fund and expenditures are not ear-marked against any source of revenue.
2. Yes, one half of one per cent.
3 and 4. $1,000,000; one half of one per cent, applicable to the 1925 Loan.

SALARIES OF CANADA FOOD BOARD.

Mr. J. F. REID:

What are the salaries now being paid to each of the members of the Canada Food Board?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Henry B. Thomson, chairman, $7,000 per annum; Hon. C. A. Dunning, Director of Agricultural Production, no salary; J. D. McGregor, Director of Agricultural Labour, no salary.

OBSERVATION AND PRIVATE CARS.

Mr. MacNUTT:

1. Has an order been issued to discontinue observation and private cars on transcontinental and other trains?
2. If so, was this done in the interests of conservation?
3. Is the Government aware that recently a heavy private car was attached to the rear end of the Imperial Limited Train No. 2, at Vancouver, and hauled across the Continent to some point in Ontario?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No.

THE MONEY MARKET.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Government adopted any measure or measures with a view to preventing a depreciation of value in the money market, in respect to the bonds issued for the various war loans?
2. If so, what measures were adopted?
3. If not, what does the Government propose doing to provide against such contingency?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The answer to this question will be found in answer to the hon. gentleman's question headed "The Victory Loan."

PROHIBITION—DOMINION REVENUE.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. To what extent will the revenue be affected by reason of the Prohibition measure in Canada?
2. In what manner does the Government propose to offset the receipts thus affected?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The subject of this question will be dealt with in the Budget Speech of the acting Minister of Finance.

RECONSTRUCTION OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS COMMITTEE.

Mr. COPP:

1. Who were named on the Original Building Committee for the rebuilding of the new Parliament buildings?
2. Who are at present acting on the said Building Committee?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Hon. Robt. Rogers, M.P., Hon. Charles Murphy, M.P., Hon. Rodolph Lemieux, M.P., Hon. Dr. J. D. Reid, M.P., Hon. J. D. Hazen, M.P., Hon. William Pugsley, M.P., Hon. P. E. Blondin, M.P., Hon. Senator Robert Watson, Hon. Sir James Lougheed, K.C.

2. Hon. F. B. Carvell, M.P., Hon. Dr. J. D. Reid, M.P., Hon. P. E. Blondin, Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, M.P., Hon. Senator Robert Watson, Hon. Senator G. D. Robertson, Hon. Sir James Lougheed, K.C., Hon. J. A. Calder, M.P.

REGIMENT AT AMHERST DURING ELECTION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Which regiment or part of a regiment landed or arrived at Amherst, N. S., shortly before the last general election?
2. Did the members or soldiers of that regiment vote at the last general elections?
3. Who was their commanding officer, what was his name, rank and the date of his appointment?
4. Where was the above regiment recruited, and where drilled?
5. When did this regiment arrive at Amherst and from whence was it brought?
6. How long did this regiment remain at Amherst, and where did it go from there?

7. Were all the soldiers of said regiment British subjects? If so, how many were British subjects by birth, and how many by naturalization?

8. How many men composed the said regiment, and how many of them voted at Amherst at the last general election?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Reinforcing drafts from the 1st and 2nd Depot Battalions, B. C. Regiment.

2. No available information.

3. Lieut. J. Douglas Beatson, appointed to 1st Depot Battalion, B. C. Regiment. (1st September, 1917, as lieutenant.)

4. British Columbia. Recruited and trained at Victoria and Vancouver.

5. Arrived Amherst, N.S., November 29th, from Military District No. 11, British Columbia.

6. Stationed at Amherst from November 29th to December 16th; proceeded to St. John, N.B., en route for Overseas.

7. Information not directly available, but could be obtained with considerable difficulty, necessitating a very careful perusal of documents, and which would take some time to accomplish.

8. Draft 1st Depot Battalion, B. C. Regiment: Strength, 2 officers and 200 other ranks. Draft 2nd Depot Battalion, B. C. ranks. No information available as to how many of these troops voted at Amherst at the last general election.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. POWER:

1. What properties, if any, have been purchased by the Militia Department or the Military Hospital Commission in Quebec City, since the first of January, 1917?

2. From whom were these purchases made, and on whose recommendation?

3. What was the purchase price?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. How many persons of all ranks are employed by the Military Hospitals Commission in British Columbia, and what are their names, rank and salaries?

2. Why were they appointed, and where are they stationed?

3. How many of these men have seen service at the front?

4. Who is the senior official of the Military Hospitals Commission in British Columbia?

5. What is the total monthly cost of carrying on the work of the Commission in British Columbia, and how many men are being looked after at present?

6. How many buildings are operated by the Military Hospitals Commission in British Columbia, and where are they situated?

7. How many officials from headquarters in Ottawa found it necessary to visit the Pacific Coast during the past year, and for what purpose?

[Mr. Sinclair.]

8. Has the Military Hospitals Commission a regularly appointed publicity agent? If so, what is his name, and what are his duties?

9. Has he seen overseas service, and what is his salary?

10. What was the total cost of the publicity department during 1917?

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES.

MOTION OF MR. J. A. CURRIE FOR LEAVE TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE WITHDRAWN FOR THE TIME BEING AT REQUEST OF PRIME MINISTER.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the recent rioting in the city of Quebec, together with all the attendant circumstances in connection therewith.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before any action is taken on the proposal of the hon. gentleman, I would suggest to him the advisability of postponing it until to-morrow at least, as any discussion upon it should be accompanied by information which the Government will then be prepared to lay on the table of the House, but which it is not prepared to lay upon the Table to-day. These proposals have been and are now under consideration, and can be announced to-morrow. In the meantime, it seems to me undesirable that any debate should proceed to-day, in the absence of the information which I have referred to. I, therefore, ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his proposal for to-day.

Mr. CURRIE: According to the custom and usages of the House, when any new information is to be brought down on a question of this kind, no other course is open to a member but to accede to such a request as that made by the Prime Minister, and I do so graciously, because I think perhaps it will be in the interest of the House that all the facts in connection with this matter should be laid upon the Table, in order that we should have a free and full discussion to-morrow of the whole matter.

Motion withdrawn.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT.

Bill No. 17, to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act—Hon. Mr. Meighen—read third time and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR ADVANCES ACT 1914.

Bill No. 15, to amend the Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne—read third time and passed.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir George Foster for the third reading of Bill No. 4, to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the solar mean time during the summer months.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think a correction has to be made in the Order Paper with respect to the title of this Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It should read:

In advance of the Standard Mean Time.

Mr. McCOIG: I wish to announce to the House, and to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that I have received a great number of petitions, protesting against this Bill becoming law, and, if it is in order, I would move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee for further consideration.

Motion of Sir George Foster agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

On motion of Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolutions, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for a Bureau under the Minister of Trade and Commerce to be called the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, to collect, abstract, compile and publish statistical information relative to the commercial, industrial, social, economic and general activities and condition of the people, to collaborate with all other departments of the Government in the compilation and publication of statistical records of administration, according to the regulations, and to take the census of the Dominion; and that the Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be called the Dominion Statistician to supervise and control the said Bureau; and that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, pay out of the moneys to be provided by Parliament for such purposes, such sums as are required for the taking of the census, collection of statistics, the remuneration of the officers and clerks, and the payment of all expenses incurred in carrying into effect an Act for such purposes.

Mr. NESBITT: We cannot hear a word of what is being said.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Come back and take your old seat, and you can hear.

Mr. BUREAU: Before the resolution is adopted, I should like to know from the minister what the purpose of the establishment of this Bureau is. A lot of enumerations are contained in the resolution. There is one item which states that in this Bureau the statistics for the census will be taken. I thought there was a branch in the Department of Agriculture charged with the duty of collecting statistics regarding the census of Canada. Every now and then we receive a leaflet purporting to be statistics covered by this particular branch of the Department of Agriculture. This resolution also provides for the compilation and publication of statistical information relative to the commercial, industrial, social, economic and general activities and condition of the people. With reference to the first item, I thought the minister had a bureau or branch in his department, the special purpose of which was to collect statistics of commercial data. I know that we receive from time to time very interesting reports from the Department of Trade and Commerce, explaining the conditions of trade in various countries where the minister has representatives, who seem to report assiduously, and this information is conveyed to the people of Canada through those leaflets which were received monthly or bimonthly, I could not tell you which. I was under the impression, as far as the industrial statistics are concerned, that the Department of Labour had statisticians, whose duty it was to collect all these statistics relating to the industrial condition of the country, to the condition of the labouring classes, to the amount of work that is being performed, and the prices of various commodities, etc. Is the object of the minister to have in his department, and under his control, a Bureau of Statistics wherein all statistics which are now being gathered by the other departments, or by the various branches which are under the control of the other departments, would be collected, and is it the intention to have the whole thing merged into this department, and have a Bureau of Statistics wherein statistics of all kinds, whether relating to our foreign trade, or to our industrial, social, or general activities, would be collected? Perhaps it will not be necessary to deal with our social conditions, because the social columns of our newspapers will supply anybody who wants information along that line.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It might be a little different.

Mr. BUREAU: It might be, but I do not know that I would support the Minister of Trade and Commerce with reference to that particular branch of the statistical bureau.

I want to know whether all the other statistical branches in the various departments will be abolished or merged into this one great statistical department where information can be had as to any branch of the service, or any statistics with reference to the condition of the country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The thing is not as formidable as it appears at first blush and on reading it on the Order Paper. It was a matter of doubt really as to whether it would be necessary to put a resolution on the Order Paper or not as a foundation for the Bill, but as that was the course that was pursued when the present Act was introduced, it was thought better to follow the rule on this occasion. Consequently, the resolution was placed on the Order Paper to form the foundation for the introduction of a Bill. My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) was right in most of the impressions he had with reference to what is being done, but he was a little bit out in the allocation of the services which he enumerated to the different departments. What it is meant to do is to consolidate, and make some few amendments to, the law as it is at present upon the statute book and as it is administered in the Department of Trade and Commerce. The object of the consolidation and ratification of the legislation which is at present on the statute books to make the law more effective. It is designed, as it is provided now under the law, that there shall be a central statistical board or office. It is proposed to call that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as being a somewhat more apposite name for the work which is being carried on and as being in line with the nomenclature in other countries. The idea underlying the present law, and which will underlie these amendments, is that general economic statistics shall be under the supervision of, and be issued by, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The different departments will, of course, retain their administrative, or record, statistics, or such statistics as are necessary for the administration of the department. There will be no change in that respect. Then, again, during the last three years—not to make the story long, because I propose to go a little more fully into it when I introduce the Bill,—a great deal has been done to co-ordinate the work in connection with the Dominion statistics both in the gathering, compilation and distribution, with the different provincial statistical departments. By conference and good will, an understanding has been reached with all of these along certain lines, the idea being to do away with overlapping and to have a uniform basis upon which the information is gathered so that the statistics will have a comparative value and so that there will be no contradiction between them. We have suffered a great deal with respect to the prestige of our statistics by having different computations put forward by different provinces and by the Dominion almost always arising from the fact that there has never been a uniform basis upon which the questions have been issued, on the answers to which the information is compiled. On the introduction of the Bill I shall ask the House to listen a little more at length to an exposition of the measure.

Mr. BUREAU: I would assume that in preparing the Bill and talking the matter over with the officials the details had been very carefully considered. Will this relieve any of the other departments from any work now undertaken by their statistical branches, or will it leave the other departments, and their statistical branches, in the same position as they now occupy and with the same work as they now do?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will see that the resolution provides for the co-operation of the central statistical bureau with the departments and if it is found, as it has already been found—and in some cases it is in operation—that the two can work in co-operation with each other and reach a better result, that co-operation will take place. Provision is made for co-working between the different departments and the central statistical Bureau. The object is to confine the departments to record or administrative statistics and leave the field of general economic statistics to the central bureau.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there any provision for collecting data on labour?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, to a certain extent. Any central system of statistics must take in capital and wages, labour employed and so on; but the special statistics of labour are under the Labour Department and will remain untouched.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why not under the same head?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The two can collaborate and it might result in the amalgamation of certain lines of statistical information.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 32, respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I thought I heard my right hon. friend a moment ago, when we were in committee, declare that it was his intention to explain the Bill at some length.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When I move for the second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE VAN BUREN BRIDGE COMPANY.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid (Minister of Railways), the House again went into committee on Bill No. 14, to confirm an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Van Buren Bridge Company, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On the schedule.

Mr. MICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, I had an interview with the Minister of Railways yesterday afternoon with reference to this Bill. He informed me that he was going to see the Bill through, and that I could put before the House all the objections possible; but he was bound to see it through. From his remarks when this Bill was last before the committee I noticed that the minister did not understand everything in reference to this matter. He stated to me that we would have an interview and that, no doubt, the matter would come out all right. As a minister of the Crown, the hon. gentleman seems to me to be fair-minded, but I am sorry to say that he is a stubborn gentleman, and I am afraid that he feels himself obliged to see this Bill through the House. I am very sorry for the public that the Minister of Railways has taken this step, for, after all, we are here to protect the public interest, and the Minister of Railways should be the first man to set a good example.

I know the locality where it is proposed to change the site of the union station. The proposed station is altogether outside the town of St. Leonards, a distance of between a quarter and half a mile. We have had petitions and telegrams of protest read to the House. I have also received letters from business men, and notwithstanding all these protests coming from the whole corporation of the town of St. Leonards, my hon. friend is still under the impression that this union station should be built on the Transcontinental railway. I had from the Minister of Railways yesterday afternoon promises that the welfare of the public will be looked after.

At the present time, the Transcontinental railway has one train going east and one train going west daily. The train going east passes through the town of St. Leonards at twelve o'clock midnight. The train going west passes through at three o'clock in the morning. The Intercolonial railway train arrives at St. Leonards at three o'clock in the afternoon. The Canadian Pacific railway runs an express reaching St. Leonards at five o'clock in the afternoon, accommodating the public by running a train during the day. Now, if the location of the station is changed, I am sorry to say that the public will be forced to travel from the union station on the Transcontinental railway about half a mile to take the train at the Canadian Pacific railway station. You will not stop the public from travelling over the Canadian Pacific railway.

The day before yesterday I read a telegram in the House in reference to the protest of the people of St. Leonards regarding this Bill. I also stated in the House that the people of St. Leonards were strongly against the proposal contained in this Bill unless the terminus of the Intercolonial railway should remain where it is at present. The ex-Minister of Railways, Hon. Mr. Cochrane, promised the people of St. Leonards that no change should be made, and I am sorry to see that the present Minister of Railways does not see eye to eye with his predecessor. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, protest most energetically against the passing of this Bill, and I want to request the Minister of Railways, if he will be kind enough to listen to me, that before he commences to move that station from the International railway to the National Transcontinental railway, he come himself to the town of St. Leonards and visit the site where he proposes to build the new station. I am sure of one thing from the good judgment of my hon. friend, that after seeing the proposed site, he will in common with the residents of St. Leonards, be opposed to the site of the new station.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAUD: There is a great deal of territory that my hon. friend has not yet covered as Minister of Railways, and this is a part of the country where he has not the least idea of local conditions. Before passing this Act, or before moving the present station from the International railway to the Transcontinental railway, I would ask the minister to come when the

session is over and see for himself and thereby convince himself that he is wrong and that I am right.

Hon. J. D. REID: Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the committee a few evenings ago, my hon. friend stated that he understood that the charter given by this House for this piece of railway had a clause in it that the station would not be moved from where it is at the present time. The hon. member (Mr. Michaud) and I have discussed that point, and we have found the objection was not well founded. The situation as it has been laid before us by the officials of the Government railway system is this: the Government operates the Transcontinental railway between Lévis and Moncton, which runs through the town of St. Leonards and has a station there. After the Transcontinental railway had been completed the Government purchased what is known as the International railway, running from a point on the Intercolonial line to St. Leonards, a distance of one hundred and twelve miles. The International railway had been in operation for some years and had its own terminal station. Since the purchase of that line the Government has had to maintain two stations in the town of St. Leonards, although it is the owner of both railways. But there was no connection between the International and the Transcontinental railway systems. Therefore, the traffic going over the International line, intended for the Transcontinental, has to be taken over this two miles of railway that we are leasing, and for which we have to pay the owners of the stretch in question, namely, the Bangor and Aroostook Company. The management of the Government railways discussed the matter with me, and we came to the conclusion that a connection should be made between the two railway systems. Negotiations were entered into, with the result that we are leasing the stretch of two miles, as has been shown in the agreement attached to the Bill. The objection raised by the hon. member (Mr. Michaud) is that if we carry out this agreement the Government, as the owner of both railways, will only use one station, that of St. Leonards, and the International railway will run its trains into the station maintained for the Transcontinental. It must either do that, or else continue running to the station of the International railway. It would be impossible to use the latter station because the Transcontinental could not go around and over to it. Therefore, as a matter of business, and in the interest of the country, it does not seem reasonable to my mind that we should continue to run the International trains over the two miles in question to that station, and at the same time maintain the station that has been used by the International railway. The hon. member states that if we do away with the station, as proposed, people wishing to travel on the Canadian Pacific railway will have to go from the Transcontinental Railway station to that of the Canadian Pacific railway. If I understand the situation, and my facts have been gathered from our officials, the International station as it now exists and the Canadian Pacific Railway station are very close together, and there is very little distance between them. The Transcontinental Railway station, from the information I have, is not far away, and at most passengers will have to travel but a few hundred feet. Why should the Government operate the International railway and keep up that station in order that people may have to walk a few hundred feet less to travel on the Canadian Pacific railway? On the other hand, people travelling by the International railway who wish to take the Transcontinental railway have to walk a longer distance to reach the latter railway. The object in leasing this small piece of line is, as I have stated: First, it is, in my opinion, an absolute necessity that we have a connection between the two railways in order to permit of the carriage of freight on our railways over the Transcontinental. Either we had to build two miles of line or else lease the needed section as we have done. Furthermore, in order to effect economy and save useless expenditure it is intended to only have one station for the two railways. The hon. member (Mr. Michaud) states that if I were to visit that portion of the country I would see the necessity of continuing the station which it is proposed to close. All I can say to my hon. friend is that I have gone into this matter very carefully. I believe it is in the interest of the public, and of the great railway systems concerned, that this connection should be made between the International and the Transcontinental railway. In my opinion, the connection proposed here is the cheapest and best that could be made. Even if we were to build the two miles stretch instead of leasing it, it would still, in my opinion, only be necessary to have the one station. If this Bill passes we will secure the needed connection and it will be of great advantage for freight

4 p.m.

traffic, at all events. As far as making the one station serve for the two railway systems, that policy is correct, from the information in my possession, and I cannot hold out to the hon. gentleman any prospect of letting the two stations remain. When the opportunity of passing through that district is afforded me, if any evidence should be presented that would justify the retention of the two stations, it will be taken into consideration. In the meantime, we are exceedingly anxious to have this connection at the earliest possible moment, even for freight traffic, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not further object to assisting us in facilitating the passage of the Bill for the reasons that I have mentioned.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am sorry to say that I cannot assist the hon. gentleman in passing this Bill. Local public sentiment is opposed to it, as evidenced by the long adverse petition presented by the citizens of St. Leonards. I know the conditions in that locality, and in view of all the circumstances, I cannot concur in the minister's decision to close up the station in question. The minister has stated that the question involved is one of business for the Transcontinental railway. In my opinion, it is a matter of business for the people of that part of New Brunswick. When he states that there are only a few hundred feet to be covered between the two stations, I would like to say it is a distance of a quarter or half a mile.

Mr. REID: About thirteen hundred feet.

Mr. MICHAUD: At all events, we will let the question of the distance stand for the moment. I would ask the minister if he will be kind enough not to make any change with respect to the proposed union station until he makes his trip through that part of the country.

Mr. REID: I could not make that promise. The sittings of the House may detain me here too long.

Mr. COPP: I am not sufficiently acquainted with the local conditions to be able to say whether the minister is consulting the public convenience in locating the union station at the place referred to. I would ask, however, if the making of this agreement involves the dismantling and tearing up of two miles of the International railway?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. COPP: And is he also closing the station on the International railway.

Mr. REID: That is the intention.

Mr. COPP: I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that he is doing away with a section of railway which was purchased not very long ago. I do not recollect the price per mile paid for this railway, but at all events he is dismantling and doing away with a section of two miles. From a business standpoint he is simply throwing away two miles of this railway, tearing up the rails and dismantling this portion of the road. While doing this, he is leasing from the Bangor and Aroostook railway two miles of railway at the annual rental of $1,200. So far as the business life of a railway company is concerned, it is only a short time between now and 1934, and at the end of that period, during which you have thrown away these two miles of railway which you have bought and paid for, and have inconvenienced the people of that locality, taking away from them the railway privileges which they have had for years, and during which period you have paid an annual rental of $1,200. Whoever happens to be occupying the position of Minister of Railways at that time will be up against the proposition that he has to retrace his steps and rebuild the two miles of railway, or purchase these two miles of railway that the Government had under lease, or else enter into a new lease. I am speaking only from a business standpoint; I am not speaking from the standpoint of convenience to the citizens of that locality, because I do not know the circumstances, and I am taking my information only from what my hon. friend (Mr. Michaud) has told this committee. I would like to ask the minister what it costs per year to keep the International Railway station open, what help is employed there, and what it would cost per year to keep the station in existence.

Mr. MICHAUD: There is only one employee.

Hon. J. D. REID: Perhaps I can answer the two questions at once. The hon. member states that this Government are going to be out $1,200 per annum from now until 1934, that being the rental mentioned in the lease, and that we shall have nothing to offset that. The hon. member knows that, when we take up two miles of rails, those rails are worth at the present time probably $17,000 or $18,000, and if that money were invested in Dominion Government bonds, it would bring in interest sufficient to pay the $1,200 per annum, so that there is really no pecuniary loss. I cannot say offhand how many officials are at that

station, but I know there is an agent, and he probably receives $600 or $700 a year, so that we are saving at least that amount. The hon. member also states that the people of that locality are being deprived of their railway facilities.

Mr. COPP: The minister misunderstands me. I do not know about that. All I say is that they have been deprived of a convenience they have had. I do not know the location.

Mr. REID: I do not know it either, but the plan that has been submitted to the House will show it. People coming in to or leaving St. Leonard on the International leave at a certain station of the International that has been there for a number of years. The Transcontinental is a few hundred feet to the south of the International, which means that if you want to take a train on the International, you go a few hundred feet further from whatever part of the town you live in. There is no inconvenience further than that, and so far as the Government are concerned, we shall have this advantage, that if we were to take up the rails and dispose of them, the interest on the amount received for the rails would cover the amount we have to pay as rental, and we shall save the amount which we have been paying for our cars going over that road during the whole of the year, cars being transferred from the International to the Transcontinental, and which must amount to a considerable sum of money. We shall also save the salaries of the employees who are kept at the station and of those who are engaged in maintaining the two miles of railway. I cannot understand where there would be much inconvenience, except that any passengers coming in on the International, who wanted to go on the Canadian Pacific might, so far as I can judge from the map, have to walk probably two or three hundred feet from the International to the Canadian Pacific, whereas, if they wanted to go on the Transcontinental, they might have to walk ten or twelve hundred feet.

Mr. MICHAUD: The passengers would not have to walk any distance at all because the International train runs into the Canadian Pacific station.

Mr. COPP: In answering my question the minister opened up a new phase of the matter, pointing out that the Government would not lose anything; that, as a matter of fact, there would be a financial gain to the Government to take up and dismantle these two miles of railway because, as the minister says, the rails could be sold at a high price owing to the present demand, and the interest on the money received, if invested in Victory Bonds, would more than pay the annual rent provided for in the lease between the Government and the Bangor and Aroostook railway. If one were to follow the minister's argument along that line, one could take up the rails on any piece of railway and make money on the transaction. That, however, is not what, as I understand it, the Government intend doing. I understood from the minister that it was in the interest of the Transcontinental railway to enter into this agreement for the leasing of this road; that it was to do away with the keeping up of two stations. Now, he says, from a business standpoint, it is to the benefit of the Government to take up these rails and invest the money received for them, because the interest on that investment will more than cover the annual rental of $1,200. I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that at the end of 1934, when this lease expires, the Government will be called upon to enter into a new lease, or to buy the road, or to rebuild the two miles of railway that has been torn up, and if, during that period, the cost of rails increases, then the Government will be out a very large amount to rebuild, re-establish and re-equip the two miles of railway which they have in their possession and which they are throwing away rather than keep that road in operation. One of the reasons the minister gives for his action is that it will do away with the expense of keeping up the International Railway station. He says himself there was only one official there whose salary would be about $600 or $700. Yet he is paying to the Bangor and Aroostook railway $1,200 per annum for the purpose of doing away with a station on the International railway. From a business standpoint, my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. Michaud), in opposing this proposition, is making only a reasonable argument, and the minister has not made out a proper case so far as the financial advantage of the Government and the interest of the railway are concerned. The minister says that he knows nothing about the location and, of course, we accept his word in regard to the matter. If we did not accept his word from a Parliamentary standpoint, we would know, from the agreement he is making in regard to the matter, that he does not know anything about it, and that he is depending entirely upon some railway official in regard to it. The minister

will not be Minister of Railways very long before he will come to realize fully that frequently young engineers from some school who are taken into the service, will, during the summer months when they have nothing else to do, go over the Intercolonial and make faddy recommendations without regard to the interests of communities which have had railway accommodation for years.

My hon. friend must not forget that the usual thing is for a town or village to build up around a station, and the station become the very heart of the community. I think the minister, before taking away the station which these people have had for so many years, should give some better reason to the House, or he might let the matter stand for further consideration.

Mr. J. READ: I should like to hear from the minister as to the policy of the Government in such a case as this. Around the station at Cape Traverse, for instance, there is a large vested interest, and before the Government do away with that station I think we should have a statement from the minister whether it is right and proper to deprive these people of their rights. I have no doubt that the officials who have recommended this union station at St. Leonard's are acting in the interests of the Government system, but is it honest or just to do away with the other station regardless of the rights of individuals? I think one of the principles embodied in British justice is that the individual stands above the community, and where an individual has to suffer rather than a corporation the individual's interest should at least be recognized.

Schedule agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. MICHAUD: If the minister carries out his idea of a Union station, he will not effect the economy he anticipates, because two clerks will be needed, one as operator and the other as freight agent. At present the clerk at the International station gets a salary of $400 a year, but it would be necessary to have two clerks at the Union station.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again in committee on Bill No. 5, to amend the Dominion Lands Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move:

That the following clause be inserted in the Bill immediately after clause 13 on page 6 of the Bill:—

13 A.—Section forty-one of the said Act is amended by striking out the word "five" in the fourth line thereof and substituting therefor the word "six", and by adding the following proviso thereto:—

Provided that all instalments or any portion of any instalment in arrear, whether of principal or interest, shall bear interest at the rate of seven per centum per annum; provided however that as to sales of School lands made prior to the first day of April, 1918, the minister may with the consent of the purchaser or registered assignee increase the rate of interest in arrear to seven per centum per annum.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, amendments read the first and second time, and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Department of Trade and Commerce, salaries, $157,737.50; contingencies, $15,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The number of employees is the same as before. The amount voted is about a thousand dollars less than last year, and there are no changes of any moment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the explanation of the item "Commissioner of Commerce, $6,000?"

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The explanation I made last year will be exactly the same this year. I am retaining that vote, but the office has not yet been filled. As we come nearer to the period of re-adjustment, I should like to have that office at the disposal of the Government. The work must necessarily be done by a pretty high class official.

Census and Statistics Branch, $91,600.

Mr. BUREAU: Does this include part of the salaries to be paid to the new statistical bureau, the resolution in regard to which we discussed this afternoon?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I see an increase of some two thousand dollars in the total.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I wanted to know whether this increase was caused by the new officers who will be employed in gathering these statistics after the Bill, the resolution in

regard to which was debated this afternoon, comes into force.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This vote will carry on the work of the Dominion Bureau of Statitics, which is here called the census and statistics branch. It will be the same kind of work, except that the betterments to which I alluded in my remarks upon the resolution, will be carried out under the new Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the amounts mentioned here are to cover the expenditure of the Census Department, or the branch of my hon. friend's department, as carried on now?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, with the improvements that are to be made under the new Act which will be presented.

Naval Service—To provide for the maintenance and upkeep of ships, Naval College, dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, $600,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This, I think is an appropriate time for my hon. friend to give to the country and the committee the programme, which has been announced in the press, in regard to naval construction in Canada. I may say at once that I have applauded the idea, or rather the programme of my hon. friend, namely to promote naval construction in Canada. I understand that a large amount of money will be spent for the construction of ships, and that rolling mills will be erected in Canada in connection with that naval construction. I know that my hon. friend, obtained during recess, from the United States Government very valuable concessions in regard to rolled plates needed for the construction of these ships. I am somewhat interested in this question, as I represent the county of Maisonneuve where, as the committee is well aware, we have the magnificent plant of the Canadian Vickers Limited, in which thousands of skilled labourers are employed, and actually very busily engaged night and day, building ships.

The Canadian Vickers have secured contracts from the Imperial Government, and, I understand, from the Dominion Government. They also had contracts from some of the neutral countries. But my hon. friend will explain, I believe, to the committee that it has been deemed wise and proper during the war to cancel all contracts for the building of ships for neutral countries in order to concentrate all naval construction on Imperial, Canadian and allied Governments' orders. I hope that the Government will not depart from that policy and that at the same time in the operation of the Military Service Act regard will be had to the urgency of the men engaged upon naval construction remaining in the employ of naval firms.

I do not wish to discuss the operation of the Military Service Act, but I may say to my hon. friend that the Vickers, to take one instance, is a firm which employs 3,000, or perhaps more men—3,000 at all events—working day and night, of whom 300 or 400 were conscripted. The local tribunals granted exemption to the men as long as they were employed by the Canadian Vickers Limited, but subject to being called as soon as they should leave the employ of the company. Appeals have been filed in almost all of these cases, but the appeal courts have confirmed in every case the decisions given by the local tribunals. The Government, and my hon. friend, will understand—and I wish the hon. the Minister of Justice were in his seat—that men are absolutely needed in that industry. It is essential that companies, such as the Vickers and other big plants of like nature, should not be disturbed in their day and night work by those appeals.

Once more, I do not wish to discuss the operation of the Military Service Act, but I just want to point out to my hon. friend that naval construction at the present time in Canada is in progress and I give my hon. friend all the credit which is due him in carving out the programme which he has placed before the public of late. My hon. friend remains, after all, faithful to himself and to the policy which has been advocated by his former associates for years. I am glad that through the infusion of new blood into the Government the policy which was defeated in 1911, because it was misrepresented, is being kept on the statute book and is being acted upon. It was acted upon quietly and grudgingly by my hon. friend's immediate predecessor, but it is being acted upon openly, faithfully and liberally by my hon. friend, the present incumbent. I do not wish to be critical at all. I congratulate my hon. friend, and I hope he will stimulate naval construction in Canada. By doing so he will prove himself to be a staunch friend of the British Empire and of his own country. Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister of England, Mr. Bonar Law, the President of the United States and M. Tardieu, who represents the French Government at Washington during the war, have united in the statement that what the Allies need most in the present emergency is food, munitions and ships. Now, by

giving ships for the transportation of food, and not only of food but of men and munitions, my hon. friend is doing yeoman work in the cause which is dear to every one of us.

I would like my hon. friend, however, to give us the official programme which he has prepared and which he intends to carry out. He may be assured that he will receive from this side of the House a unanimous support, because we stand for the construction of ships in Canada. We have the skilled labour, we have the ores, we have the material; all it requires is a little goodwill and some courage. I have been speaking on behalf of the Canadian Vickers because that firm happens to be in my own division, the county of Maisonneuve, but there are other firms on the great lakes, at Toronto and in the Maritime Provinces. There was a time, in the olden days, when the Canadian clippers sailed the seven seas, and when Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island were carrying far and wide the British ensign. When the wooden ships passed away and when the steel frame ships took their places, there came a lull.

But, with the natural resources which we possess, and the technical knowledge which has been acquired, and with the strong Canadian feeling which exists in this country, there is no reason why we should not at the present moment set out to capture once more the blue ribbon of the Atlantic. I might remind the House of one of my surprises when for the first time I was a candidate for this House, some twenty-two years ago. I remember paying a visit to my good friend the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding), who was then Prime Minister of Nova Scotia. Passing along one of the busy commercial streets of Halifax of that day, he said: "Mr. Lemieux, it is generally believed that the great Cunard firm started in New York or in Liverpool; but look at this little sign; it is nearly a hundred years old; Halifax is the place where the Cunards started their business." Well, Sir, all this is to show that we have the necessary ability, courage, and resources, and above all we have the naval policy laid down in the statute-book. I am pleased to see that my hon. friend is living up to the policy of his revered leader, and hope that he will quietly bring his new associates—I will not say compeers—in line with the real, progressive Canadian policy of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MURPHY: If it be the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to accede to the request of the hon. member for Maisonneuve and inform the committee regarding the shipbuilding industry, may I request that the minister be good enough to explain what field is covered by the shipbuilding branch of the Imperial Munitions Board as distinct from the shipbuilding industry carried out under the operation and direction of his departmeent?

Hon. Mr. BALLLANTYNE: Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to wait until the Marine estimates were under discussion to give to the House to-day the details in regard to the Government shipbuilding plan as it pertains to the mercantile marine. Possibly, however, this might be just as good an opportunity as any, and I shall be only too pleased to give to the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), and to the House, the information they have every right to have in regard to this large national undertaking that the Government has so recently entered upon.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve has stated that the Government has undertaken a large programme of naval construction. I wish to correct him on that point. The programme of the present Government is not for naval ships, but for mercantile marine ships. It is true that, during the past year, there has been a certain type of naval ship built at various yards in Montreal and throughout the Dominion for the Imperial Government and also for the Canadian Government. I do not think it would be right for me to enter into details as regards the type of naval ships that have been so built during the past few years, or as regards those that are under construction at the present time. I am sure the members of the committee will agree with me that it would be unwise at this juncture to enter into too many details in that respect. Suffice it to say that I am very glad to make known that all the vessels of war which have been built in the various yards of Canada, and of course in the one to which the hon. member for Maisonneuve has alluded, have been constructed equally as well as they could have been in the Old Country or in any other land. I am sure that that fact will be very gratifying to honourable members.

To come to the Government's programme for ships for the mercantile marine, I wish to explain that there are at the present time fourteen shipyards for building steel ships in Canada. If all of these yards were

unoccupied at the present time, and were all engaged building for the Canadian Government the standard type of steel ships, the annual tonnage output would amount to 250,000 tons.

The hon. member for Russell has asked me to explain what the programme of the Imperial Munitions Board has been, and how it affects the present programme of the Canadian Government. I reply by stating that when I had the honour of being called to the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries and Naval Service, I found that the Dominion Government was advancing money through the Imperial Munitions Board, under the direct management of Sir Joseph Flavelle, to keep all of the steel shipyards in Canada fully occupied in building ships for the Mother Country. It seemed to me, and also to the Government when I brought the matter to their attention, that the time was opportune for Canada to embark upon the building of steel ships as a national, permanent policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: And, after giving the matter very careful consideration for some months, and working out a comprehensive programme on good, sound, business lines, I brought the proposal before my colleagues in the Government, and I am very pleased to state that it was unanimously decided that after the Imperial Munitions Board contracts were completed all the berths in all the shipyards of Canada which are building steel ships would be utilized to the full in building steel vessels for the Canadian Government.

Mr. MURPHY: When will that date likely arrive?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Our programme is this: as these berths become vacant and the Imperial Government ships are completed, they are taken up by the Canadian Government. At the present time we are having two ships built by the Vickers Co. of Montreal, one of 8,100 tons dead weight capacity, an 11-knot ship, and another of 4,350 tons. I am pleased to state that I have every hope that this fall both of these vessels will be put in commission for the Canadian Government. It will be the first time in the history of Canada that sea-going vessels as large as the two I have referred to have been built in Canada by Canadian money and owned by the Canadian Government; and I am very glad to know that hon. members opposite join with hon. members on this side in favouring the policy that the Canadian Government are undertaking in the building, permanently as I have stated, of steel vessels to keep the present yards going. I hope a little later on, as the finances of the country become less strained, that the appropriation which is allotted to my department for building steel ships will be very much greater than it is at present.

In addition to the two ships that are being built by the Canadian Vickers Company for the Canadian Government, another ship of about five thousand tons is being built by the Wallace Shipbuilding Company at Vancouver. Another vessel of 3,550 tons is being built by the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, of Collingwood. Hon. gentlemen will understand that vessels that are being built in the yards on the great lakes are necessarily limited, as to size and tonnage, so as to conform to the depth of water in the canals. Ships that are being built in any of the yards on the great lakes cannot draw more than fourteen feet of water, which necessarily needs a limitation as to size in the case of these vessels. At the present time the Dominion Government have these four vessels under construction.

Mr. McMASTER: Are you building the vessels in question under contract, or on the cost and percentage plan?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The ships are ordered at so much per ton. I, for one, do not believe, and neither does the Government, in having ships built on a percentage basis. Furthermore, I would not like the House to think that I accept the first price that is given to me by any of these shipbuilders at so much per ton for a completed ship, according to the design, blue prints and specifications of the Government, for I certainly do not. I am pleased to say that in the department we have some very able men. Mr. Duguid, the naval architect, is a man who has had a splendid training, extending over many years in some of the largest shipyards in England. We also have expert men possessing a thorough knowledge of marine boilers and marine engines, as well as many expert draughtsmen. There are, as I stated a moment ago, three different types of Canadian ships under construction: The eight thousand tonner, the five thousand tonner, and the smaller sized ship of three thousand five hundred and fifty tons. The technical officers of my department estimate what the cost of a ship will be. We also ascertain what a similar ship —a vessel of the same design, class and tonnage—is being built for in the United

States and in Britain. With this information from both the countries referred to, and our own estimated cost, we have a very excellent check on the Canadian shipbuilders, which prevents them charging us an unfair or unreasonable price for the vessel to be constructed. Hon. gentlemen will, therefore, gather from what I have stated that these vessels are built at so much per completed ton according to the blue prints and the detailed specifications of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

As the berths to which I have alluded become vacant from time to time they will be immediately taken up by the Canadian Government, and the existing steel shipbuilding plants throughout Canada will be occupied to their full capacity. I cannot state how many ships are being built by the Imperial Munitions Board at the present time, but the Prime Minister gave that information to the House on the opening day of Parliament. One of the difficulties that confronted me in taking up this important matter——

Mr. MURPHY: I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but was there any co-operation betweeen the Government and the Imperial Munitions Board, or were the respective programmes carried out entirely separately.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They are entirely separate. The Canadian Government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries have absolutely nothing at all to do with the Imperial Munitions Board, so far as relates to our shipbuilding programme, and any ships that the latter has ordered are for Imperial account. The duty of the Imperial Munitions Board is to see that they are finished and paid for; and the Canadian Government assumes no responsibility for any of the ships that are under construction at the present time for the Imperial Munitions Board.

5 p.m.

I was about to say that one of the first difficulties that confronted me when considering the adoption of a permanent shipbuilding policy, was that of steel ship's plates. I think hon. gentlemen are aware that there is no duty on ship's plates coming into Canada. They are doubtless also aware that there has not been, and there is not at the present time, a rolling mill in Canada for the manufacture of these plates. If Canada is to become a shipbuilding nation, as I see no reason why she should not——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: —it is necessary for her to be self-contained insofar as concerns all the material that is required for building these mercantile ships; and one of the first things that I set about to try and obtain for Canada was a large plate mill, so that all the plates required for the ships that we are now building, and I hope also for a very much larger programme later on, would be made in our own country. I took the matter up with the large steel manufacturers. I did not confine myself to the manufacturers in this country, but also went to the United States steel companies, and asked them what kind of proposition they could place before the Canadian Government in order that we would secure what steel plates we required here. After several months of negotiations with the several steel companies in Canada and in the United States, I am happy to say that the best and most favourable proposition I could get, and the one that was accepted by my colleagues, was the one submitted to us by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of Sydney.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There being no duty on ship's plates, we could not expect any large industry, either in Canada or in the United States, to come to this country and undertake the erection of a plant for rolling ship's plates, that would involve at least $5,000,000 capital expenditure without any protection whatever. These are not days when the policy of protection needs be discussed, and as we are more concerned with the prosecution of the war than with tariff matters, I did not raise the tariff question with my colleagues at all, nor do I intend to do so with hon. members of this House. We went about the task in another manner, which I hope will receive the unanimous approval of the House. In brief, the contract that I have concluded with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of Sydney was made on the following basis: The Dominion Government have guaranteed to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of Sydney that they will have a minimum tonnage of fifty thousand tons of ship plates a year, extending over a period of five years, making in all a total tonnage of two hundred and fifty thousand tons. The price per hundred pounds for the moment is $4.15. The safeguarding of the public interest, in so far as the price is concerned, from time to time, has been arranged on the following basis: Hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that ship plates are made from steel ingots,

which in turn are made from pig iron, the pig iron being produced from iron ore. I am happy to state that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company own and operate within British territory facilities to produce all the raw materials that I have just mentioned as being required for the rolling of ship's plates.

We have taken, as a basis to adjust this price every six months, the price per ton of steel ingots. The price at the time the contract was entered into for steel ingots was $25.50 per ton. The price of plates to start with is $4.15, based on an ingot price of $25.50 per ton. These prices were agreed upon after long weeks of negotiation, and I was accused in a friendly way perhaps, by Mr. Mark Workman, of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of driving too hard a bargain with them on behalf of the people of Canada. I do not think that is exactly so, because I consider the contract we have entered into is eminently fair to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company as it is also fair to the Dominion of Canada and the Government. The mill will take about fifteen months to be erected, and Mr. Workman estimates that it will cost about $5,000,000. The Government does not put up one cent of money for the erection of this mill. The Government was pressed to advance this money, but I declined to make such a recommendation to my colleagues, because I considered that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company is strong enough to put up the $5,000,000 required for the plant, and I, therefore, recommended to my colleagues that we do not advance the money. Accordingly, the Dominion Iron and Steel Company are going to erect this plant at their own cost.

Mr. McMASTER: What is that $4.15? The minister did not give us the unit. Is it $4.15 per plate?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The price of steel ingots is $25.50 per ton, and the price of plates is $4.15 per one hundred pounds. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company claim that within twelve to fifteen months they will be turning out all the ship plates the Dominion wants.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has a contract been signed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not yet, but it will be in a few days.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As soon as it is, will the minister lay it on the table of the House?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly, with pleasure. The Order in Council has been passed, approving the terms agreed upon, and when the contract is signed, I shall lay it upon the table of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the minister can lay the Order in Council on the Table this week that will be satisfactory.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be very glad to do so. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company are financing this mill, and the capacity of the mill, they estimate, will be 150,000 tons of plate per year. I wish to point out that, in addition to ship plate, it is estimated that there are about 50,000 tons of other plate, such as boiler plate, used in Canada. There is no duty on boiler plate, nor on ship plate. This mill will be a new national industry for Canada, and not only will it turn out the ship plates which we shall require here, and which, I think, even with the existing yards we have, will run something like 75,000 tons a year, but there is no reason why the Dominion Iron and Steel Company should not be able to get orders for, if not the whole, at least a part of the 50,000 tons of plate used for other purposes than for ships.

To follow along the policy of safeguarding the public interest and the interest of the Government, so that we shall not be paying too much for ship plate, I may say that after the mill has run for six months turning out the plate, the price of the plate will be determined on the fluctuating price for steel ingots based on a price of $25.50 per ton. We were also able to arrange with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, also with a great deal of reluctance on their part, that no matter how high the price of steel ingots goes, in no event will the price of steel plate cost the Government any higher price than $4.25 per hundred pounds. If the price of steel ingot drops over a period of six months the price of plate will be lowered accordingly. We are not going to take the Dominion Iron and Steel Company's say-so as to what their cost will be, so we have a clause in the contract that the Dominion Government shall send out expert accountants, whom we shall name, to go over the books and costs of the company, and if the price of steel ingots has fallen during the period of six months they will see to it that the Government gets a proportionate reduction in the price of steel plates. Those are the essential points in the contract into which we are about to enter. The further particulars will be known to hon. members when the Order in Council is laid upon the Table.

There is another clause in that contract into which we are about to enter, and it is: that on all the plant and machinery that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company will require to import into Canada for the shipplate mill they will pay duty, and that duty will afterwards be refunded.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Dominion Government are making only two concessions: first, we are guaranteeing 250,000 tonnage for a period of five years, and secondly, we are remitting the duty on the machinery and material they will require to bring in for their mill. In order that the ships which the Government are ordering shall not cost too much money, I am happy to be able to say that through the splendid support of the British and Canadian War Missions at Washington, and through the generosity of the American Government, we have been able to buy 80,000 tons of steel plate in the United States on very favourable terms, at a price as low as the United States shipbuilders are paying. This amount will keep our plants operating during the balance of 1918 and during the whole of 1919, so that our supply of steel plate is assured until such a time as Canada is able to roll her own plate.

I was glad to hear my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) commend the Government for embarking on this policy at the present time. I will not weary the House by emphasizing the necessity for ships, for we all know to our sorrow the great loss of tonnage that occurs daily not only to the British Empire, but to all the Allies and to neutral countries as well, through the operations of German submarines. It follows that those countries that are well supplied with ships after the war will progress more rapidly than those countries which are short of ships. Hon. gentlemen will understand that the ships which are being built by the Imperial Munitions Board, and are being financed by Canada, will not be under the control of the Dominion Government, but are being built for the Imperial authorities, to be owned and operated by them as they see fit. But the ships that Canada is building now, and the ships she will build in the future, will be absolutely owned and controlled by Canada and will be used in the most effective way for the prosecution of the war. We hope also to use these ships for carrying the products of our fields, mines and forests across the seas to the various countries with which I hope Canada will later be doing a large export trade. Without the ships, Canada would be in a very unfortunate position.

Almost daily I am receiving requests from various interests in this country for ships; the people are almost begging for them. We require ships for our coal trade, we require ships to carry the products of the farm, and we shall require ships to work in conjunction with the Government-owned transcontinental railways. No definite railway policy has been worked out, and I merely mention the railways in connection with the steamship services. Canada already owns the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Northern railway, and there may come a time when she will want ships on the Great Lakes and on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, to act as feeders for the National Transcontinental Railway system.

I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion this policy that Canada has embarked on with regard to the building of ships is a wise and safe policy. Not only will the ships be under the Government's control, to be operated by them as they see fit, but if necessary they can be rented or sold, and there are many other things that we could do with them, so I consider our policy is a very safe one in the national interest.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve said something about neutral ships. The Canadian Government, of course, are confining their efforts entirely to ships of Canadian registry. We intend to keep our yards busy with Canadian registered ships only—ships for the Canadian Government.

A large number of wooden ships have been built by the Imperial Munitions Board for the Imperial authorities, but it is not the intention of the Canadian Government to have any wooden ships built. I am not prepared to express any opinion for or against wooden ships, except that with the money available for ship building in Canada at the present time, it seemed to the Government the wisest policy to invest that money in steel ships only. The wooden shipbuilding yards in different parts of Canada have many opportunities at the present time for building wooden ships. While they cannot build wooden ships under Canadian registry, they have every opportunity of building wooden ships for our Allies and for neutral countries, and some of these yards are now working on very large orders for wooden ships for Allied and neutral countries.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve spoke, also, of the necessity of retaining the skilled

and technical workers required for building ships in Canada. Everybody is agreed—this House, the people of Canada and of the British Empire, and all our Allies—as to the necessity for ships, ships, and more ships, and although the operation of the Military Service Act does not come under my jurisdiction, I can say to my hon. friend that the representations that have been made and which will be made in the future to the proper tribunals for the exemption of these men will be given every consideration, and care will be taken to safeguard the interests of this country and of the Empire by seeing that the necessary number of men are retained in the ship yards to carry out the programme of the Dominion Government.

Mr. McMASTER: Did I understand the minister to say that Canada advanced money to the Imperial Munitions Board for the building of ships by that Board?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is correct.

Mr. McMASTER: What control have the Canadian people over the money which the Imperial Munitions Board use for the building of ships, or is the money merely lent to the Board?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The money is merely lent to the Board, as a bank would lend money to a private individual or business concern.

Mr. POWER: I represent a constituency which at one time was the centre of the wooden shipbuilding industry in Canada, and before giving my cordial approval to the Government's plan of steel shipbuilding I should like to be informed whether the minister has made a full investigation into the possibilities of reviving the wooden shipbuilding industry, and whether or not experts have given it as their considered opinion that wooden ships could not be used to increase the world's tonnage with the same good effect as steel ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government, and I, as the minister charged with the responsibility of seeing that the Government's shipbuilding programme is carried out, looked very carefully into that question, but, as I stated in my remarks a few minutes ago, the Government's policy being only to keep the steel shipbuilding yards in Canada busy, our financial ability will not permit us to go beyond that. My hon. friend from South Quebec (Mr. Power) will agree that, as a business proposition and as a national proposition, bearing in mind that these ships are being built not for to-

day only, but for the future, it is a wiser policy for Canada to put her money into steel shipbuilding than to put it into wooden ships. I am not saying anything derogatory to the wooden ships, but the speed of a wooden ship is very much less than that of a steel ship, her carrying capacity is less, and the wooden ship is debarred from the submarine zone because her speed being so slow, she presents a very much better target for submarine torpedoes. But the latter argument is not the one that causes the Government to go in for steel shipbuilding. The other arguments which I have just presented carried more weight.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: I suppose, in a matter of such importance, with so many details, we should all feel disposed to reserve our judgment on matters of detail, so that if any question arises later on we may be free to inquire into it. Subject to that I want to offer my congratulations to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the exceedingly interesting and most admirably clear statement he has made on an undertaking of so much importance to the country. I think the House has received the announcement very favourably, and we shall all desire, when the details come to be considered, that there may be nothing found in them which will lead us to withdraw our good opinion of the minister's programme.

I think the Government should be congratulated upon giving their attention just now to steel shipbuilding which of course does not necessarily imply that they lack appreciation of the importance of wooden shipbuilding. My own judgment is that we do not need any particular stimulus for wooden shipbuilding in our country. It is an art with which many of our people are quite familiar. I do not know whether there is a revival in the ancient city of Quebec of the great art of wooden shipbuilding, but in the Maritime Provinces there is a very large measure of activity all along our coast. In my own constituency several wooden ships are being built. I am afraid the conflict between iron and wood and steel was settled some years ago when, in the age of progress through which we were passing, the fact had to be recognized that the wooden ship must give way to the iron ship, and the iron ship in turn must give way to the steel ship. By and by we will return to those conditions when the large wooden ships will hardly have much chance in competition with the large steel ships. There has been in the past, and I believe there will be in the future, quite

a demand for wooden ships of the smaller class. I believe the conditions that will exist at the close of the war, and for some years after the war, will be such that there will be large opportunity for the wooden shipbuilders of the country to engage in their enterprise. So that I feel that, in giving the preference to steel shipbuilding, as the hon. minister is doing, there is no danger of any injustice being done to the wooden shipbuilding industry. I believe that industry will flourish for some years to come without any particular aid from the Government.

Steel shipbuilding is, in a measure, a new industry here. It has been carried on in a small way, but owing to the very fact that the hon. gentleman has stated: that we had no plate mill in the country, we could not expect to engage in the enterprise in a very large way. As I happen to know something of the formation of the Dominion Steel Company, and as I was, in some measure, identified in a modest degree some years ago with the creation of this splendid industry in Cape Breton, I take a particular pleasure to-day in hearing the minister make the announcement that he is arranging to have a contract with the Dominion Steel Company, whereby the steel plates will be made in the works at Sydney. Altogether, I am sure the House has been deeply interested in the statement of my hon. friend, and I offer him my hearty congratulations on it.

Mr. McMASTER: Before the item is further considered, I may be allowed to make some observations upon it. First of all, the minister may never need to apologize for addressing this House, because he is possessed of one great outstanding virtue, namely, that when he rises in his place and speaks, we can all hear him with ease. In harmony with this acclaim of congratulations this afternoon, I wish to congratulate the minister, but on somewhat different grounds. The minister said he was able to induce people to start a valuable industry in this country by allowing their machinery to come in free, or rather allowing the machinery to come in on payment of the duty and afterwards refunding the duty to these people.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That was done in a moment of weakness.

Mr. McMASTER: The point I wish to make is that, if it is a good thing in Canada to permit manufacturers to bring in free of duty machinery for making ships, it might be a good thing in Canada to allow machinery for other purposes to be brought in free. I would not like this occasion to pass without saying that I hope that the minister's attitude that no large industry can be started or perpetuated in Canada without artificial encouragement by means of a bonus or tariff will not be endorsed. I would not like that statement to pass unchallenged, because I trust he is wrong. I trust there are industries in this country which do not need any encouragement by bounty or tariff. The building of ships is a war measure. If artificial stimulation is required it should be given, but it should not be given, I take it, as a matter of principle. My recollection, of course, does not go so far back as the recollection of the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) but I am old enough to know that the industrial history of this country is emphasized here and there by large companies who enjoyed bounty encouragement and tariff encouragement, and who, when they were making too much profit, capitalized that profit against the people of Canada by watering their stock in most lavish fashion. I make these remarks not in any way to detract from the congratulations that have been showered on the minister—because he deserves these congratulations for the way he has placed this matter before the House—but in order to put myself, and, I believe, some of my friends on both sides of the House, on record that we are not absolutely wedded to the principle of protection.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Before proceeding with the estimates, I want to thank the hon. member for Queens-Shelburne for his kind words of commendation on the Government's policy of shipbuilding, and I am pleased that he thought we picked on the right firm and the right province in Canada in which to have the ship plates rolled. In addition to that, I want to give a little further word of encouragement to my hon. friend, Mr. Fielding, to whom this country is indebted in a very large measure for his patriotic services, that while at the present time I regret that there are no steel shipbuilding yards in the Maritime Provinces, and while our programme is limited, as I stated, to the amount of the expenditure we can afford to allocate for shipbuilding, at the same time I have been giving a lot of attention during the last few weeks, and so have my colleagues, to the question of having a large steel shipbuilding industry located somewhere in the Maritime Provinces, so that steel ships may

be made there, as well as in other parts of our Dominion. Probably the attractions of Nova Scotia, when we finally come to decide upon a site, will prove as great as they did when we were thinking of where the ships' plate mill should be established.

While the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and myself can see eye to eye in a great many things it is not my intention to enter into any tariff discussion this afternoon, but I am glad to hear what the hon. gentleman has said. I do not want him to think that this shipbuilding programme is a war emergency programme. We have not launched it with that view at all. We believe that shipbuilding will be one of the large permanent industries of Canada and I hope the hon. member will be here with me when the present contract for ships' plates expires and that I will have his support in granting the necessary prtection to the vast industry which will have been built up by that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will there not be rolling mills also at Montreal?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is no reason why rolling mills should be confined to any one particular province but it is not an attractive business proposition at the present time. There are not many financiers or industrial men in this country who want to put $5,000,000, or even $3,000,000, into a plant that has absolutely no protection whatever. If any other group of financiers wish to enter into the rolling of ships' plates, either in Montreal or in any other part of Canada, I will not say that the Government will give them the same assistance that we have found it necessary to give the Dominion Iron and Steel Company—I think hon. members will agree that it was necessary to do that to get the first mill started—but if any other group of financiers wish to start into the rolling of ships' plates without any duty, the Government will be very pleased indeed to see them do it.

Mr. MICHAUD: I have a clipping from the Graphic newspaper published in Campbellton, N.B., which reads as follows:

> The Graphic in conversation with a gentleman who is interested was informed yesterday that if the town of Campbellton would provide a free site and exemption for a term of years, his firm would seriously consider the establishment of a ship-building plant here.
>
> That such an industry would be of immense benefit to Campbellton goes without saying, and nothing we can do should be left undone to induce the firm to establish a plant here.
>
> We would suggest that the town council place itself on record as willing to assist such an industry.

The town of Campbellton is an important harbour in the northern part of the province. I would ask the minister if he knows anything about the transaction that is referred to here or if it is about to take place. Has he heard anything about a shipbuilding plant being established at Campbellton, and, if so, what?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have not received any proposition from Campbellton or from any financier who contemplates the establishment of a shipbuilding plant there. I have already, I hope, clearly explained to hon. members that we hope to see more ship yards in Canada than exist at the present time but we are limited as to the creation and expansion of ship yards owing to the financial condition of the country. If the finances of the Dominion exchequer will permit an extension of our programme, we certainly will not forget Campbellton if its citizens should put a proper proposal before us.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to join with other hon. members, especially on this side of the House, in congratulations to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). But I wish to advise him also that he gets a good deal of sympathy, particularly from this side of the House, and to point out to him the reason why that is so. I hold in my hand a paper called the Halifax Herald. I understand this is the personal organ of the right hon. the Prime Minister, but notwithstanding that, it contains one of the most vicious attacks upon my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I have ever known to be made upon a public servant.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Shame.

Mr. READ: It is a shame, coming from a senator and a man who obtained his position, I think, through the good graces of the present Dominion Government. This attack of the Prime Minister's organ on my hon. friend is a disgraceful thing altogether. Did my hon. friend see it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. READ: I am almost ashamed to read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Mr. READ: It is as follows:

> Halifax, March 12.—Further investigation by The Halifax Herald in shipping and pilotage circles yesterday has brought additional and conclusive evidence that there must be a shake-up of no meagre dimensions at Ottawa. The pilots' story that a steamer laden with high explosives was allowed to lay in the fairway

of the harbour one day last week for seven hours, was fully confirmed, and in getting the confirmation other details of a most startling nature were disclosed.

The Halifax Herald is scrupulously careful to abide by the rules of the censorship and anything calculated to furnish information to the enemy is gladly withheld from publication. There is not a man familiar with marine affairs at this port, not a Nova Scotia captain who has gladly given his services to the work of naval patrol, not a master mariner who regularly brings in and takes out his steamer, but what has a story to tell of stupidity, of pigheadedness, of bungling in connection with the affairs of the port and, following up these stories, the trail leads directly to Ottawa and reveals a heterogeneous bunch of incompetents who may know the ways of society, who may be able to judge aright the merits of various blends of wine, but who certainly do not know the ways of ships and are not able to judge the competence of those whom they place in charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. READ: (reading)

In times of peace we should not have such men at the head of affairs of a maritime nature. To have them in such position in these awful days of war is evidence of a laxity on the part of our people, a laxity which has already led to fatal consequences and which should, perchance a break be made through the British fleet, lead to awful disaster. God forbid that a change at Ottawa be withheld until such a time comes.

It took one of the greatest disasters the world has ever known, to partially arouse those in authority, but those who were in supreme authority then are still in authority. Britain, France, Italy, the United States—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have been waiting very patiently to see what reference the article that the hon. member was reading might have to the vote under consideration. But I find that instead of coming nearer to the vote it is going farther and farther away from it, and I must therefore ask the hon. gentleman to desist from reading the article.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The item reads: "To provide for the maintenance and upkeep of ships, Naval College, dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve." The whole question that is involved in this article is the very vote under consideration. Now, I will just finish reading——

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I rule that the hon. gentleman must desist. He can either submit to the ruling or appeal to the House.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I accept your ruling Mr. Chairman. As I said before, I want to congratulate the hon. minister upon the ability that he has displayed in his office. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that he is one of the best men we ever had at the head of the Marine Department.

Some hon MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I do not endorse that article, I want it distinctly understood. And I would like hon. gentlemen, and the present Government, to understand that they are going to get my unqualified support in everything they do that I think is right. I am not a partisan, and I am not going to be one.

I was going to remark, however, with regard to the great shipbuilding problem before this country at present, that I had the pleasure of visiting British Columbia recently, and while there went through one of the shipyards that the hon. minister stated he has given a contract to, the Wallace Shipbuilding Company at Vancouver. I am rather surprised that none of the members from British Columbia have spoken on this question, because I saw there the most marvellous development of shipbuilding that can possibly be found in the world. I stood in that shipyard and saw the workmen moulding the plates for the building of the ships. One of the most intricate pieces of work in connection with shipbuilding is the making of the bilge plates of a beautiful steel ship. Four men were handling that plate. Not a blow was being struck, not a bit of human muscle was being exercised, no brawn was being used except in simply moving the plate along to receive the pressure that was coming from the mountain that stood within view of the very men that were handling the plate. There they were, drawing energy from "white coal" which was generated from a mountain lake, and they were moulding that plate into that intricate shape, ready to put on the ship's bottom, without using a mallet, a chisel, or a maul. It was a marvellous thing, and it showed that the people of British Columbia, at any rate, have all the necessary elements to compete with anything in the world in the building of ships. I found that not only were they moulding plates by means of electrical energy, but they were cutting off their great beams with an instrument just like a pencil following a line, cutting off great beams, six inches square, with a jet of electric flame, and the celebrated acetylene gas that is used in connection with it. All the riveting and that sort of thing is being done by the same power. There is no doubt in the world but that we can build ships in Canada. We built them before. There was a time in our history, in the early sixties, I think, when

Canada—little undeveloped Canada—stood second, or, at any rate, third, in the whole coterie of the nations of the earth in point of tonnage. And, during those years the men who went down to the sea in ships from the Maritime Provinces and the province of Quebec were second to no men in the world. They were first. Very few sailors amongst them, because they were not very long at the business, but they developed to such a marvellous extent into officers that one would think they were all precocious boys. I have seen young men, taken out of the green woods in the province of Prince Edward Island, in two years' time become masters of square rigged ships in the foreign service; they were the greatest successes that any country ever produced. Anything that the hon. minister can do to build up a mercantile navy I am sure will be to the interest of Canada as a whole, as well as to the interest of those centres which have the good fortune to have the industry established amongst them.

I want it to be distinctly understood that I do not endorse any of that stuff that I read from the Halifax Herald.

Mr. J. F. JOHNSTON: Might I ask the minister if his department is experiencing any difficulty in getting shipbuilders in Canada to accept contracts at the present time? The reason I ask is, that it has been brought to my attention by a gentleman of prominence in marine circles that shipbuilders are not accepting contracts from the Government as readily as they might on account of the exacting terms of the contracts. I would like to have the answer of the minister.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the hon. gentleman, it has not come to my notice that we have had any difficulty at all in placing orders for steel ships in Canada. Whenever the berths become vacant we find the shipbuilders eager and anxious for business. It has not been brought to my notice that there is any condition such as my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the hon. minister inform the committee why there is such a large decrease in the item compared with last year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hon. gentlemen will notice that the vote for this same item in 1917-18 amounted to $1,000,000. We are asking the House to vote now $600,000, which is $400,000 less than last year. I will give the reason for the reduction very briefly. This is a reduction of $400,000 on the estimates passed for the fiscal year 1917-18. Last year the vote was partly nominal, as stores purchased and distributed to Canadian, British and Allied vessels in connection with the prosecution of the war were charged to this vote, and refunds were then credited thereto. For the present year the system of bookkeeping for store expenditures has been changed and such expenditures will be charged directly to the war vote, any refunds being credited to that vote. The item for the coming year is to cover the cost of maintaining the Royal Naval College, the expenditure on headquarters permanent naval staff and some of the expenditures of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt. I might explain that it is the policy now for Canada to be called upon by the Imperial Government to furnish provisions for a great many of the Imperial ships at Halifax and at Esquimalt. Canada supplies the provisions necessary for these British ships and we charge the amount to the Imperial Government, and it is refunded later. Charging a certain sum this year to the war appropriation is the reason the amount is $400,000 less than last year.

Fisheries Protection Service—to provide for the repairs and maintenance of Fisheries Protection Steamers, $300,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose this applies to the Government Fisheries Protection Steamer "Princess," and also to the lightships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. We have on the Fisheries Protection Service on the East Coast: "The Canada," "The Curlew," "The Constance," "The Gulnare," and "The Petrel." On the West Coast there are three ships, and on the great lakes, I think, one. These comprise our Fisheries Protection vessels.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o''clock.

The Naval Service—Radiotelegraph service—To provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations, $225,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to get from the minister some information as to this vote. How many wireless stations are under the control of the department? How many men are employed? Is the department encouraging the study of radiotelegraphy?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have at the present time 184 coast, land and ship stations in Canada, of which 66 are Govern-

ment land and ship stations. The total personnel employed in the Dominion is 506, 230 of whom are in the Government employ, and 276 are employed by commercial companies. We have a school in Ottawa with about sixty attending.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What are the arrangements for the students? Do they get scholarships? Is the Government paying them directly or indirectly to study radiotelegraphy? The minister will, of course, understand this is a very important item. Wireless telegraphy has rendered great service to the navy and to the merchant marine, and its use has become universal. I am quite sure that when peace is restored wireless telegraphy will be of immense service for our ships at sea. In normal times, we know, the S.O.S. call in the midst of the ocean has saved many ships. It will be interesting to know that the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada is encouraging the study of radiotelegraphy. I am pleased to be able to say that Canada was the first country to encourage Signor Marconi to establish the system, the first official station being bonused by the Canadian Government. It is quite a credit to Canada, and I would be glad to know that, under the direction of the minister, similar encouragement will be given in the future. I understand that the department was represented some few years ago at a congress of radiotelegraphy held in Europe, I think at London, at which rules and regulations were drafted and accepted by a number of the governments of the world. Perhaps the minister is not familiar with the sittings of that congress, but he might, at some later date, give the House information on that subject. At all events, I wish to state that it would be a most interesting development for Canada and for the future of our merchant marine that wireless stations on board ships be made compulsory.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am pleased to advise the hon. member that they are compulsory at the present time. Every vessel of over 1,600 tons is compelled to have a qualified operator on board. The radiotelegraph school was formerly, as hon. members will no doubt know, at Halifax, but owing to the terrible catastrophe that happened there on December 6 last, the headquarters were removed to Ottawa. All those operators are sworn in for the duration of the war as belonging to the Royal Canadian Navy. They are engaged first as learners, and then, if they pass all the examinations to become operators, they are sent to the various stations throughout Canada. As regards the conference that took place at London, while I was present at the time in London, I am not familiar with all the details, but I shall be glad to give the details later on.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some six years ago my successor in the Post Office Department, Hon. Mr. Pelletier, introduced a Bill in this House with a view to getting cheaper rates for the transmission of messages across the ocean. A contract was signed with a company having its own system of radiotelegraphy—I forget the name of the company and the system. The contract was a most favourable one. Last year, at the end of the session, my hon. friend's predecessor, Hon. Mr. Hazen, introduced a Bill, giving to the Marconi Company the benefit of that contract, the contract being transferred to that company. Mr. Allan, of Montreal, as the minister knows very well, is the president of that company. Does the minister know whether the company has done anything?—whether the contract has been adhered to? I was very pleased to see last year that the board of directors was under the chairmanship of my friend Mr. Allan of Montreal, a well-known and highly respected citizen. I understand that this matter is under the direction of either the Marine Department or the Post Office Department, I am not sure which. Has anything been done in connection with that Marconi Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I understand that my predecessor, Hon. Mr. Hazen, introduced a Bill to enable that company to operate, but they were not able to do so, and I understand the company has gone into liquidation.

Mr. MORPHY: I notice there is a decrease in this item of $70,000 from the appropriation of last year, which decrease seems to be commendable. This item is to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations. How many stations does the minister contemplate building and where are they to be located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government have not under consideration the erection of any stations at all. The estimates for 1918 are reduced by the amount of $70,000 through the omission of an item providing for the construction of a station on Hudson Strait. I understand the station was not gone on with.

Mr. MORPHY: That does not quite answer the question. This item is to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations. My question was, how many stations, if any, is it proposed to build and where?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thought I made myself clear to the hon. member that we were not going to build any stations.

Mr. MORPHY: Then what is the money for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For the maintenance and carrying on of the stations.

Mr. CAHILL: Why was the station referred to not built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There was no necessity for providing that service until such time as the Hudson Bay railway should be completed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Later on, when the war is over, I would like the hon. minister to look into the matter of wireless telegraphy from the point of view of state ownership. Actually, we are paying very high rates for cablegrams. It is true that there has been a reduction in the rates of some cable companies, due to a long agitation, although that reduction has been withdrawn during the war, except at certain times. I think that every Saturday evening cablegrams can be sent at reduced rates if addressed to some one in the army or connected with the military service. But after the war is over, the hon, minister, as head of the department supervising this service, should concentrate his attention on that phase of the question, namely a reduction in the tolls for transmitting telegrams across the ocean.

There has been in the British Empire during the last twenty-five years a constant agitation, first to reduce the postal rates and the cable rates. It has been found, after practical experiment, that the lower the rates the more money came into the treasury. The apostles of that postal reduction were, first, Rowland Hill, and later Mr. Henniker Heaton, the member for Canterbury, England. He was an Australian, by the way, but he sat in the British House of Commons for twenty-five years. He died at Geneva at the beginning of the war. But he agitated until finally he was the chief promoter of the postal conference which, under the Duke of Norfolk, brought about the two-cent rate throughout the British Empire; and it is well to remember that this reduction was proposed by the then Postmaster General of Canada, Sir William Mulock. But the agitation did not stop there. Mr. Heaton was engaged even up to the time of his death in an endeavour to secure a reduction in the cable rates; and, as the cable companies were strongly opposed to any such reduction, Mr. Henniker Heaton, in league with Signor Marconi, was about to obtain cheaper rates for the transmission of wireless communications.

It seems to me that Canada, being the largest and oldest Dominion in the Empire, is very much interested in this matter of cheaper communication by wireless with the Mother Country. We are interested because we have such a large flow of immigration from the British Isles, and these immigrants, largely settlers in the West, are at times, because of their family connections on the other side, obliged to have rapid transmission of messages to their folks at home. We know that a letter takes too long to travel, although before the war we were blessed with a relatively fast steamer service across the Atlantic. Not only are we interested from the point of view of communications which may pass privately between our immigrants in the West and their families in the British Isles, but we are also largely interested in getting a cheap news service for our newspapers. The news which comes from Europe in ordinary times is more or less tainted—and I do not use that word in any offensive sense—with the American touch.

Mr. JACOBS: How about the Northcliffian touch?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not referring to individuals. But it seems to me of the utmost importance that we should get a cheap news service direct to Canada without relying on the service to New York, Boston or other points in the United States. I am speaking of conditions that would obtain in normal times if we can establish a wireless system which will compete with the cable companies, and it is only by competition that we shall have cheaper rates.

Now, this is a very important point, in my judgment. Some years ago, when I had the honour to be Postmaster General of Canada, I obtained from the Postmaster General of England cheap postal rates for British newspapers and magazines, and as a result these were to be seen in every railway station and bookstore in Canada. I made a calculation at the time, and by comparing the dead weight of the number of bags and baskets at Rimouski and Hali-

fax filled with magazines and newspapers, found that in less than six months after having obtained that cheap postal rate we had nearly doubled the circulation of these periodicals, and after a year or so there was no more comparison, because the country was flooded with them. I thought it was a good service to Canada that we should, at all events, give the preference to that literature. I am sorry to say that for the last three or four years the arrangement between the two post offices has not been renewed; and, whilst I do not wish to discuss postal matters on this item, I desire to impress upon my hon. friend that he should not lose sight of the fact that for cheap news from Britain to Canada he must rely on the wireless system, because that system will give the necessary competition to the private-owned cable companies, and competition will bring down the rate. That is the reason I asked this evening if there was a school attached to the department in order to promote the system of radiotelegraphy. I believe in the future of radiotelegraphy, and I think it will be a blessing for Canada when we have stations dotting our shores from the 45th parallel as far north as possible, and when we have direct communication by wireless, not only with the British Isles, but from our western coast, with Japan. I hope I have not transgressed the rules too much, and I hope my hon. friend will accept my views in a good spirit, and will give heed to some of the advice which I have given him free of charge.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) stated that he hoped the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would do certain things to ameliorate conditions after the war is over. I hope my hon. friend from Maisonneuve is not raising any false delusions or forlorn hopes in the breast of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because it is quite possible the present minister may not occupy that position when the war is over. It is quite possible that the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the member for Maisonneuve, may hold that position, and may have to swallow the advice he has given to the present minister.

Patrol of the northern waters of Canada—$40,000.

Mr. MORPHY. Will the hon. Minister kindly explain what that item is for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. gentleman is aware of the various expeditions which have started out, not only in the past few years, but in previous years, both to the Arctic regions, and to the frozen regions of the South. The latest one is known as the Stefansson expedition. Stefansson is still in the North. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that they had rather a difficult time, lost their ship, and were stranded in the Far North nigh on to two years, and Stefansson is still there.

Life Saving Stations—including rewards for saving life, $100,000.

Mr. JACOBS: Are we going to provide now for the saving of life, without knowing how many lives are going to be saved?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman has certainly given me a poser, because if I knew how many lives were going to be lost, and where the loss would occur, we would have our life-saving apparatus ready, and no lives would be lost. But in regard to the life-saving stations, while I am asking hon. members to give their assent to this estimate of $100,000, I wish to explain that I am going thoroughly into all the life-saving stations from one end of Canada to the other. I want to be satisfied that they are giving the service that the Government would expect them to give and I also want to get a more complete record of the dates when those stations were erected, whether they have saved any lives, how many, and at what dates. While I will use the utmost care and discretion, if I find I can close any of those stations and save some money to the country, hon. gentlemen may be quite sure that I will do so. I am at the moment giving this matter my very careful attention.

Royal Naval College of Canada—Restoration, $25,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I wish to explain that I consider the vote here of $25,000 far too small and inadequate for what we may be called upon to do. The Naval College which was situate in Halifax, and which turned out so many cadets with such a high standard of efficiency, was almost blown to pieces when the catastrophe occurred in that city. The cadets were then temporarily transferred, through the kind courtesy of the Militia Department, to the Kingston Military College quarters. We do not know for the moment where they will be sent this fall, as we have not time to get a new Naval College erected at Halifax, and possibly will not have time to make adequate provisions for quarters there. If we are not able to provide accommodation there, we will probably send the cadets temporarily out to Esquimalt, and in the supplementary estimates, which are yet to come down, I

may ask the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as those on this side of the House, for a larger appropriation. I think hon. gentlemen will understand that you could not build a college, or even a barn hardly for $25,000. I will ask them to be good enough to pass this item now, but I will probably put something more in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. CANNON: When was the college established?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In 1910.

Mr. CANNON: Was it after the Naval Act was passed by the late Government, and was it in accordance with the law then passed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The late Government, or rather, the Liberal Government, under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was in power when the Naval College was established at Halifax. That college was erected at the time as part of the policy of the Liberal Government of 1910.

Mr. CANNON: Are there any training ships in Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, yes. I think most hon. members know that Canada has the Niobe and the Rainbow, and we have a large number of cadets constantly training on those vessels.

Mr. CANNON: Are those ships solely employed for training purposes, or have they taken any part in actual warfare?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They are more largely devoted to training purposes than anything else, although the much maligned Niobe performed efficient service, which it would not be wise for me to explain to hon. members of this House, in connection with the war. I may say our small navy, although it is very much larger than it used to be, is co-operating and has been co-operating with the naval authorities ever since the war broke out.

While the Niobe is not a fighting ship, she is performing very effective and valuable service at the port of Halifax, and the Rainbow also on the Pacific coast.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the ship of Commander Ross still in commission?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: The minister mentioned that the naval forces of Canada had been considerably increased of late. Will it be possible for the minister to give us some information as to the number of ships that have been either built or obtained or taken over by the Government and which are actually controlled by my hon. friend's department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that, owing to war conditions, as the hon. member will understand, I am unable to give publicly to the House the information that he has asked. If he would care to come to my office I would be very glad to give him the details in strictest confidence. Suffice it to say that the Canadian navy, small as it is, has played a very important part since the war broke out, but it would not be wise or prudent for me to give the details.

Mr. CANNON: Will the minister tell me if whatever has been done as regards the naval force has been in accordance with the Naval Act passed by the Laurier Administration?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I should say no to that. The additions that have been made to the Canadian navy, and the duties that various ships are performing, are in conformity with the wishes of the Imperial naval authorities.

Mr. CANNON: Under what law is that done? Is it in accordance with an Order in Council or the existing law?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not at all necessary to have an Order in Council. The hon. gentleman knows that the Naval Act is on the statute books of Canada.

Mr. CANNON: It is the Naval Act actually in the statutes that my hon. friend is using?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As I said a moment ago, the Canadian Government are not following out the Liberal naval policy, but whatever we are doing we are doing under proper authority and working in harmony with and on the advice of the Imperial naval authorities.

Mr. CANNON: And under the existing law.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice breakers, $1,500,000.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: There is an increase of $320,000. Would the minister explain why?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The amount that we are asking for is larger than last year. The expenditure for nine months of 1917-18 ended the 31st December, 1917, has been increased 18·2 per cent over the expenditure of the corresponding period of the previous year.

This is required for boilers for the Montcalm and for repairs to quite a number of the Government steamers.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is a special item for boilers, No. 206.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The amount of this vote has been increased by $320,000. The increase is required to meet the rapidly increasing cost of coal, material and labour for steamers whose operating expenses and repairs are paid out of this vote—the Aberdeen, Aranmore, Champlain, Estevan, Lady Grey, Lady Laurier, Montcalm, Nelson, Rouville and Stanley. This amount is necessary for repairs to these vessels and also because of greatly increased cost of coal, wages, oil, etc.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the minister's attention to a matter concerning the ports on the south shore of Nova Scotia. Several of these ports, owing to the severe winter which we have passed through, have been closed or obstructed by ice. If I am not mistaken, and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) will correct me if I am, the port of Lunenburg was thus obstructed. Lunenburg is the most important fishing port in the Dominion. The port of Shelburne was obstructed. It is one of the finest harbours we have in the country. The port of Yarmouth, the gateway of western Nova Scotia, with its important traffic, also suffered some obstruction. In all these cases application had to be made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for relief, and I am glad to be able to say that in every case the minister and his staff did the best they could in the matter, and that some relief was granted The object of my present remarks is to suggest to my hon. friend that it would be very desirable, in view of difficulties of that character, if a vessel suitable for the purpose were assigned to that class of service for a short period during the winter, probably about a couple of months. It would not need a powerful icebreaker of the class needed in the St. Lawrence region. A vessel or boat ordinarily employed for other purposes, but perhaps equipped with some little extra sheathing or something of the sort, located, perhaps, at Halifax, to be ready for service of that character, would be able to render very necessary and valuable service. The ice which forms in these ports is not very thick and if attended to promptly it could be disposed of easily if the proper appliances were available, whereas, if it is allowed to become solid, difficulty may arise. The people in that part of the country appreciate the efforts of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to give them relief and are grateful for what has been done, but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman for his consideration whether it would not be well to assign a special vessel to spend a couple of months at Halifax and be ready for an emergency of that character.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to see if that cannot be done for another season. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has brought the matter to my attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to make the same request for the harbour of Gaspé. Gaspé is the greatest port of Canada. That is where the fleet assembled after the boys left Valcartier camp for England. You have probably seen the picture of the fleet that anchored in the harbour of Gaspé when the boys left for the front. Every year after the ice is clear in the gulf and after navigation has opened, the interesting population of Gaspé is bottled up. The farthest point of the bay is very narrow, the ice is very thick and the people are bottled up. There is no communication. After several S.O.S. calls, during many years, the Marine Department decided to send, generally in April, one of the ice breakers or one of the other big steamers of the department to facilitate the opening of the harbour. The minister will probably hear from the people of Gaspé on the opening of navigation, and in making this request now I am simply giving him an advance notice.

Mr. POWER: What are the names of the ice breakers that ply between Quebec and the north shore of the St. Lawrence in winter time, or are there any?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The steamer Montcalm.

Mr. POWER: Did the Montcalm make a trip this year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not since the early part of January. She is at present engaged with the Lady Grey in breaking the ice between Quebec and Montreal, and when she gets through there, if she is not damaged, the department hope to send her on one of her usual trips along the north shore as far as Seven islands.

Mr. POWER: I would suggest that it would perhaps be a good thing to send the Montcalm down to Seven islands and along

the north shore right now, because from newspaper reports the inhabitants there seem to be in a semi-starving condition. I am quite aware of the importance of having the ice cleared to open the port of Montreal early in the spring, but at the same time, with all due deference to the claims of the city of Montreal, I would urge the minister, in the cause of common humanity, to endeavour to succour the people along the north shore rather than help the financial interests of the great commercial port of Montreal.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Montcalm and the Lady Grey are not breaking ice for the port of Montreal, but for the port of Quebec, which my hon. friend represents so well in this House. As soon as they get through breaking the ice for the port of Quebec, the Government will be very glad to send the Montcalm to the north shore. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman's impression that the inhabitants of the North shore are in a starving condition. As far as I can make out, they are short of certain emergency supplies, and these will be sent down on the Montcalm in a very short time.

Mr. POWER: I understand that the Montcalm is breaking ice above Quebec, and as in the ordinary course of nature rivers flow down it would seem to me that the ice is being broken for the port of Montreal which lies above Quebec. Certainly the ice is not being broken to give access from the sea to the port of Quebec.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I quite understand that water flows down and that if the steamer breaks ice anywhere west of the port of Quebec that must naturally help the ports between Quebec and the city of Montreal, but the chief place where the ice breaking is being done is very close to the city of Quebec, as my hon. friend will admit.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why did the Champlain suspend its regular trips between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay and the ports on the North shore from some time after the middle of November last up until the end of December?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Champlain was in such an unseaworthy condition that she was withdrawn for repairs to her machinery.

Mr. CASGRAIN: If I remember correctly the minister stated some time ago that another Government steamer called the Bellechasse replaced the Champlain for a while, but not for the whole time during which the Champlain was undergoing repairs. Why did not the Bellechasse continue until the Champlain was ready?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman is aware what a severe winter we had; it set in much earlier this year than last, and the Bellechasse was unable to cope with the conditions, so the department had to withdraw her.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would like to direct the attention of the minister to a state of affairs which certainly exists in the part of the country which I have the honour to represent. Perhaps all the hon. members of this House do not know the conditions of the people along the north shore of the river St. Lawrence, especially in the county of Charlevoix and down below. As soon as the fall comes the people there are absolutely cut off from the civilized world, and I am surprised that the Government is not taking steps to have the ships put in proper shape, always ready to cope with the situation, particularly at a time like last December, when a general election was on. At that time the boat service was absolutely discontinued, and it was very inconvenient to the electors, and to the candidate himself who had to travel all the way from Quebec to Murray Bay and other points on the north shore. I know that lots of electors were not able to record their votes because the service was discontinued.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: What was your majority?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I got in anyway, by five thousand and over.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I suppose there is no intention on the part of the Government to discontinue the service of the Champlain between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not object to the Champlain being withdrawn for a while for proper repairs. She is an excellent boat and was built in England, but she received so many bumps at the different wharves at Cap à l'Aigle, St. Irenée, St. Denis, Murray Bay and elsewhere that at the end of last season she was in very poor shape. The captain himself told me that an accident might happen at any time. But certainly when the boat is withdrawn from the service it should be replaced, because, as my hon. friend has pointed out, the people on the North shore depend entirely on this ser-

vice. When the railway is built conditions will be improved, but the boat will still be necessary. A large population is absolutely dependent at the present time on the regular service of the Champlain.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Champlain runs from Rivière Ouelle to Murray Bay and St. Irenée, and it is the intention of the Government that she shall continue on that route. With regard to the North shore service, that does not pertain to my department, but to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I am sure my colleague will provide, if he possibly can, for regular trips to the North shore and the south as well.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is unfortunate that these repairs cannot be made at a season when there are other boats to communicate with these ports, rather than in the fall, when the Richelieu and Ontario navigation boats do not go to the north shore. The repairs should be made in the summer or early fall, when other boats are available for this service.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has said something which seems to me very sensible, and I will add this for the information of the minister. Most probably the Champlain would have been fit to continue on the service if she had not been used by a member of the Cabinet who travelled up and down the river on her as if she were his own, with no regard whatsoever for the public interest. Whenever this gentleman wanted the use of the boat he would take it and the rest of the community had to wait. What I say is a fact and it constituted a scandal. Those farmers who needed the boat to get their produce to Quebec were prevented from doing so. The gentleman to whom I refer, who was a member of the Ottawa Government, would step on to the vessel and off she would go. He did that, I may say, quite often. Now, who paid for these journeys? Has the Government received any money from this gentleman for the use of the vessel, or for the coal which was consumed in making these journeys? I understand also that concerts were given on this boat.

An hon. MEMBER: They had Victrolas.

Mr. CANNON: I understand all these trips were most harmonious, but at the present time, when the Government is urging, and rightly so, that the people should practise strict economy, all such things as I have described should be stopped immediately. I have no doubt that now my hon. friend (Mr. Ballantyne) is at the head of the department there will be no repetition of them.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am certainly not aware of any such acts as the hon. gentleman has just described, but I will be very glad to make the most rigid investigation into his allegations. The charges he makes are not very specific, however, and investigation therefore will be difficult.

Mr. CANNON: I can make no more specific charges.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not aware that any member of the late Government did as he alleges, and I am quite sure that no member of the present Government has ever used the steamer Champlain for excursions or picnics.

Mr. CANNON: I am sorry to tell the minister that he is not well informed. The gentleman who did use the Champlain in the manner I have described was a member of the Government at the same time as my hon. friend. He used this vessel quite often, and as the minister knows, these trips are very expensive. The gentleman to whom I refer is no longer a member of the present Administration; he is now no more, but it is not his fault.

Mr. JOS. READ: The minister is new to his department, and therefore, probably does not know very much about conditions obtaining in the Straits of Northumberland prior to his taking office. In the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, one of the steamers belonging to the Marine Department was formerly employed, but this vessel may have been transferred to the Railway Department. The inauguration of the car ferry system on the Straits of Northumberland has done away with the necessity of maintaining the winter boats, I hope for all time to come, thanks in large measure to the Prime Minister. Let me say that the car ferry is an unqualified success, and has performed a service that nobody expected to be so successful. The car ferry is a tremendous ice-breaker, probably one of the best in the world, and its operation has changed the conditions down there. During the very severe weather of the past winter the car ferry has made a trip between the mainland and the island every day she was required to do so; in fact, the vessel sometimes made the trip two or three times. Notwithstanding that fact, however, the congestion of freight in Prince Edward Island was never so abnor-

mal as it is to-day. Everything in the way of freight was held up very largely all the winter, mainly because of difficulties arising in connection with the railroads. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that a large portion of our produce still awaits shipment to the mainland, and a great deal of it is of a perishable nature. When the spring comes this produce must be got across to the mainland or it will be lost altogether. At a time like the present we do not want such a loss of produce to the Dominion if it is at all possible to avoid it. The two ports of Summerside and Charlottetown have always been opened by the winter steamers in the spring. This year I presume the Stanley will not be in juxtaposition to these ports, and, therefore, will not be able to open them up. I would, therefore, ask the head of the department that has always opened these ports in the spring to use his influence with the Minister of Railways, and have a vessel detailed for this purpose when the time is opportune.

9 p.m.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine and Fisheries will only be too glad to go to the rescue of the Railway Department again when the necessity arises, and detail either the steamer Stanley or the Aranmore for the required purpose.

Mr. CAHILL: This increase of $320,000 seems to be a large one in these times when the curtailment of expenditures is called for. Is the increase principally due to extraordinary repairs, or maintenance charges.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is due to repairs, wages, fuel, oil, and all that sort of thing. The outlay for these purposes is very much higher than in normal times, and that is what makes up the $320,000.

Mr. CAHILL: It is an increase of something over twenty per cent.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Mr. CAHILL: There is an item for repairing the Montcalm amounting to $60,000. I was anxious to know whether the bulk of this increase is due to repairs or to increased cost in maintenance. Would it be possible to get an idea as to how much the increase has been for repairs as compared with maintenance?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We found it absolutely necessary to put in new boilers into the Montcalm.

Mr. CAHILL: Are the items for repairs greater than usual?

[Mr. Read.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can give you all the details. We have twenty-three steamers, and the repairs of the hulls and engines amount to $257,340. That embraces nearly the whole amount.

Mr. CANNON: A few years ago the steamer Montmagny was wrecked. Has any attempt been made to float her, and if so, by whom?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All attempts made to raise the vessel have been quite unsuccessful. A tender was awarded to a Quebec firm for that purpose, but, I am sorry to say, without any success.

Mr. CANNON: What firm was given the task of floating the ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not quite certain; I think it was a company called the St. Charles Navigation Company, a Quebec company.

Mr. CANNON: What were the conditions of the contract which was awarded to the company in question?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the company raised the steamer they were to pay the department $25,000, but they were unable to do so.

Mr. CANNON: Then, as I understand, the Government practically sold the ship for $25,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would have been correct had the company accomplished the task it set out to perform.

Mr. CANNON: What time had they in which to float the ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There was not any specific time, they were given a reasonable opportunity to see if they could accomplish their task, and they were unable to do so. We now consider the contract null and void.

Mr. CANNON: Has any other contract been given?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No other contract has been awarded.

Mr. CANNON: Has the department any intention of making further attempts to float the ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will be very glad to favourably consider any offer that is made to the department. At the moment we have not received any.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that in the Quebec papers a few days ago it was reported that a gentleman offered to float the

Montmagny provided he received financial aid either from the citizens or from the Government. It would be a good thing for the minister to help that man if his proposition is really a serious one. The Montmagny was a beautiful ship, and it is really too bad that she should be left in the river without any attempt being made to float her, which, I understand, it would be rather easy to do.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think it is more difficult than the hon. member appreciates, but if he will have his friends come and see me, we are open to receive offers to raise the steamer.

Mr. CANNON: I have no friends.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry to hear that.

Examiners of masters and mates, $16,500.

Mr. J. READ: Will the minister tell us how that $16,500 is to be expended? Do the examiners get a fixed salary, or do they receive fees from the masters and mates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The examiners get a fixed salary for the duties they perform.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Where are those schools located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At St. John, N.B., Halifax, North Sydney, Yarmouth, and in the winter months they are at Quebec and Kingston.

Mr. CANNON: Who looks after those schools?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have no superintendent over all the schools, but we have an instructor at each one of those stations. For the city of Quebec, it is Captain P. L. Lachance.

Mr. CANNON: What is his salary?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Fifty dollars a month.

Mr. CANNON: Does he work all the year round?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, only during the winter months.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $5,000.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice there is a distinct decrease in this item from the appropriation of 1917. Does the minister expect fewer obstructions in 1918 than in 1917?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know that I do, but the department considers the amount we are asking here will be sufficient for our needs, and we are trying to keep all the items of expenditure down to the minimum.

Mr. PARENT. Are there any particular rivers affected by this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, there is not any particular river or spot. The item covers work wherever navigation may be obstructed in any way. This vote is to remove the obstruction.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Was the amount of $20,000 for 1917-1918 all spent?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Inspection of live stock shipments, $3,000.

Mr. CANNON: What is this item for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is for live stock inspectors at the port of Montreal, Mr. Delorme, and Mr. O'Grady. Their business is to see that any live stock going aboard the steamers are properly taken care of and the necessary provision made for them.

Mr. CANNON: What are their salaries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Delorme, $1,200; Mr. O'Grady, $1,050; miscellaneous, $750; making a total of $3,000.

Mr. POWER: Where does the live stock go to?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: To England—hundreds and thousands of horses.

Mr. CANNON: Is there a station of this kind at Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE. That is not in my department; that belongs to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. POWER: Surely the hundreds and thousands of horses would be inspected by the British Remount Department, or the Imperial Munitions Board, or whatever department it may be which purchases these horses.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We do not inspect the horses. I would not want to convey to the hon. member the impression that we do. The business of these inspectors is to see that there are proper stalls or accommodation for horses or any other live stock that may be put on board the steamers.

Mr. CANNON: The item reads, "Inspection of livestock shipments."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It might have been worded a little differently.

To continue subsidy for wrecking plants—Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. POWER: How much is given to Quebec and to whom?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vote is to pay the following subsidies: British Columbia Salvage Company, Victoria, $10,000; Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company, Levis, $25,000; in all, $35,000.

Mr. POWER: What service does the department get for the subsidy of $25,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is one of the matters of emergency for which the department has to provide. While I am happy to state that the St. Lawrence route below the port of Quebec, and, in fact, the whole St. Lawrence route has, practically speaking, been free from accidents, at the same time it would be unwise in the interest of navigation for the department not to have a powerful and efficient plant ready in case an expensive steamer might come to grief.

Mr. POWER: I understand that at one time the steamer Lord Strathcona was kept constantly under steam and the Davie Company received a subsidy for this service. Is there now a boat kept under steam ready to sail at any moment?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Lord Strathcona is always kept under steam.

Mr. CANNON: Is the Government taking over the plant that used to belong to the Davie Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, the Government have not taken over the steamer; we are merely granting the subsidy.

Mr. CANNON: I mean the wrecking plant.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government have not taken over the wrecking plant. The name of the company that operates it is the Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While I do not object to the maintenance of the wrecking plant at Levis, and while I see the necessity of it for the river St. Lawrence proper, I think it would be wise, at no distant date, for the department to establish a wrecking plant lower down the river St. Lawrence. If a wreck takes place in the gulf of St. Lawrence between Newfoundland and, say, Anticosti, or between Anticosti and Magdalen island and the bay of Gaspé, I do not wish to be parochial, but it seems to me it is too far away to send to Levis for a wrecking plant in order to meet such a contingency.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

I know the department has had under consideration the erection of a wrecking plant lower down the river St. Lawrence. If the minister contemplates the erection of a plant there I might, perhaps, give him some of my own ideas about that. I consider the bay of Gaspé would be the proper point at which to have that wrecking plant.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose the hon. member is speaking now as the member for Gaspé.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The department have not under consideration at the present time the establishment of a wrecking plant below the port of Quebec, but I shall be glad to give the matter consideration.

Mr. TOLMIE: Has any reduction been made in the subsidy to the British Columbia company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The British Columbia appropriation remains the same.

Mr. FIELDING: Many serious wrecks occur, I believe, on the Newfoundland coast. To have ready access to these, even my hon. friend's port of Gaspé would hardly be suitable. I do not want to suggest any port in my own constituency, because that would look like parochialism, but I would suggest in all seriousness that a plant established at Sydney or at North Sydney would be a better location for the class of wreck with which the department has to deal. It is worth considering at all events, in the future planning of these arrangements.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be very glad to take into consideration the suggestions made by my hon. friends.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to; progress reported.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Women to be entitled to vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have given consideration to some of the suggestions which were made with regard to the terms of this Bill, and I now propose the following amendment:

That subclauses (c) and (d) of the first subsection of section 1 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor as subclause (c):

Possesses the qualifications which would entitle a male person to vote at a Dominion Election in the province in which said female person seeks to vote. Provided that a married woman or an unmarried daughter living with her father or mother shall be deemed to have any necessary qualification as to property or income if the husband or either of the parents is so qualified.

The reason for that amendment is that it brings the qualification for a woman for the electoral franchise more nearly in line with that which is necessary for a man. As the clause was originally drafted, it gave women a somewhat wider franchise than men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Bill been reprinted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, that is the reason I am moving these amendments now. The object of the subsection in the first place, is to provide that the qualification of women shall be the same as that which would entitle a male person to vote at a Dominion election in the province in which the woman seeks to vote, but inasmuch as that provision, if unaccompanied by any qualification, would cut out a very large number of women from the right to vote, where that right is based upon property or income, therefore the clause goes on to provide:

That a married woman or an unmarried daughter living with her father or mother shall be deemed to have any necessary qualification as to property or income if the husband or either of the parents is so qualified.

That amendment removes the difficulty which was suggested as to the term of residence in the Bill as originally drafted. It is proper that hon. members should have time to consider the amendment, so I will ask that it stand. I also beg to move:

That subclause (c) of the second subsection of section 1 be amended by striking out the words "being a married woman and previously an alien," in first line thereof, and by substituting the word "parent" for the word "father," in the third line thereof, and by inserting after the word "constituency," in the ninth line thereof, the words "while he is so engaged in such preparation or revision."

The clause will then read:

If she has become a British subject by marriage or by the naturalization as a British subject of her parent while she was a minor and in either case has done nothing (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject, and obtains and presents to the official in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists of the said constituency, while he is so engaged in such preparation or revision, a certificate under the signature of a judge,—

And so on. I also give notice that I will move that the second section be amended by adding thereto the following at the end thereof:

And in each of the said Acts the expression "person" or "male person" or any similar expression, shall include a female person, unless a different meaning is required by the context, or by the terms of this Act.

As far as I can judge, these amendments will cover such of the objections as were urged on a previous occasion, in so far as seems desirable to give effect to any suggestion so made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When will these amendments come up for consideration?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just as soon as we can take them up.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the Bill be reprinted for to-morrow?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope so.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the principle of the Bill will be discussed in Committee of the Whole, when it is taken up again?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The principle of a Bill is always discussed on the second reading.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood that we passed over the Bill rather lightly on the second reading, because an understanding had been reached between the leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister that there might be fuller discussion either in Committee of the Whole or on the third reading. The object was to give members more time to go into details of the Bill, and study it more closely.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The principle of a Bill is one thing and the details another. I do not recall any understanding that the principle was to be discussed in committee. It is not usual to discuss the principle of a Bill in committee. The principle is discussed on the second reading and the details are discussed in committee, but if my hon. friend desires to relieve his mind of any view as to the principle of the Bill, perhaps we might waive the rules for the time being and let him have the opportunity.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want any favour in that regard, but I understood at the time that we suspended the discussion on the second reading with the distinct understanding that there would be a general discussion in Committee of the Whole.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not recall it; it may be so.

Mr. BUREAU: On page 98 of Hansard I find:

> Sir Robert Borden: In order to make the matter perfectly clear, permit me to say that we are merely carrying out in this respect, the same principles with regard to women which now prevail in regard to men.
>
> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I do not intend to discuss the principle of the Bill on the present occasion, but will reserve any remarks I may have to make on that subject.

I told some hon. gentlemen who were inquiring about the matter that my understanding was that those who had any remarks to make on the principle of the Bill would be given an opportunity to make them when the Bill came up in Committee of the Whole, the same as on a second reading.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would not understand that the observation to which my hon. friend has called attention would constitute any such understanding as he suggests, but, as I said before, I have no desire to be strict in the enforcement of the rules. It would be undesirable, I think, to have a protracted discussion in committee on the principle of the Bill, when the principle should be discussed on the second reading, if at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On page 97 of Hansard I find:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: The House is very thin at the moment, and I do not purpose to discuss the principle of the Bill at this stage, as I understand several members wish to speak on it. I suggest that we give the Bill its second reading and go into Committee upon it, when the information I desire can better be given than across the floor of the House.

Of course I understand the hon. minister would not prevent any one discussing the principle of the Bill, because he tacitly agreed that the principle of the Bill would be discussed in committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will not admit that I tacitly agreed to anything. However, I do not think we will have any trouble.

Mr. FORTIER: I understood the other day that this Bill would come before the committee again and be examined on its merits. If the minister is ready to hear discussion on the subject at once I am prepared to go on. Otherwise, I would have to wait until a future time, when the matter will come up for discussion. I may say I am opposed to the Bill.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think we had better go out of committee now, without prejudice to any rights my hon. friend had.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Ocean and River Service—Unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: While we are asking for a vote of $5,000, I wish to inform hon. gentlemen that the expenditure up to February 28, 1918, only amounted to $64.05, but we thought it wise to ask for a vote of $5,000, although I do not think we will spend any more next year than we did last year.

Amount required for two boilers for Canadian Government Steamer Montcalm, $60,000.

Mr. CANNON: Is it the minister's intention to call for tenders?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is the intention of the department to put in a similar make of boilers, Babcock & Wilcox, if we can get it at a reasonable sum. If we are unable to do so we will call for public tender.

Mr. CANNON: I understand the intention of the department at present is not to call for tenders.

Amount required for two steamers for buoy service in Maritime provinces, $300,000.

Mr. WIGMORE: Is it the intention of the department to purchase two new steamers to replace two that are at the present time in use or is it intended to add two new steamers to the fleet?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The intention is to add two new steamers. Unfortunately the department lost several boats; the Montmagny was one and there was also the unfortunate foundering of the steamer Simcoe. The intention is to build two new steamers especially designed for carrying buoys and for the service which they may be called upon to perform.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has referred to the Simcoe. That was a very sad accident. Has an investigation disclosed anything as to the cause of that accident?

Mr. PEDLOW: Was the steamer Simcoe insured, and if so, for how much? I would like also to ask if the department has investigated the possibility of salvaging that boat?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government carry their own insurance. This steamer

was not covered by insurance in any outside company. We have not been able to salvage the steamer although we have endeavoured to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister give me the information about the Simcoe?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There was no formal investigation held, but a very thorough inquiry was made by the department. I regret to inform the committee that we have no information that would enable us to tell what was the cause of the loss.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many people perished?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I have not the exact number, but I think it was 42.

Mr. CANNON: Are the ships going to be built in Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly; it is the policy of the Canadian Government to have everything built in Canada.

Mr. CANNON: Has the construction of these ships started?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, not yet; we would not care to do that without the approval of hon. members and the House generally.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is there any vote for new buoys?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This particular vote we are asking for is not for buoys. It is for two new steamers to be used in placing buoys.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Where are the steamers going to be built?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I could not answer the hon. member because we will have to call for tenders according to the specifications of the department and whoever gives us the lowest bid and can turn out the best steamer will be awarded the contract.

Mr. CANNON: Is it the intention of the Government to have shipbuilding plants of their own?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The matter has not been considered by the Government, but if they ask the advice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may say that I will certainly be against it.

Public Works—Chargeable to capital (Marine Department)—River St. Lawrence ship channel, $478,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend give an outline of the work to be done this summer on the ship channel in the river St. Lawrence, and state what depth of channel they have attained and what remains to be done.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The river St. Lawrence ship channel extends from the city of Montreal to what is known as the "Traverse," 60 miles below Quebec. The entire length of the channel is 220 miles. With the exception of 1.74 miles at cap à la Roche and St. Augustine bar, there is a 30-foot channel from Montreal to the sea. At cap à la Roche and St. Augustine bar advantage is taken of the rise in tide. At cap à la Roche there is a rise in tide of from 4 to 6 feet and at St. Augustin bar of approximately 13 feet. The narrowest point in the channel is at St. Croix bar. At this point the width is 250 feet. The width of the channel to the rock cut at cap à la Roche is 300 feet, which is being widened to 550 feet. The channel through lake St. Peter is 450 feet wide at the straight parts and from 600 to 800 feet on the curve. Work on the 35-foot channel has been completed over a distance of 39.90 miles. There remains yet to be dredged to a depth of 35 feet, 50.48 miles.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many dredges are there under the control of the department engaged on the work in connection with this ship channel?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Owing to the financial situation we are curtailing very much the expenditure on the work to be done on the St. Lawrence ship channel this coming year. We only have four elevator dredges with tugs and two self-propelling steel elevator dredges with tugs, six in all. Hon. gentlemen will notice that there is a decrease, as compared with last year, of $194,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have there been any accidents in the channel during the last fiscal year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am happy to say there have been only minor accidents—nothing of a grave character.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend induce the insurance people to reduce their rates now that the ship channel in the river St. Lawrence is in such good order and as there are only minor accidents? Unfortunately, a few bad accidents some years ago gave Lloyds a pretext to raise their rates abnormally. I think my hon. friend, who is au fait with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, who has been vice president of the harbour commission and was con-

sequently in touch with all the oceanic interests, might endeavour to make his influence felt with that famous insurance concern and see that the rates between Great Britain and Canada under ordinary conditions are lowered. There is no reason why the river St. Lawrence should not be navigated as well as the ocean itself, with the remarkable improvement which we have witnessed in the ship channel in the last twenty years. I know that I am voicing the sentiments not only of the business community in Montreal, but of all Canada. It is a big question which affects not only the merchants and shippers in Montreal, but the farmers in the West. I hope that my hon. friend, business man as he is, will see to it that we get from Lloyds proper rates for our ocean tonnage.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can sympathize with the hon. member's views regarding the high rates of insurance on the St. Lawrence route. It is a matter that I gave a great deal of thought and attention to in the six years that I was one of the harbour commissioners of the port of Montreal. It is a very difficult problem, as the hon. member has stated. At the first opportune time, I certainly will take it up with the Lloyds people, because I do not know of any route that is safer, either by night or day, than the St. Lawrence ship channel from Montreal to the sea. It is thoroughly well buoyed and splendidly lighted, and the depth of the channel is now 30 feet to the sea, and in some parts 35 feet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the curves have been reduced?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. I quite agree with the hon. member that we should have lower rates of insurance, and I shall look into the matter. I do not say that I shall accomplish it, but I will make the attempt to do so.

Mr. CANNON: Is the dredging work done by tender?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, the dredging of the St. Lawrence ship channel for many years has been done by the department's own dredges and its own staff, and that is still the policy.

Mr. PARENT: Where will the dredging be done next summer, at Montreal or Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The principal dredging will be done at cap à la Roche, and at St. Augustin bar, also in the north channel.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. CANNON: Does this item cover the dredging work in the St. Charles river?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am very happy to say that it does not. That work comes under the Public Works Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry? Carried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does this item also cover the lighting of the ship canal?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Simply the dredging.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What was the amount expended last year for dredging?

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that the item on dredging has been carried. If hon. gentlemen wish to ask questions, they must not wait until after the item has been declared carried.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I believe I rose before the item was carried.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the Chairman will allow me, I will give my hon. friend the information. Last year the amount expended was $672,000.

To provide for construction and completion of dredging plant for St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Father Point, $163,900.

Mr. CANNON: Would the minister explain the difference between the item we have just voted for the St. Lawrence River ship channel and the present item for dredging plant?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to give the hon. member the information he seeks. The item we have just passed is for dredging the St. Lawrence ship channel. The vote we are now asking is for the maintenance of the Sorel shipyard.

Mr. CANNON: What is included in the item we voted for dredging the St. Lawrence? Does it include salaries paid to the employees, coal burned, and the expenses of the work itself?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, quite so.

Mr. CANNON: Where is the dredging plant to be built? Will it be purchased in England, or built in Canada, and if so, where?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vote that the Committee is considering at the present time is for the maintenance of the shipyard at Sorel. The amount appropriated for maintenance is $53,900, for improvement of the shipyard, $10,000; and there is also an amount to complete a dredge that the

Canadian Vickers Company are building that will amount to $100,000, making a grand total of $163,900.

Mr. CANNON: I notice that the item reads "for construction and completion."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: "Of dredging plant."

Mr. CANNON: Yes. Completion implies that the work is already started.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The word "completion" refers to the dredge that the Canadian Vickers Company have under construction at the present time for the department, and which is not finished.

Mr. CANNON: Was any money voted last year for the construction of this dredge?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: And the amount was not sufficient?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. CANNON. How much was spent?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It appears that there was $150,000 voted for this dredge last year, but the work was suspended on account of the war, owing to the yard being fully occupied in building vessels more urgently required. Therefore, we are asking now for a revote of $100,000.

Mr. CANNON: A revote? I understand that Parliament has already voted $150,000 for the construction of this dredge. Tenders were called for, I suppose?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: And the contract awarded to the Canadian Vickers?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: And the work was suspended. If I understood the minister rightly, this is not new money that we are voting. We are voting an old item for the second time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: According to the rules of Parliament, when money is voted and is not expended for the purpose it was voted for, it is necessary to come before Parliament again for a vote.

Mr. CANNON: What I want to know is whether that $150,000 has been spent?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, it has not.

Mr. PEDLOW: How much of that money has been spent on the dredge? Was a contract executed when the dredge was ordered, and has the price been changed since that time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Tenders were called for by my predecessor, and the contract was awarded on the 27th October, 1914. The total amount of the contract price was $833,300. There was voted in 1915-16 $500,000; in 1916-17, $325,000; in 1917-18, $150,000, and we are asking this year for $100,000.

Mr. CANNON: The minister explained at first that the contract had been awarded but that the work had been suspended on account of the war?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: In view of the information which the minister has just given us, how can the work have been suspended when nearly $600,000 of public money has been expended on this dredge? What was the money expended for?

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps the hon. gentleman is afraid that this money is not going to be spent in his province.

Mr. BALANTYNE: There has been a certain amount of work done on this dredge, otherwise the votes would not have been passed at each session of Parliament. It is a fact, however, that the work has been suspended. I am told this was in the summer of 1915.

Mr. EULER: Is the amount asked for intended for permanent work?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vote we are now asking hon. gentlemen to pass is for permanent work. If it is continued until it is finally completed we will require this vote of $100,000, but it is for permanent work on a new dredge.

Mr. EULER: The Department of Public Works has decided not to make any expenditures in a capital way unless they are absolutely necessary, because of war conditions. Is not the same policy to be adopted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will understand that this contract was awarded to the Vickers Company in 1914. It is a valid contract, and it is obligatory on the part of the Government to carry it out. By agreement between the Vickers Company and the Government, the work has been temporarily set aside since the summer of 1915, but it is quite probable that during the coming summer, and probably before then, the Vickers Company may be in a position to complete the dredge.

They cannot do so unless we secure this vote of $100,000.

Mr. EULER: Then this is a case of a contract awarded before the war began?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: The contract was awarded in October, 1914, which was after the war had broken out.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cannon) is quite correct. The war broke out, as we all unfortunately know, in August, 1914, and the contract was made in October of that year.

Mr. PEDLOW: Including the vote asked for in these estimates, the total amount required to pay for this contract is over $1,000,000. Is that on account of the enhanced value of material entering into construction, or do you intend to pay more than the contract price for the dredge, or does any part of the sum form a revote?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have endeavoured to make it clear that my predecessor, in October, 1914, after calling for public tenders, awarded the contract for the building of this new dredge to the Vickers Company of Montreal. There have been sums of money spent on the erection of this dredge from time to time since then, but the work has been set aside, and I am now asking for a vote of $100,000 to complete the dredge.

Mr. JOS. READ: Then the dredge has been partly built and you are going on with the work?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then, including the amount asked for in this estimate, Parliament will have voted for this work over one million dollars?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, but that amount has not been spent.

Mr. CANNON: As regards the balance of the item, where is the money to be spent, and in what manner?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The maintenance of the shipyard at Sorel will amount to $53,900, and improvements on the shipyard at Sorel $10,000.

Mr. VERVILLE: It has been rumoured for some time that the shipyard at Sorel was to be closed. Is there any foundation for this rumour?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As far as I know it is the intention of the Government to continue the Sorel shipyards, but not on as large a scale as in the past.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad that my hon. friend has declared himself in favour of awarding all contracts by tender as far as possible, and as much as possible, to private firms. I want to call
10 p.m. my hon. friend's attention to a case which will possibly come under his notice. I understand that the department has been using for possibly twenty-five or thirty years the McCarthy estate at Sorel, which would now like to either sell the property to the department or have it retroceded to the estate. I would like to know from my hon. friend what he intends to do in the matter. I understand that a petition of right has issued in the case.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government has expropriated the McCarthy property and the matter is now in the hands of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What offer has been made by the department to the McCarthy estate?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not personally aware that any offer has been made. Possibly my predecessor may have made one, but if so, I have no record of it here, I am sorry to say.

Mr. McCREA: We do not yet appear to have obtained all the information that we are entitled to on this item as yet. If I understand the matter aright, a contract was let in 1914 for the building of a dredge, the contract price being $833,000. We are told that in one year $500,000 was voted, the next year $325,000, last year $150,000, and this year we are asked to vote $150,000. Were all those amounts actually paid, or was any part of them paid? In other words, when the dredge is completed and paid for, is it going to cost the country $833,000 or more than that?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When the dredge is finally completed, the contract price will be $833,700. All of the moneys that have been voted in the various years have not been spent.

Amount required for converting six ship channel tugs for salt water service, $50,000.

Mr. CANNON: Where are those tugs at the present time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At the present time they are at Sorel, and as there is a great demand for tugs to be converted into seagoing ships, and as the British Government are liable to ask for them at any time, the department is asking for this appropria-

tion to convert those six channel tugs for salt water service. At the present time, they are equipped only for fresh water service.

Mr. CANNON: Are those tugs to be replaced after they are sent down for salt water service ?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not the intention of the department to replace those tugs providing they are used for salt water service.

Mr. CANNON: If those tugs are not to be replaced, their usefulness must surely not be very great.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I assure the hon. member their usefulness is just as great as it has ever been, but owing to the curtailment of the expenditure on the St. Lawrence ship channel, as the hon. member will have noted by the appropriation, we are not requiring for dredging work on the St. Lawrence ship channel as many dredges as we formerly did. We have, therefore, those six tugs that are idle, and we think it is good policy to have them converted for service on salt water.

Mr. J. READ: The object of the minister is to put condensers in them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Lighthouse and coast service—agencies, rents and contingencies, $178,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister explain the increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The increase is due principally to salaries. As hon. gentlemen know, the cost of living has advanced so very much, and we find it necessary to increase the salaries.

Mr. CANNON: Who is the agent at Quebec at the present time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Béland.

Mr. CANNON: Is his salary to be increased, and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Béland's salary is to be increased $100. At the present time he is receiving $3,100. If he gets this increase of $100, he will reach the maximum salary of $3,200.

Salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $485,000.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the lightkeepers come under the provisions of the new Civil Service Act with regard to the Outside Service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I hope the minister will extend to the lightkeepers the policy which he has just enunciated with regard to marine agents and employees in the marine agencies. I believe there is no class of public servants who are so much underpaid as the lightkeepers. They are faithful servants, their duties are very important, they are subject to many hardships, and I believe that since 1870 they have not received an increase of salary. In fact many of them have to-day a smaller salary than their predecessors had previous to 1870. The cost of living has increased, especially during the last few years. Their work is harder than it was. The season of work has been extended; in fact, I believe this winter they had to work until the 23rd of January. Many of them have to employ help. I know the case of one lightkeeper who has a salary of $1,400. That seems to be a good salary, but the regulations of the department compel him to employ two servants whom he has to pay and feed, and in the end those men are much better off than he is. I consider that the salaries of the lightkeepers ought to be increased before the provisions of the new Act come into force.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I wish to support what the hon. gentleman has just said with regard to the salaries of lighthouse keepers, and I would urge the minister to apply the increase also to the lighthouse keepers on the upper lakes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad to hear the minister say that the lighthouse keepers will come under the Civil Service Commission in future. I would suggest, however, that there are cases where the Civil Service Commission might take into consideration special circumstances. I would like to cite one or two cases. In the gulf of the St. Lawrence there is a place called Bird's Rock, one of the Magdalen islands, a celebrated place, and a very interesting spot to visit. There is another place called Bryon island, which was the first land sighted by Jacques Cartier when he came to Canada. There are lighthouses on both these islands. Bird's rock is but a rock, but Bryon island is an island. The lighthouse keeper who is appointed at any of these places goes into exile practically for life, except that after a certain number of years he applies for superannuation, which is granted to him; but speaking generally, they take their families with them and settle there for life. I know the lighthouse keeper at Bird's rock. He took his family with him to the Rock, and there is a sad story con-

nected with that lighthouse, as the minister knows. In a case of that kind, where the lighthouse keeper's son has grown up to the business, has learnt telegraphy and flag signalling and all the other work connected with keeping the lighthouse, it seems to me the department should recommend to the Civil Service Commission, other things being equal, that the eldest son should succeed his father. I also know the lighthouse keeper on Bryon island. He has been exiled there now for fifteen years. There was a new lighthouse built at that time at the request of the navigators and of the steamship companies, and this man was appointed at my suggestion. His name is Procul Chevrier. He is an excellent and faithful servant of His Majesty, and has kept the lighthouse admirably. Now that he is full of years he resigns, and it is his desire that his eldest son should succeed him. The son has been brought up to the work of the lighthouse in that isolated spot in the gulf of the St. Lawrence, and I would urge the minister to recommend the Civil Service Commission, other things being equal, to give this man's son the preference in appointing a new lighthouse keeper there. It seems to me that in special circumstances such as these the department might well intervene and make a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I have much pleasure in joining my voice with that of my hon. friend from Kamouraska on behalf of the lighthouse keepers. The minister perhaps may answer that the lighthouse keepers are in a certain classification. Quite so, but we are asking him for a revision of that classification. The cost of living has gone up so high in the last few years that I think the time has come when the classification should certainly be revised. I know it might be a hard thing for some of the officials of the department to start on the job, but I think the minister for his own satisfaction should put the men who have worked so hard in the interests of navigation on a proper salary basis in order that justice may be done. I would also speak on behalf of the light ship keepers, who, I think, are not classified. I think the minister has before him at the present time a petition for an increase in the amount granted the lightship keeper for his season's work. I have heard—and I should like the minister to tell me frankly whether it is so or not—that instead of an increase this season the crew is going to be reduced. I sincerely trust that the minister will not entertain that idea. As my hon. friend from Kamouraska has said, the season of navigation in the gulf of St. Lawrence below Quebec has been extended, and if the minister knows the hardships the crews have to undergo I do not think he will reduce their number. The records of the department show, to the surprise of many people, that after the captain has paid his engineer and the crew and supplied the food for the six or seven months of navigation, there is only about $400 left for him and his family. I certainly do not consider that sufficient, and I trust the minister will take my suggestion for an increase to the lightship keepers into consideration, as well as revising the classification of the lighthouse keepers. I should also like to know whether it is the intention of the department to provide a bonus fund for retiring lighthouse keepers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The suggestions of my hon. friends for a suitable increase in salary for the lighthouse keepers and the keepers of light ships fall on very sympathetic ears. I have under consideration at the present time, subject to the approval of this House, an increase of salary for the lighthouse keepers and for the keepers of lightships. I am sorry that the main estimates do not provide for this increase, but I intend to put in the supplementary estimates an item of $50,000 for this purpose, and I am very glad, indeed, to know that hon. gentlemen will approve the item when it comes up. There is no question but that the salaries of the lighthouse keepers are inadequate when we take into consideration the high cost of living. This came under my notice some little time ago, and I intended to express myself in this way even if hon. gentlemen had not brought the matter to my attention. In regard to a pension or superannuation for the lighthouse keepers, I would be very glad to give the matter consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. minister consider the suggestion I made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I overlooked that. Hon. gentlemen will understand that ministers have no longer any authority to make appointments, or even to make suggestions, but the deputy ministers have, and I am sure my deputy, who is present to-night, will see that the name of this man is placed before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Is it well understood that there will be no reduction of the crews of ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have no intention of reducing the crews of ships.

Administration of pilotage, and maintenance and repairs to Steamer Eureka, $56,300.

Mr. CANNON: I wish to call attention of the hon. minister to the rather exceptional situation of the apprenticed pilots in Montreal. I do not know if my information is accurate, and if it is not I wish the minister would correct me, but I understand that in Montreal no examinations have been held for the last nine years. Young men have been apprenticed for years. They are fully competent, but, on account of these examinations not being held, they cannot become pilots and cannot receive the salary of pilots, and these young men are in the position of either ceasing to study or work as pilots, or else practically starve. The number of full-fledged pilots in Montreal, I understand, varies between sixty and seventy. Some of them are very old and ought to be replaced, and I think it would be in the public interest if the minister would give orders for the holding of examinations immediately, so that the young men who would be successful in examinations could perform their duties as pilots during the course of the coming summer. I understand that last year the ships were so numerous on the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and the lower St. Lawrence that the number of pilots was not sufficient to take the ships from Montreal to Quebec, and that men who were not competent, who had not the proper knowledge of the channel or of the river, were put in charge. All this information, as I say, has been given to me from reliable sources, and if my information is not accurate, I wish to be corrected by the minister. I would be very glad if the minister would give us a declaration as to whether or not examinations will be held this year, so as to improve the lot of these young apprentices in Montreal.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The examinations of apprenticed pilots do not take place unless there is a vacancy on the permanent staff of pilots, commonly known as branch pilots, and while it may be regrettable, as far as the young and enthusiastic apprentices are concerned, that the branch pilots live to too old an age, or live to an age that appears old and are still able to perform their duties in an efficient way, I can quite appreciate their position. I will admit there are a number of apprenticed pilots in Montreal waiting to be examined, and to pass their examinations for promotion to branch pilots. The remainder of the statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to inexperienced pilots being put on the route, is, I am sorry to say, inaccurate. No one but thoroughly experienced branch pilots are allowed to take charge of any ships, and there was certainly a sufficient number of qualified licensed pilots to take charge of all the ships that navigated the St. Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec last year.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Is there a sufficient number now?

Mr. CANNON: What is the number of branch pilots operating between Montreal and Quebec??

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About 50. I can give you the names.

Mr. CANNON: I do not want the names. Is there any regulation as to the number of pilots that should be on the list? Is there a maximum fixed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Fifty licensed branch pilots are considered a sufficient number to take care of the pilotage system.

Mr. CANNON: According to the law, would the minister have authority to increase the number, if he wished to do so?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, yes, I have the necessary authority.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to draw the attention of the minister to a fact connected with some of these old men who are in positions similar to the position of the pilots of Montreal. A number of men who have been doing this work do not want the young men to come up at all, and absolutely refuse to teach them the trade, and if there are young men in connection with the Montreal pilotage who are old enough and competent enough to obtain a license, I do not see why there should be any limitation. How are they limited? Is it by regulation of the pilot commission or by the pilots themselves, or is there a statutory limit?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Montreal pilotage system is under the direct control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and there is a departmental regulation limiting the number of pilots to fifty, but if I found that more pilots were required than that number I certainly would see that the examination of the apprenticed pilots took place, and any vacancies that occurred would be promptly filled. The hon. member who has asked the question being a sea-faring man will understand that there is a very rigid five-year course for the appren-

ticed pilots, and the apprenticed pilots are taking that course right along. A few of them have completed the term of their apprenticeship, and are simply waiting to be examined. There is no use holding the examination of the apprentice pilots unless vacancies occur.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: There is a sufficient number?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite sufficient.

Mr. PARENT: Following the investigation that took place at Halifax after the disaster that happened there, I remember seeing in the papers that the scope of the investigation would be extended, so that it would cover the pilotage authority in Quebec and the pilotage authority in Montreal. I am not sure if this investigation has been held in the different places. I would like to find out whether it is the intention of the department to have a change in the administration of the pilotage authority in Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The pilotage systems at Montreal and Quebec are already under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A commission was appointed by my predecessor some years ago and an investigation was held into the pilotage systems of both Montreal and Quebec. All the recommendations, except in a few minor cases, were put into effect by my predecessor, Hon. Mr. Hazen. Since I have been appointed minister a commission has been appointed, composed of Mr. Robb, secretary of the shipping federation of Montreal, Captain Bales, who was port warden, and Captain Harrison, of the Furness-Withy Company, Halifax; and they held a most thorough and rigid investigation into the pilotage system of the port of Halifax. The report has been completed and I hope to lay it on the table of the House shortly. The recommendation that this commission made was that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should abolish the pilotage commission of the port of Halifax, and should take the pilotage system under his control in the same way that the pilotage systems of Montreal and Quebec have been taken under the control of the minister. The necessary authority has been taken, the pilotage system of the port of Halifax is now under my control as minister, and Captain Lindsay has been appointed superintendent of pilots. Captain Lindsay is a sea-faring man holding a master mariner's certificate and has been connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries for some years. The commission have also visited and looked into the pilotage systems of Sydney, Louisburg, St. John, and the Miramichi. They have not as yet rendered their report, but no doubt they will do so in due course. They will then proceed to the Pacific coast and investigate the pilotage systems of Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster and Nanaimo. I hope that when the commission have finished their investigation of these important sea ports the department will be able to put the pilotage system on a much more satisfactory basis than prevails at the present time under various local pilotage commissions.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. CANNON: Were the Halifax pilots under the authority or supervision of the minister?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In an indirect way, but the local pilotage commission exercised very great authority. Now that the local pilotage system has been abolished, as minister I am assuming the responsibility and control of the pilotage system there.

Mr. CANNON: Since the minister has taken control, have any measures been taken against the pilots who were held responsible for the terrible disaster which occurred in the harbour at Halifax?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Since the terrible Halifax catastrophe a court of inquiry was instituted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That court rendered its judgment, and I understand that all those who were held by this court of inquiry to be in any way blameable for the catastrophe are being dealt with at the present time before the court.

Mr. CANNON: I read in the papers at the time the investigation was held that some people thought that the calamity might have been avoided if the pilot on the Mont Blanc had been able to speak with the crew on board the ship. I understand that the ship is a French ship, that the crew was French, that the pilot was English, that he could not speak any other language than English, and that there was therefore absolutely no possibility of communication between the captain and pilot of the ship as to the direction of the ship. I do not know if these are the facts, but if they are I might suggest that the minister send down to Halifax some French-speaking pilots who would take charge of French ships, in the hope that catastrophies like that might be avoided in the future.

Mr. BUTTS: I come from a sea-faring country, and I know a little bit about it. If you send down from the St. Lawrence river French-speaking pilots to navigate the waters of Nova Scotia or the gulf of St. Lawrence, or any other place along the Nova Scotia coast, it would be suicidal—it would be out of the question altogether. You men from the St. Lawrence do not know anything about Atlantic navigation; you do not know anything about the game of seamanship. I am not saying this in a carping or critical spirit, but simply by way of suggestion, but I wish that you would withhold your hand from anything affecting Sydney or its pilotage system until you can get men accustomed to conditions in Sydney harbour to investigate the system that has prevailed there. Perhaps I am wrong in criticising. You may have used your very best judgment, but you have never steered a boat against a sou' west wind in Halifax harbour like I have done. I know some little thing about navigation in Sydney harbour and the Cape Breton coast, and I am giving it to you now in the very best spirit and asking you to take the advice of some of the Cape Breton mariners as to how they would navigate that coast before you lay sacriligious hands upon the pilotage system there.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Butts) that every consideration will be given to the suggestion which he has made. One who has had the experience that he has informed us he has had, is at all times worth listening to, and everything that he has stated will be given very careful consideration. In answer to the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Cannon) about French pilots at Halifax, I am not in a position to know whether there are any there or not. But we all know, especially we of the English-speaking race, that the French people speak one language equally as well as the other, and if there are any qualified French Canadian pilots down there, and I can find them, I certainly shall see that they are sent.

Maintenance and repairs to wharves, $10,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Where are these repairs to be made to wharves, because I see on another page of the estimates, under the heading of "Public Works Chargeable to Income," a great many appropriations made for different wharves and breakwaters, and repairs to wharves and breakwaters, in the different provinces.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The vote that we are asking hon. members to approve of is for small repairs that are required from time to time for the maintenance of public wharves that are under the control of the Department of Marine. These small repairs are generally around $50 or so.

To provide for breaking ice in Thunder Bay and Lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, $40,000.

Mr. POWER: Does this item cover the breaking of ice in the St. Lawrence river?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. POWER: What are the "other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation?"

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This vote is asked particularly for Thunder bay. There is an area of 27 miles of ice which has to be broken up every spring and that will explain why the vote is as large as $40,000. If there are any other nearby points that require the services of an icebreaker this vote will apply to them. That is what we mean by "other points"—points adjacent or close to Thunder bay.

Mr. CAHILL: Who does the ice breaking?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company.

To provide for telephones at different points throughout the Dominion in connection with aids to navigation, $500.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that in connection with the ship channel? I understand there was a telephone system between Montreal, Quebec, and, perhaps, points lower down the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This vote is asked in case there may be some isolated station where we would need to install a telephone. As a matter of fact, we have never spent any money during the last three years under this vote, but it is just by way of precaution that we are asking that the amount be voted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If, without any additional cost, the department could at isolated points like the Magdalen islands, allow the public to connect with the main line, would the department object to that? I have received many letters of late from the islanders, and as they have not telegraphic communication, and as they have to travel quite a distance, sometimes at considerable loss of time and sometimes at considerable danger crossing the lagoons on the islands, they say that if they had the privilege of a telephone line it would give them more comfort in carrying on their business, and would be of more convenience for the community at large.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The operation of telephone lines belongs to the Department of Public Works, and when the estimates of that department are up I am sure that the minister (Mr. Carvell) will give the matter consideration if the hon. member will bring it to his attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is this particular telephone system for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For isolated lighthouses.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That fits in exactly with the condition of things on the Magdalen islands. The Marine Department has a station on each of these islands, and it is true that there is a telephone line on the Magdalen islands. I am not sure whether it is controlled by the Public Works or the Marine Department.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: By the Public Works.

Meteorological Service, including Magnetic Observatory, grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal Observatories; also allowance to L. F. Gorman, Observer at Ottawa.

Mr. POWER: Is the Quebec Observatory included in this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: What is the amount expended on the Quebec observatory in a year, including the salary of the keeper?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Arthur Smith is the man employed there. He gets a salary of $1,200, and we propose to advance his salary to $1,300.

Mr. CANNON: How many observatories are there in Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are 69 stations.

Mr. CANNON: What is the nature of the work done by these officers?—because $200,000 is a rather considerable amount to be spent for this branch of the service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not find any details in my dossier, but the duties of these officers are to find out the weather conditions and to communicate them to the prominent centres throughout the country.

Mr. CANNON: I suppose this information is given without any guarantee?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is quite true.

Amount required to pay compassionate allowances to the widows, or fathers, or mothers, or dependents of the Captain and members of the crew of the C. G. S. Simcoe who lost their lives when that vessel foundered in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 7th December, 1917, $61,500.

Mr. POWER: Will the minister explain upon what basis these allowances are made up? I do not want the minister to say $100 to so-and-so and so-and-so, but on what principle are these allowances based?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will deal with the officers first. There were 11 officers who lost their lives, and their dependents are awarded $2,000 each, making a total of $22,000. Then we come to the chief petty officers, 13 in number. We are allowing their dependents $1,500 each, making a total of $19,500. We are allowing the dependents of the balance of the crew, 20 in number, the sum of $1,000 each, making a total of $20,000, or a grand total of $61,500.

Mr. POWER: The reason I asked this question was that I would like to be informed whether there is in the department any fixed rule with regard to compensation for injuries, or compensation to the relatives of those who have lost their lives while in the service of the department.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have no such provision in the department, and that is the reason we are asking the committee to vote this amount now.

Mr. COPP: I notice that this item is a provision made for "compassionate allowances to the widows, or fathers, or mothers, or dependents of the Captain and members of the crew of the C.G.S. Simcoe." I understood the hon. minister to say that this matter has been adjusted by allowing $2,000 to the dependents of the first officers, $1,500 to those of the second officers, and smaller amounts to the dependents of the seamen. I do not know what the policy of the department is, but I cannot see any particular reason why the dependents of an officer who has been drowned in a catastrophe such as this should be entitled to any more compensation than the dependents of an ordinary seaman in the same vessel who suffers the same fate. It does seem to me that is an absolutely arbritary system of making compassionate allowances. Here is an officer who may be better off financially, and may not have as many dependents to care for, and yet because he happens to occupy a little higher position than one of his men, who has worked as hard, and suffered the same fate, he receives much greater consideration. It does seem to me that the principle is wrong whereby larger compassionate allowances are given to the dependents of officers than

to the dependents of the petty officers or men.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I admit that it is an arbitrary way of fixing the amount of compassionate allowance to the dependents of these unfortunate officers and men, but the only explanation I can give is that it is the usual one, and based doubtless on the difference in the standard of living. We all know that when a person receives a greater salary they usually maintain a higher standard of living, and hon. gentlemen will quite understand that we could not make the same grant to dependents of the crew as to the dependents of the officers. We are simply following the same policy that is followed in the army, where the dependents of a colonel who is killed receive a greater pension than is awarded to the dependents of officers of lower rank, or private soldiers. There is a great deal of merit in what the hon. member has stated, but it is simply a question of what rank was occupied. I cannot offer the hon. gentleman any other reason for the difference than that.

Mr. COPP: Perhaps nothing I can say will deter the minister from carrying out what I might term the "aristocratic" policy that has been followed by other governments as well as this, but I desire to place myself on record in a most emphatic way against such a policy as being absolutely wrong in principle. I am democratic enough to realize that a man who is out in a storm and suffers death has done just as noble and creditable service for his country as the officers or person of higher rank who were victims on the same occasion.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. COPP: There is one other matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the minister.

The CHAIRMAN: There can be no further debate at this stage unless the minister withdraws his motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no object in railroading matters. The gentlemen on this side have shown no disposition to obstruct.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I appreciate very much the kind assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. COPP: The matter to which I wish to draw the minister's attention has reference to an item of $10,000, which was passed the other night, for the repairing and carrying of fishways into rivers. I have received a letter from one of my constituents stating that on the Petitcodiac river a fishway is required near river Glade, and the writer expresses his sentiments very strongly. He states that the fishway has gone down and it should be repaired in the interest of fishing operations there. I would ask the minister if he would make inquiries from whatever officer he has in that locality, with a view to having the fishway in question restored.

11 p.m.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Sifton the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Friday, April 5, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 33, respecting Brazeau Collieries, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 36, respecting Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 37, respecting The Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

THE WAR.

REGULATIONS FOR UTILIZING THE HUMAN ENERGY OF CANADA TO BEST ADVANTAGE—ORDER IN COUNCIL.

On Motions being called:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to bring to the attention of hon. members two Orders in Council which received the assent of His Excellency the Governor General yesterday, and both of which are of so important a character that they should be communicated directly to the House. The first is:

At the Government House at Ottawa,
Thursday the 4th day of April, 1918.
Present:

His Excellency

The Governor General in Council:

Whereas it is necessary to enact such regulations as will utilize to the best advantage the human energy of Canada for purposes essential to the prosecution of the present war;

And whereas the need of men of military age to provide reinforcements for the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and the equally urgent

need for labour to assist in the production of food and of other articles essential for war purposes, necessitate special provisions to the end that all persons domiciled in Canada shall, in the absence of reasonable cause to the contrary, engage in useful occupations under the regulations hereinafter set forth;

And whereas the Minister of Agriculture is impressed with the necessity of enacting forthwith the regulations hereinafter set forth, which in his opinion will greatly assist in rendering available for the purpose of production labour which otherwise might not be secured;

And whereas the Minister of Militia and Defence also fully concurs in the enactment of such regulations;

And whereas these regulations are not intended to affect any right of members of organized labour associations to discontinue their work in the employment in whch they have been engaged when such discontinuance is occasioned by differences actually arising between the employer and the employed. The purpose is to prevent persons capable of useful work from remaining in idleness at a time when the country most urgently requires the service of all human energy available.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and under the powers vested in His Excellency in Council under the War Measures Act, 1914, and under all other powers His Excellency in Council thereunto enabling, is pleased to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:

REGULATIONS.

1. Every male person residing in the Dominion of Canada shall be regularly engaged in some useful occupation.

2. In any proceeding hereunder it shall be a defence that the person is,

(a) Under sixteen years or over sixty years of age.

(b) A bona fide student proceeding with his training for some useful occupation.

(c) A bona fide student in actual attendance at some recognized educational institution.

(d) Usually employed in some useful occupation and temporarily unemployed owing to differences with his employer common to similar employees with the same employer.

(e) Physically unable to comply with the provisions of the law as herein enacted.

(f) Unable to obtain within reasonable distance any kind of employment which he is physically able to perform at current wages for similar employment.

3. Any person violating the provisions hereof shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on summary conviction before a Magistrate to a penalty not exceeding One Hundred dollars and costs, and, in default of payment, to imprisonment with hard labour for a period not exceeding six months in any common jail, or in any institution or on any farm owned by a municipality or province and declared by by-law or Order in Council respectively to be a public institution or farm for the purposes of this law, which said institution or farm for the purpose of this law shall be a common jail.

4. Where the proceedings in any case in which a fine is imposed under the authority hereof are instituted at the instance of any muinicipality or by any officer of a municipality, the fine shall be paid to the treasurer of such municipality; and where such proceedings are instituted at the instance of or by any provincial officer, such fines shall be paid to the provincial treasurer; and where such proceedings are instituted within a municipality by any other person, the fine shall be paid in equal portions to the treasurer of the municipality and the treasurer of the province; and where the place in which such proceedings are instituted is not within the boundaries of any municipality, the fine shall be paid to the provincial treasurer; and where the proceedings are outside the boundaries of any province, the fine shall be paid to the Receiver General of Canada.

5. Useful occupation and reasonable distance shall be questions of fact to be decided by the magistrate.

6. The magistrate may hear and consider other defences than those mentioned in section two.

7. "Magistrate", shall include Justice of the Peace, and Police Magistrate appointed by Provincial or Dominion authority.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

ORDER IN COUNCIL PROVIDING FOR ITS ENFORCEMENT CONSEQUENT ON DISTURBANCES IN QUEBEC CITY.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): The other Order in Council which I desire to communicate to the House has relation to the recent unfortunate disturbances in the city of Quebec. It reads:

At the Government House at Ottawa.

Thursday the 4th day of April, 1918.

Present:

His Excellency

The Governor General in Council.

Whereas on the 28th day of March last the opposition of a large number of the population of the City of Quebec to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder, broke out in open violence and serious riots ensued on that day and on subsequent days in which the rioters destroyed the office of the deputy registrar appointed for the District of Quebec under the said Act, and moreover caused great damage to other property, and threatened further damage, and it became necessary for the restoration of order, the protection of property and the preservation of the King's peace that these riots should be suppressed by military authority;

And whereas at common law it is the duty of a military officer with the troops under his command to interefere, when such interference is necessary, to put down riot, insurrection or civil disturbance;

And whereas it is provided by the Militia Act that the active militia of Canada may be called out on active service in aid of the civil power upon requisition of the civil authorities, and the King's regulations and Orders for the Militia contain certain directions for regulating the exercise of command and disposition of the troops upon such occasions;

And whereas notwithstanding that it was necessary as aforesaid for the preservation of the peace and to repress rioting that resort should be had to military force the civil authorities of Quebec made no requisition for the

calling out of the Militia and the Officer Commanding therefore, acting manifestly in the general interest and for the protection of the public, and by direction of the Minister of Militia and Defence assumed the responsibility to command and direct the operations of the troops for the protection of life and property and the restoration of the peace;

And whereas it is expedient that the legality of such intervention, and of the proceedings of the military authorities consequent thereon, should be declared and affirmed, as it is hereby intended to be, and that provision should be made for such further action by military force as may be necessary for the preservation of law and order in the existing circumstances, or in similar cases in the future if they should unfortunately occur;

And whereas for the reasons aforesaid it is expedient for the peace, order and good government of Canada that the effect and operation of law should be given to the provisions herein contained;

Now therefore His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, by and with the advice of the King's Privy Council for Canada, in the execution of the powers conferred upon him by the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to provide, order and enact, and it is hereby provided, ordered and enacted as follows:—

1. If, in the opinion of the General Officer or the Officer Commanding the Military District in which any riot, insurrection or civil disturbance takes place, the circumstances be such as to demand or justify the intervention of the military power, it shall be competent to and within the authority of the General Officer or the Officer Commanding the said military district to issue orders for such intervention to the troops on service or on active service under his command, and with such troops to use such force as he may determine to be reasonably necessary to quell and suppress such riot, insurrection or civil disturbance and to restore the peace, whether or not any requisition be made upon or order given to such Officer or to any military authority by any civil magistrate or civil authority; and the provisions of this section shall extend to and authorize and make lawful the intervention operations and proceedings of the Officer Commanding the troops in Quebec and the officers and troops under his command in the circumstances herein recited to quell and suppress the riots and disturbances at the City of Quebec on and subsequent to the 28th day of March last and to restore peace and order there.

2. In the case of any riot, insurrection or civil disturbance which takes place while the Military Service Act, 1917, is in operation, if the General Officer or the Officer Commanding any military district of Canada, order any troops on service, or on active service under his command, to be called out for the maintenance of public order, or for preventing obstruction to the due enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder, the Governor in Council, may, within the affected area which he shall by order designate, supersede, or supersede to such extent as he may specify, until his further order, the jurisdiction and powers of the civil courts, and declare that within the said area the orders of the General Officer or of the Officer Commanding the troops shall in all respects be obeyed by the civil population, and that offenders against the law, or persons disobedient to such military orders, shall be tried and punished by courts-martial constituted in the manner hereinafter provided; and consequent upon any such order of the Governor in Council the provisions of the two next following paragraphs shall, until his further order, have effect:—

(a) All persons within the said area shall be subject to military law, and the civil tribunals shall continue to exercise within or in respect of the aforesaid area only such powers and jurisdiction as shall not have been superseded or suspended by the Governor in Council; and the General Officer or the Officer Commanding the troops may constitute courts-martial for the purpose of trying any person who is charged with any offense against the law, or with disobedience to any military order, within the said area;

(b) The constitution, powers and procedure of any court-martial so constituted as aforesaid shall be the same as the constitution, powers and procedure of either a general or of a field general court-martial; and any such court-martial shall have the power, in addition to the ordinary powers possessed by a court so constituted, to impose any sentence which might be imposed in a like case by any civil court of the Province; provided that a sentence imposed by any such court-martial shall not be executed until affirmed by the Governor in Council.

3. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Habeas Corpus Act, or in any other law or statute, and notwithstanding any right or remedy of habeas corpus or proceeding by way of habeas corpus, all persons in military custody within any area which shall have been designated as aforesaid, and all persons who may be captured, arrested or taken into military custody whether within or not within any such area during or in consequence of any riot or insurrection, shall be held, detained and remain in such custody without bail, inquiry or mainprise until released by direction of the Minister of Militia and Defence or delivered by his order to the civil authorities.

4. Any male person who takes part in any riot, insurrection or civil disturbance, incited, instigated or caused by way of opposition to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, or the regulations thereunder, shall if declared or found guilty of so doing by sentence of a court-martial or of a competent civil court, be deemed to have been called out for military service under the said Act, whether or not he be within any class of persons which has been called out for military service by proclamation, or within any class of persons to which the said Act or regulations apply, or within any of the exceptions of the schedule to the said Act; and he shall by reason of such offence forfeit any exemption or claim to exemption to which he would otherwise be entitled, and be liable forthwith to military service in all respects as if finally selected therefor and required to report for duty under the provisions of the said Act and regulations; provided that if any male person be captured, arrested or taken by military authority during the continuance of any such riot, insurrection or civil disturbance, while taking part or having taken part therein or while being present thereat to encourage, or assist the rioters, he shall be liable forthwith to such military service as aforesaid without any further or other warrant or proceeding than the certificate of an officer in command of the body of militia

effecting the capture, arrest or taking that he was so captured, arrested or taken in the circumstances aforesaid.

5. Any male person who

(a) Wilfully prevents, impedes or obstructs, or attempts to prevent, impede or obstruct, or engages or takes any part in any riot, insurrection or civil disturbance, or breach of the King's peace against the enforcement or carrying out of the Military Service Act, 1917, or any of the provisions of the said Act, or any regulation thereunder; or

(b) Wilfully with violence, or attempted violence or otherwise obstructs, assaults, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to obstruct, assault, intimidate or interfere with any officer or person, or the property or premises occupied by any officer or person charged with the execution of any duty under the Military Service Act, 1917, or any regulation thereunder; or

(c) Incites, counsels, encourages, or assists any person to disobey or to refrain from executing any lawful order or direction made under or in pursuance of the said Act or any regulation thereunder; shall upon conviction of any such offence, in addition to any other penalty therefor by law provided, thereby ipso facto become liable to military service under the said Military Service Act to the extent and in the manner provided in the fourth section of these regulations and as if finally selected for military service and required to report for duty under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder.

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES.

MOTION OF MR. J. A. CURRIE FOR LEAVE TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE TO DISCUSS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the rioting, agitation, disturbances and non-observance of the law in Quebec together with all the circumstances, conditions and causes near and remote having any bearing on or connection therewith.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion is made under Rule 39, and I shall take the liberty of adding that fact to the motion. Under Rule 39, subsection 4, it is my duty to determine as to whether, in the first instance, a motion so proposed is in order. It does seem to me that in view of all the circumstances the motion of the hon. member is peculiarly within the meaning and scope of this rule and, in my judgment, it is in order. Having so ruled, my responsibility ends. There is a further question as to the propriety, or perhaps I had better say the desirability, of discussing a matter of such grave importance. That is for the House, and I shall submit the question to the House as to whether it is their wish that the hon. gentleman should proceed. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to move this motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule says: those in support of the request of the hon. member will please rise.

And twenty-one members having risen, in their places.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed. Before the hon. member does so I had better state that under a motion of this character, which is submitted without notice, the rules are very clear that the discussion must be strictly relevant to the subject. The authorities are all agreed that discussion must be much more strictly confined to the subject than is the case with an ordinary substantive motion. The wording of the motion, as submitted by the hon. member, appears to indicate a desire on his part to widen the scope of the discussion. The rule is clear that only one matter can be discussed upon a motion of this character. That matter is the recent unfortunate disturbances in the city of Quebec, and the wording of the hon. member's resolution does not help to enable him to widen the field of discussion. I deem it my duty to direct the attention of hon. members to the rule in this respect, and I ask their assistance to see that the field of discussion is not unduly widened.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of diffidence that I have brought this motion forward. Every one is conscious—no one in this House more than I—that we have had serious disturbances in the city of Quebec, and in the province of Quebec generally. I have not brought the motion forward, as has been suggested, for the purpose of self advertisement in any manner, shape or form. I have not raised it for the purpose of stirring up any political trouble or faction; and as far as I am personally concerned, my treatment of this subject will be as mild as the tone of any discussion that has ever taken place in this House. But it must be noticeable to every person, it must be common knowledge to everyone, that if there is anything that this House should discuss, it is this very matter which I have brought before you to-day.

For nearly a year this question has been before the public. In undertaking to raise it here, great pressure was brought to bear upon me not to proceed with it to-day. I

could have rightly brought this question before the House in two ways. I could have brought it up, as I am now doing, in the old-fashioned method of having a discussion on a public question without bringing on a vote. No vote of want of confidence is asked under this motion; all that is sought is a simple discussion. It is very important, indeed, that the House should discuss matters of this character relating to documents laid upon the Table by ministers of the Crown. Under the rules of the House, when a minister answers a question or makes a statement to the House, no discussion is allowed, and the only way in which a discussion can be obtained on this subject is under the present rule by moving the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of grave urgency. There is another way by which discussion could be caused, and that is by moving a motion on going into Committee of Supply. Now we all know that the House has had very little opportunity since it has met this session to bring up any question on going into Committee of Supply. If this question were brought up on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, it would have had to be brought up as a want of confidence motion in the Government of the day. Now as I am one of the supporters of the Government of the day, and wholly in sympathy with the ideas and objects that the Union Government has placed before the people, and it would not look very well for me to raise this question through the medium of a motion of want of confidence. For that reason, I have had recourse to the present procedure, and there will be a free and open discussion of the whole question, and for such free and open discussion the whole country is waiting.

These are my reasons for having brought the matter forward in this manner. I hope to lay my statement of the case clearly before the House, and then the ministers of the Crown, as well as other members of the House, will have the opportunity of discussing it fully and freely. Now under other circumstances this question would not have been of very great importance, because every member who sits in this House, certainly all the old members, know that during the last session of the House there were frequent outbursts of rioting of this character in the province of Quebec. The matter was suppressed by the newspapers and nothing was said about it in this House, because during the last session every member felt under a great deal of restraint. We could not criticise anything openly and above board, for the simple reason that voluntary service was the method then in operation of securing men for the war, and if a man spoke out his mind here on any of the public questions at that time, it would have been said that he was injuring recruiting. In fact, on more than one occasion at that time matters were raised in the House which the public press declared were injurious to that cause. As a soldier, as one who has taken part in the war, as one whose whole heart is in this war—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

Mr. CURRIE: I have taken a little part in the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: As one who has taken a little part in the war, and whose whole heart is in the successful prosecution of the war, I desire to see that our brave troops at the front are supported in every possible way. As I sat in the House last session there often occurred to me the words of Robert Louis Stevenson in one of his famous essays, where he said that the greatest lies are told in silence. I heard things said in this House, which, had they been uttered outside, and I had been free from any responsibility in connection with voluntary service, I would have denounced as untruths. But now the Military Service Act is in operation and we are taking men for the war under the form of conscription, and the lips of men in this House and in the country need no longer be still for fear of injuring voluntary recruiting. I have made it my rule of conduct, and I am going to continue to do so from now on to the end of the war, that in any action or matter that comes before this House, or is raised outside, to first ask myself the question whether I should take a certain course which might be pleasing to the enemy, or adopt another course which would be the opposite of that, and which would be in the interests of my country. So that I say in what I am going to do I am adopting the motto of Saint Gregory, " Better a scandal than a lie."

Now this question might not have come before the House at all. A little bit of rioting might not have mattered very much, but what do we find? The condition of affairs as far as this war is concerned—because this country is at war and at war very seriously, although a great many people do not realize it—the condition of affairs

at the front at the present moment is critical. We have been asked by the leader of the Government in England to send reinforcements to our brave troops at the front. I have his language here, but it is not necessary for me to quote it, and I was very much ashamed to see in our public press, Mr. Lloyd George's cable for more men set away in the back of the newspapers whilst the feature under great headlines on the front page was made of "Riots in Quebec." That order should have been reversed, because after all the rioting that has taken place in Quebec has only, in a measure, stimulated public opinion in this matter of recruiting. From the Orders in Council that have been brought down to-day we are going to see more "pep" in the recruiting campaign carried on in that province, and there is going to be a stronger hand maintained there from now on. But there is nothing contained in those Orders in Council which is not to be found set forth in the laws of the country, the military laws, to-day, except one thing. In the first place, under the common law the military authorities of the country have a perfect right to do exactly what these Orders in Council say they shall do. They are given measures to subdue riots, and, if necessary, to shoot, but the military authorities are at liberty to do all that also under the King's regulations and orders. They shall resist riot and they shall shoot, and they are at liberty to do all that under the King's Regulations and Orders. In the second place, it is the old English law and rule, and it exists in all British countries. If men are killed in the fight, then the officers must all be tried in a civil court unless there is a Bill of Indemnity brought into Parliament which relieves them from the responsibility of killing their fellow men in their own country. And for these acts that have taken place in Quebec, there is no doubt that the officers will be charged in the civil courts of that province with manslaughter or murder, and this House will have to bring in a Bill indemnifying these officers. It did not matter even if the Riot Act were read and all the regulations of the civil law carried out, the procedure would be just the same, and the Bill would have to be brought in to indemnify the soldiers in the same way.

Now, the proclamation of martial law in all British countries has always rested with the Governor in Council. In only one case in modern times has martial law been proclaimed in a British country. In reading up this law—I had to read military law in order to get a commission from the Militia Department—I found there was only one case, a case in the West Indies, where the Governor had to proclaim martial law. The officer commanding the district under this Order in Council has the right virtually to proclaim martial law and carry on just the same as if the Governor General in Council proclaimed it.

The regulations as to the taking of men are all excellent in themselves. These regulations are splendid regulations. But that is not the question. The whole question we have to discuss here is a question which dates remotely back in this House to the time that the idea of bringing on a new form of recruiting was decided upon. It is now a year ago last Christmas since the right hon. Prime Minister announced to the public that Canada was going to send 500,000 men to the war. I note, after adding all the figures that are available, that a year and three months have since elapsed and Canada has not implemented that promise. As a matter of fact within three or four months of the period when he made his statement we had over 400,000 men at the war. We all know the great trouble taken and the efforts put forth by everybody to get men to join the army. And I must say that the Canadians responded splendidly to the voluntary call to arms; no other country in the world has done any better regardless of what anybody says. But that idea, that scheme, became exhausted. Instead of continuing as at first, when the civilians in the cities, towns and villages, the best farmers and the best business men joined together to form groups and committees to recruit men, and did recruit men, and would have kept on recruiting men, what do we find? We find that that system was diverted, and it fell into the hands of professionals, men who were professional speakers and professional recruiters, and I must say that I foresaw right then the beginning of the end. Because in any kind of sport in this country we do not approve very much of the professional. Take lacrosse or any other of our sports, we do not want to be recruited under any system of that kind. But when we are asked by our brothers, our friends and neighbours, those whom we know, to do our duty, we are prepared to do our duty.

In the last session of Parliament the Prime Minister adjourned the House, and went over to England to consult with the authorities there, and he came back and informed this House that it was necessary for us to raise a hundred thousand more men to reinforce the men we had at the front. Now, there is a process of attrition

constantly going on at the front. It is said that the term of service of an infantryman at the front, his period of service until he is wounded, or ill, or is killed, is only seven or eight months. He may be able to return after treatment and serve another seven or eight months. In order to carry on over there it is necessary, since we have four divisions, roughly speaking, 75,000 men, there, and it will be necessary for us to have virtually 75,000 or 100,000 men annually to make up for inevitable losses. Not a single person on the Government side of the House that we noticed at the time demurred. We all said " amen " to the 100,000 men. Then the question was, how are we to get these 100,000 men. National service was supposed to bring in the men. Instead of the national service which they have in France, whereby every man, woman and child in the country serves the nation when called upon, and is compulsorily called upon, what kind of national service did we have? I do not wish to cast any reflections on that system. I have only this to say, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot carry on war in this or any country in this age by a card index system, nor can you carry on war by boards. You must have men, that is the only way that you can carry on war. And that is the way this country wants the war carried on, if I know anything about what the people voted for at the last election. National service passed along, and that accomplished nothing. Then we had the Canadian Defence Force, which was supposed to bring 100,000 or 200,000 young men into khaki, and, by feeding them up well, they were expected in due time to volunteer for service abroad. I think there were something like 38 or 40 who volunteered in this force in the city of Toronto. You cannot get men to volunteer in a defence force to stay at home. That is not an idea that appeals to anybody who wants to serve in this war, even if he wants to dodge it for the time being. Instead of men, we got an expensive staff. Nothing was accomplished.

Then Parliament had to decide to do something. I want to speak a word on behalf of the men who sat in this House in the last Parliament—many of them have left this House never to come back again—but I will say this, that no Parliament ever held in a British country contained so many brave, resolute, courageous and patriotic men. The work that Parliament accomplished will speak for itself regardless of politics. Men forsook their politics to see that a law was enacted in order that we might reinforce our sorely tried men at the front. The men who took part in those struggles in the last Parliament have received nothing, as far as the press of this country is concerned, unless it be some mild form of condemnation.

What occurred at that time? The Cabinet of the last Government—I can speak quite freely of that because it is not supposed to have any connection with the present Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see what connection the remarks of the hon. member have with the subject under discussion. I do not wish to restrict the hon. member unduly, but I must ask him to adhere more closely to the subject. It is inevitable, perhaps, that the question of national service must be touched upon or referred to, but I would ask him to confine himself as closely as possible to the present subject.

Mr. CURRIE: I am very thankful to you, Mr. Speaker, for calling my attention to this matter. Perhaps I was getting a little too lengthy in my remarks. However, I will try to come to the point quickly and say that the late Government introduced into this House the Military Service Act, and the Military Service Act that came before this House was not such a Military Service Act as that Government would have produced had there not been certain elements in the Government which were opposed to compulsion of any kind in order to send men to the front. We all know of the trouble that occurred. Ministers resigned and left the Government. Finally we had this law brought down by which a hundred thousand men were going to be secured by means of what is called the draft. Everybody in the corridors knew that it was a joke, that that law which was brought down was not the law that was really required, but it was the law, and as such it was shot full of holes. The enforcement of the Act was virtually left to the lawyers and judges and officials; if they did not wish to enforce it vigourously, every man in the country could avoid coming under its provisions. Why was the law formed in that way? I will tell you. There was intense opposition to the law on the part of our friends from Quebec and of members from that province within the ranks of the Conservative party. There was a constant agitation and struggle so to keep down the Act that it might be delayed or that the war might end or something else happen before it could be really enforced. But the measure was brought

down; we passed it, and we passed also the War-time Elections Act. I say without hesitation that had the Military Service Act been adopted by this House after the passage of the War-time Elections Act, the provisions of the former would have been much more stringent. As it is, the law is not as strong as the first law they had in England—and in England that law was subsequently amended so as to be stronger. We shall likely have to do the same thing here before the session is over.

So, when the War-time Elections Act was passed, the Government had to face the possibility of hostility in the West as well as hostility east of the Ottawa river. I have nothing to say against my good friends in the province of Quebec. Men from that province fought with me in the trenches in the greatest battle of the war, and I can testify to their courage,

4 p.m. devotion and bravery, because no braver men ever lived. Had they been properly managed by their leaders; had they not been misled and misrepresented, I firmly believe in my heart that no part of Canada would have taken part in the war more joyfully or more gladly than the province of Quebec. If Quebec has not done its duty, it is not on account of the people of that province; it is on account of their so-called political leaders.

As I say, we had to face an adverse vote in Quebec and in the West, and men like myself realized that if the Government had gone to the country without first adopting the War-time Elections Act the control of the country would have been lost to anti-British——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: The control of this country would have been lost by the British element and handed over to the anti-British element for the next twenty-five years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish the hon. member would adhere more strictly to the subject under consideration.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Let him blow off.

Mr. CURRIE: What did we have to do? We had to deprive men of the vote, because we wished this to be a British country. We know very well that if the Opposition party had won the election contest, the men from the provinces who voted on the referendum in favour of conscription would be conscripted, and those who voted against conscription would not be conscripted. That was the question that was up at the last election. Well, we went before the electors, and the electors endorsed the Military Service Act and everything that we did. The men of other parts of the country have been conscripted; they have carried on under the law, with very few complaints. But in the province of Quebec every effort has been put forth to prevent the law from going into effect and to keep the men from going to the war.

I would not have brought this question forward to-day did I not feel that unless some drastic steps are taken—more drastic even than have been mentioned in the House to-day—Quebec will not be conscripted until after the war. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, why I say that. Up to the present time the province of Quebec has given only 5,000 men under the Military Service Act, and of that number fully 3,500 are English-speaking. So that our French-speaking friends, who should be the first to stand loyally by us, have given only——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentlemen would, perhaps, be in order in referring incidentally to conscription or the Military Service Act so far as it bears upon the question of the riots at Quebec. Under this motion, however, he is certainly not in order in entering into a discussion of conscription or the Military Service Act, as he apparently purposes to do by giving figures and going into details.

Mr. CURRIE: I will try, Mr. Speaker, to keep out of difficulty as much as possible. In order, however, to make my point clear and to carry on the discussion of all matters connected with the rioting in the province of Quebec, it is nceessary that I should take into consideration the number of men enlisted under the Military Service law in the province of Quebec. You will note, Sir, that my resolution says "Quebec," not "the city of Quebec." In saying that this law has so far taken only 5,000 men in the province of Quebec, I think that I am not infringing on the rules. However, I will try to keep as straight as possible, because I want all these facts to go before the public; it is not in the public interest that any of these matters should be stifled. I do not wish to cause any trouble or raise any disturbance; nor do I wish, to quote the language of the papeis, to "blow off the roof." We are not blowing off any roofs. I believe that the time has not yet come when a member of this House should sit up like a stuffed manikin at a puppet show

and say or do nothing in regard to any question of the day. Every member has a perfect right to speak out here.

In the province of Quebec 60,000 appeals under the Military Service Act are pending, and only about 600 of them have reached the Central Appeal Judge. If six months after the passing of the law, 1,500 men can be secured in the province of Quebec, I leave it to members of the House to figure how many years it will take to obtain the balance.

I now wish to discuss the matter of who is to blame for this state of affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I will take my friends first. I believe—I have the evidence right here—that the Government, in trying to enforce this Act with caution and moderation in the province of Quebec, have given aid and comfort to those men who are doing everything in their power to create a disturbance in that province. We all know that the man who is the prominent figure in all this anti-British trouble in Quebec is the editor of the newspaper called Le Devoir, Henri Bourassa. When the war broke out Mr. Bourassa was in Belgium or Strassburg, or some place over there, and he managed to sneak out under the protection of the British flag and escape to this country. No sooner had he reached this side than by some strange process he started to carry out the very policy which Bolo Pasha pursued from his headquarters in the United States as well as in France—that of creating trouble, causing dissatisfaction, doing everything in his power to prevent the people from sustaining our part in this war.

I say without reservation that he has constantly preached sedition in the columns of Le Devoir. During the troubles in this House over the passage of the Military Service Act, he was very silent because the public mind was inflamed then, but at other times he has constantly preached sedition in his newspaper. Now, I can understand a patriot of the old school who fought for "liberty, equality and fraternity" preaching sedition against autocracy; I would do it myself, but that is not the case with this man. He does not want liberty, equality or fraternity; he wants reaction; his gospel is the gospel of reaction. I say further that he has commercialized sedition to sell his paper to the poor dupes who will read it; I repeat that that is his chief aim and object, and also to get a little popularity for himself. He is the leader of the Nationalist party. We on this side of the House had our trouble with the Nationalists when we were framing the Military Service Act; we know all about that trouble, but we are rid of them now, we hope. Why was not Le Devoir suppressed, and why was not Bourassa interned? At Sault Ste. Marie, Charles Smith, the editor of a paper there, a man whom I have known since he was a boy, the son of a respectable methodist clergyman and a very respectable man himself, said something in his paper with reference to the manner in which voluntary recruiting was being carried on. At once his paper was suppressed, and he found himself penniless, and threatened with imprisonment. To my mind he was a much better man than Henri Bourassa. It is sometimes said that Bourassa may be more dangerous locked up than at large. The men who are the fathers or the sons or the brothers of the boys who went over Vimy Ridge are not afraid of any cheap agitator in Quebec or anywhere else, whether locked up or free. In the United States men greater than Bourassa are being locked up and have disappeared from ken and will remain out of sight and unheard of until the war is over. But what do we find in the case of Bourassa? In this same paper with the heavy type about "Emeutes"—which I understand is the French for riots at all events it meant that when I was in France—are columns of Government advertising, whole pages of it. There is a three-column advertisement, for instance, on April 1st, signed by Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice; the minister no doubt will be able to explain that. On another page are three or four advertisements from the Public Works Department, and I am told that advertisements in connection with rural routes up in my riding have been inserted in Le Devoir. This is a serious matter. How can any French Canadian who reads the views of the editor of this paper escape the conclusion that as far as French Canadians are concerned, they are outside the war altogether, that De Levoir has the Government approval and the Government does not intend to do anything towards conscripting them?

Now, I come to somebody else—Mr. Lavergne.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Colonel Lavergne.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not intend to call him colonel. Why has he been allowed to travel around Quebec with the stars and crown of a colonel on his shoulders, when right from the beginning he has been opposed to the war, and stated so publicly while I was at Valcartier. This man, who

has been virtually accepted as the leader of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, should have been interned. The country could very well afford to do without him; there is nothing he is needed for; he is not making munitions, or farming—helping to do something that would assist Canada or the Allies in this war—nor is he soldiering, though he is called a colonel. Why, in Toronto recently, a man got up on a public platform and said that the soldiers at the front had taken a little too much rum on Christmas day. He was locked up and his badges and uniform stripped from him, and he was thrown out of the army. While that was happening in Toronto, Lavergne has been allowed to roam at large in Quebec, preaching seditious doctrines, and generally doing as he pleased. What is more, when the Government decided to end these riots in Quebec, the representative of the Department of Justice, if we are to believe the newspapers, went to Quebec and sent for Lavergne and his partner to find out what could be done. Lavergne laid down his terms. First he wanted the troops withdrawn. Then he wanted the police withdrawn, and what in the world else was there for us to do but leave the country to him and his friends. I understand that the officer of the Government refused to entertain such a proposal, and I am very glad that this Government had a man with backbone enough for that; but I am sorry he called on Mr. Lavergne at all. Lavergne should have been utterly ignored; in fact he should have been the first man placed under arrest in Quebec when the riots broke out.

What effect did the agitation and the disturbances have on the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I have recollections of the day when, though opposed to him politically, I greatly admired him. He was a stout, strong Britisher, and we all loved him for that. He had the courage to speak up against the Nationalists at the beginning. I have his speeches here, and I sometimes enjoy an hour or so reading them over; those on British topics are well worth reading; if we forget what has occurred during the past year. I used to think he was of the old type of French Jacobite, the beausabre, who would occasionally take an old rusty tricolour cockade out of his pocket, brush it lovingly and then put it back and come up the steps whistling Marlbrook and the Sambre and the Meuse. I used to think he drew his inspiration from brave France, that fountain from which fresh drafts of Liberty come daily to a struggling world. Here is what he said at a speech delivered in the province of Quebec on June 24, 1889 at the national festival of the French Canadians and I wish we had a few more speeches from him now like this:

> But Quebec possesses another charm which can be enjoyed in all its plenitude only by us French Canadians, it is the charm of memories. Men of Quebec, you are privileged beings. Antiquity has preserved for us the memory of a famous epitaph, calling on the passer-by to stop, as he was treading on the ashes of a hero, but you, men of Quebec, you breathe, live, and have your being among the dust of heroes.
>
> At each step you make in your city, a momument, a building, a stone, a glimpse of the sky at the end of a narrow street calls to mind a whole world of heroic events. To-day you have raised another monument which will forever perpetuate the memory of the cross planted by the envoy of the King of France when he took possession of this country in the name of his royal master.
>
> This country, however, has not remained French soil. Still we have remained true to the memory of our old mother country.
>
> Although separated from France for over a century and differing from her at present in several ways, we have always worshiped her in our hearts, watching from afar, but with ceaseless interest all the vicissitudes of her agitated career, and sharing in her joys and triumphs, as well as in her disasters and sorrows, still more, indeed, in her sorrows than in her joys.
>
> Adversity is the test of affection, and I appeal to you all if it is not true that we never realized how dear France was to us as we realized it during the period of her reverses, during the fatal years of 1870 and 1871, when the telegraph brought us the news of defeat instead of the victories which we had looked for. And when there was no longer room for doubt, when, having hoped against hope, we had, in order to convince ourselves, to read over and over again the text of the harsh law imposed by the conqueror and when Alsace and Lorraine were violently severed from French territory, I ask you if we had been deprived of one of our own limbs could we have suffered keener anguish.

What nobler words could any man utter than these? Does the hon. gentleman still believe in these sentiments, and is he prepared to implement the sentiments that have brought him into power—for that speech was delivered just previous to that great movement in the history of Canada that sent him into office in 1896? No, the shadow of Bourassa and the haunting stars of Lavergne have dimmed his eyes to the troubles of France. He sat silent in this House day after day and night after night, when men were being shot, rioting was taking place in the city of Montreal, and when dynamite was used to intimidate people who spoke in favour of the Military Service Act and compulsion. I pointed that out to him shortly before the session closed, and I told him the people of this country

would take dire vengeance on him for that, and I think they have. Now we are confronted again with the same topic. This law is not as complete as it should be. It should be made more complete. We have no desire to do any injury to those who are tilling the soil honestly. The farmer has just as high a duty to perform as the man in the trenches, and the man who is making munitions is the same as the man in the trenches.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A little bit easier.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, easier, and he is making more money. Still it is necessary work. I say that those men who are not doing that class of work, unless they are the sons of widows, with large families to look after—and there are cases of that kind—should be in khaki. I make, too, this statement, and I feel it in my heart that when those 60,000 men in Quebec are in khaki they will be the happiest men in Canada. Every one of these men from Quebec that I have seen is a brave soldier. I have never seen one of them turn his back to the foe. I do not think any one of the 60,000 will do that when in action. How can we go on trifling as we are doing? If you trifle with fire, it will burn you out of house and home, and that is what is occurring here.

I have one word to say to the people of Canada. It with regret that I have brought this matter up, but we must have this question threshed out here, because the Empire at the present moment is at one of the most critical periods of its history, and no one knows that better than I and my companions in the war. The newspapers are not giving the whole facts of the critical situation. This country has not yet realized the seriousness of it, and has not yet conscripted itself. We have not taken the matter into consideration at all. Under this Military Service Act the first thing that should be done would be to put every man in uniform, in class A, unless he can show immediate cause why he should not be taken. He should be drilled, at all events, and we should have had men under arms constantly. I differ from the Government on that point, but I think I am right, and I say at this very minute that every man who is not fulfilling his duty to his country in carrying on should be conscripted at once. I say the farmer's son who is playing pool in the villages, instead of doing something on the farm, should be taken at once and put in khaki, and there should be less nonsense about this process of law. You will never get men there by process of law. Every lawyer in Quebec is loaded up with work. They tell me it has already cost the draftees in that province over two million dollars to fight their cases for exemption so far. We cannot carry on war with writs, or with exemption boards. We must have men and munitions, and that is the only way we can carry on. I say, without reservation, that the people of this country, in no uncertain tone, gave this Government a mandate to carry out the conscription law, not merely to carry on before exemption boards, but they said to us that we should see that men are got to go to the front. That is the objective point—not the central appeal judge, or anything of that kind. And I ask every hon. member in this House who has been elected as a supporter of that measure, was that not the only issue? How can you go home and look in the face the men and women who sent you here, unless you carry out their mandate? There are no party ties to tie you down; there is no patronage here any more. You have no party ties. What excuse can you give to the people who elected you members of this House, elected you on that one issue alone, to see that men are sent to the front; to win the war? What excuse can you give to the people if you allow this matter to drag on as it has been dragging? I very much regret to have to say this, and I appeal to you, hon. members, and to the Government to carry on the work that you are doing and to hasten with it. The people are not satisfied with 1,500 men in seven months from Quebec, or any other part of the country. The people realized, during the last election, that unless a law was placed on the statute books which would compel every province to do its duty, every province which did its duty would have to send three men instead of one, and Quebec would send none. That is what they thought, and that is why they supported this Government, and sent us here.

There is something that appeals to me in higher tones than that. When I pick up the paper daily and read of the struggle that is taking place at the front every hour and every minute, it calls to my mind the combat of the flight of the star-lights, making day out of night, the guns with their red muzzles flashing night and day, the tremendous detonations of the high explosive shells; all around the geysers of earth sent into the air hundreds of feet by the explosions and falling around you, the tatoo of the machine guns, the rattle of the muskets, the shouts of the men in close, mortal combat, the groans of the wounded

and the dying. All these things come to my mind, and I can see before me the pallid faces of the dead, who have perished for you and for me, and the mangled forms of the wounded who are being carried off the field. To you, my comrades in this House, who have served in this war—there are a few of us here, thank God—I say, "Keep faith with the living and the dead, as you promised, in Flanders Fields."

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, I noted the words of caution which fell from your lips when this resolution was introduced, and I am conscious at this time that one perhaps lays himself open to a measure of criticism in bringing up this question or discussing it on the floor of this House. There are those in the House and out of it who think perhaps it should not have been done. On the other hand, Sir, if we are not to be permitted to discuss a matter of this kind, or kindred matters, on the floor of the House where, within the confines of Canada, will we find a more appropriate or fitting place? As I conceive my duty as the representative of a constituency in this country, it is to endeavour to properly present to my colleagues in the House the views of those whom I represent.

We are told by some who think that perhaps this question should not have been brought up that we should have more consideration for our fellow citizens in the province of Quebec, because they have a unique character, because they are distinct from the rest of Canada, and because they have traditions and customs which we must observe and respect. To a large degree I frankly acknowledge that that is the case, and it is not my intention to-day to violate in any way the opinions or feelings of my fellow citizens in the province of Quebec, but I desire to remind you, Sir, and this House that the citizens of the rest of Canada have rights just as well as the citizens of Canada in the province of Quebec. Throughout the length and breadth of this country we have families who have sent two, three, four or five sons to the front. My attention was brought to one in my own city—the fifth son gone to the front, three dead and one lying in a hospital in England. Families such as that have some claim to the attention of the administrators of the law in this country.

It has been rumoured that the second class was about to be called up. I wish to say with the utmost frankness, and with all respect and consideration for what the words may mean, that I think the Government would be exceedingly ill-advised in calling up the second class until adequate and definite efforts had been made, and successfully made, to exhaust those who come under the first class.

British law, Mr. Speaker, is fundamentally rooted in the principles of impartiality, firmness of application, and persistence. I am reminded of the long trip of several thousand miles made into the Arctic regions a couple of years ago by two or three Mounted Police officers to apprehend two murderers. After sixteen months they brought these two murderers from the Arctic circle to Edmonton and they were there tried. That is simply an illustration of the administration of British law wherever the British flag flies. I am reminded of the famous Cameron case in Abyssinia, and there are many others that might be called to mind. But we have this condition in Canada to-day, that with the same law and with the same constitution of courts we have entirely diverse interpretations of this Act of Parliament. In one province it is viewed from one standpoint and you have a certain application of it. In eight provinces we find a directly opposite interpretation and application. It must be apparent to every man of commonsense that one of two things is wrong, and perhaps the two things are wrong—either that the law itself is faulty and needs amendment or correction or strengthening, or else that there is a tendency on the part of one section of the community to disregard the law. It must be one of these two things, or perhaps in a measure it may be the two, and what I wish to draw to the attention of the House is that it cannot and must not be allowed to continue. The law must be impartially administered in all sections of the country. We had the assurance of the right hon. the Prime Minister the other day that it would be so, and I must say that I am willing to admit, and to frankly and cheerfully admit, that I trust in the good faith of the Prime Minister. But, Sir, in my province, in the Western Provinces and in Ontario, you find tribunals constituted under this Act——

Mr. SPEAKER: I am reluctant to interrupt the hon. member but in so far as I have been able to follow the discussion he has been confining himself entirely to the Military Service Act. The resolution deals with rioting in Quebec.

Mr. STEVENS: May I have a word of explanation? I have pursued this course

with the purpose of asking a question and I will ask the question now: Why these riots and why the failure of the administration of the Act in the city and province of Quebec? In asking that question and in dealing with it——

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it is inevitable that reference must be made to the Military Service Act in connection with the riots in Quebec. At the same time it is not competent for any hon. member to confine his discussion to the Military Service Act.

Mr. STEVENS: I was not intending to do so, but I was asking the question: Why did these riots occur in the province of Quebec? By the evidence laid on the Table officially by the Prime Minister we find that these riots were directly the result of the effort to administer the Military Service Act. In the administration of the Military Service Act in the province of Quebec and in the rest of Canada we see a distinct difference. I am willing, Mr. Speaker, to submit to your ruling, but I was going on to say when you stopped me, in explanation of the point I am making, that in all sections of the country outside of the province of Quebec the tribunals administered the Act without the assistance or appearance of lawyers or anybody representing those who appeared or appealed. There was a summary administration of the Act. Generally speaking, the public accepted the Act in that spirit and from that standpoint. In the province of Quebec we find that the administration of the same law and with substantially the same machinery, endless technical appeals did occur so that there are practically no results from the Act in that province.

Now then, we are brought face to face with the question: Why this failure in that one province when apparently there was success in the other provinces? That brings me to this point and I wish to make it the chief point in my remarks. I do not think that we will evade trouble in the province of Quebec such as unfortunately occurred last week, I do not think that the Military Service Act will be successfully administered so long as it is placed under the Justice Department of this Government. I say that advisedly, and with no desire to cast reflections personally upon the Minister of Justice. He is placed in a most awkward position, a minister of the Crown charged with certain duties, but a citizen of a province whose practically unanimous opinion was against this law, and in which province there exists a large section of the community bitterly opposed even to the administration of the law now that it is enacted. Let me make myself clear on that point by disclaiming any charge of a wholesale character against the province of Quebec, because in the last week I have met many citizens from Quebec, representing a large section of that province, who say that they wish the law to be enforced; and still we are bound to admit, if we are frank at all, that a large section of the province is determined to oppose the administration of the law to the limit of their ability.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Mr. STEVENS: The right hon. gentleman says "No." I would be very glad when he comes to speak, if he should give the House some assurance that he speaks with authority as representing a section of his own constituency which acted as they did in the most unfortunate manner the other day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: And I might also suggest to the right hon. gentleman, and I do it with all respect, that perhaps his own presence in the city of Quebec might have had a better effect than leaving intervenvention to Armand Lavergne, or other members of that particular class and kind.

I say that I do not think the Act can be properly administered in that province by the Minister of Justice, or the Justice Department, so as to avoid a recurrence of these troubles, and I think it is desirable that these gentlemen should take into consideration the possibility of such recurrence. The Justice Department has been known, I think, to all the former members of this House as a sort of embalming emporium to which is committed all knotty and embarrassing questions by the Government. If it is desired to bury a question so that it will not see the light of day again for any considerable period it is usually handed to the Justice Department. I might say that in a sense perhaps that is a useful function, because very often the Government is confronted with embarrassing questions; but, Mr. Speaker, this was an Act that demanded the utmost expedition in its application. We were told last summer, and told repeatedly in this House, that it was absolutely necessary to pass this Act in order to keep faith with the boys at the front. We went before the people of Canada with that cry, and they sent us back here almost solid from every province of the country, except one province, with

the mandate that this Act should be enforced, and enforced impartially and swiftly; and yet, we cannot say for one moment, by the widest stretch of imagination that the Minister of Justice, or his department, has enforced it with any degree of expedition.

There is one other phase of this question to which I wish to refer, and to add my voice to that of the mover of the resolution, and it is to make a definite protest against any further toleration of the doctrines preached by Bourassa and Lavergne in Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: In my city, Mr. Speaker, a man simply refused to report—he was guilty of no violation of the law, but simply refused to report. He was seized, and he is now serving a term of two years in a penitentiary, and he was not even allowed to see his friends. I made no complaint, and I make no complaint, but I cannot see why an English-speaking man in one section of the country should get two years in a penitentiary for simply passive objection, and the conduct of others should be winked at, year in and year out, who are guilty of the utmost sedition and most violent opposition to the law of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: The Order in Council brought down by the Prime Minister is, without question, a decided advance beyond what we have seen in the past in an effort to administer this law; but there is one weakness in it. Before that Order in Council will become effective in the application of military authority there must have been a violation of the law in the form of an outbreak. What we are up against, Mr. Speaker, and the underlying cause of these riots, is the passive resistance to this Act, through the technical medium of the courts, the pettifogging legal technicalities against its enforcement. That is a point the Government must remedy. Until the Government remedies that point, until it so amends this Act that it can be enforced in the province of Quebec, as in other sections of the country, impartially and firmly and without any hesitation or delay —until that is done I say there will be a great deal of dissatisfaction in other parts of Canada as well. I was told by an ex-member of this House the day before yesterday, something of a surprising character. He represented in this House for some years a constituency, one-half English-speaking and the other half French-speaking. He said the members of the tribunals in the constituency were French-speaking, and that if an English-speaking applicant came before the tribunal he was promptly enrolled and not allowed exemption.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

Mr. STEVENS: When a French speaking applicant came before the tribunal he was allowed exemption.

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY: The hon. gentleman should give us the name of the tribunal in question.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will have to accept my word that the information came from an ex-member of this House, and I do not want to expose him to possible indignities by giving his name.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is this: That there seems to be a passive, shall I say defiance of this law in one province, while there is a rigid enforcement of it in the other provinces. The causes to my mind are those that I have pointed out, first, and before all, the agitation and sedition preached for years by Bourassa, Lavergne and those associated with them, and, secondly, the slow, cumbersome, involved administration of this law by the Justice Department.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The mover of this motion was kind enough in his remarks to say that at one time he had some regard for me but that I have sadly fallen from grace in his eyes. May I say to him that on the present occasion the hon. gentleman has sadly disappointed me. I thought he moved his motion in order to discuss the riots and disturbances which took place recently in the city of Quebec, but he discussed altogether another question. He discussed the enforcement of the Act and the action of the exemption tribunals, but as to the riots in the city of Quebec he hardly said a word.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think it my duty, Sir, to speak of the riots that have taken place in Quebec. I have the honour to be the member of the constituency in which these riots took place and that honour I have enjoyed for now upwards of forty years. I know the people well, and I repeat what I said on a former occasion: that there is not to be found in any part of Canada a more peacable or law-abiding population. I think I may also add that they are a sensitive population, sensitive to resent injustice, and perhaps more sen-

sitive yet to resent a harsh act and an unkind word.

It was my duty, upon learning of the disturbances that had taken place in Quebec, to try to inform myself as to the facts, the reports being so little in accord with what I know of the constituency of Quebec East. I wished to inform myself as to what were the causes which could have brought about a condition of affairs so utterly at variance with the character of the constituency, as long as I have known it. Sir, I think now that I pretty well know the genesis of the disturbances which took place.

I said on a former occasion to the Prime Minister that if there have been disturbances, the fault was largely with the men who were entrusted with the duty of enforcing the Act. I do not complain at all of the higher officers in the district. So far as I know them, they are men of honour and have tried to do their duty. But, Sir, as to the men who were entrusted with the duty of putting into force Section 15 of the Military Service Act, a more unfortunate selection could not have been made. Section 15 of the Act cited by the Prime Minister empowers any officer of the law to ask any man whom he meets for his papers. This is an inquisitorial power, and everybody knows—and in saying this I am sure that I place myself in the judgment of every member of this House—that this inquisitorial power, to be effective, and not to be resented, must be executed with proper regard to the dignity and honour of the man who is subjected to it. My right hon. friend said that the origin of the riots was the arrest of a young man named Mercier by the officers of the law. I had better quote the words of the right hon. gentleman:

> It appears that a young man named Mercier had been asked by the Dominion police engaged in the enforcement of the Military Service Act for his exemption certificate, which he did not have with him. He was taken into custody until the certificate could be produced. As a matter of fact, under the provisions of section 15 of the Military Service Act, it was his duty to produce it when called upon to do so. The certificate was sent for and produced, whereupon he was immediately discharged.

These words are true, but that is not the whole story, and I will now endeavour—and I am sure that what I say will not be gainsaid by subsequent information received by the Government—to give the facts. Mercier is a young man who resides on Notre Dame street in the city of Quebec. There is on that street a bowling alley and billiard room called Salle Frontenac. On Thursday of last week, about half-past eight in the evening, he went to the bowling alley. He was in company with a man named Deslauriers. I have his affidavit here, but it is in French, and perhaps I may summarize it. He says that he saw as he came in two of the constables who had been entrusted with the enforcement of the Act in the city of Quebec. One is known as Major Evanturel, because at one time it is said he was connected with the militia. The name of the other constable was Belanger. When Mercier saw Evanturel, and was told that Belanger was in the room, he said to his friend: "We had better go out." Why did he say that? Having seen with his own eyes this man Evanturel, and having heard that this man Belanger was there, he said: "Let us go out." The fact is that this man Belanger is as well known in the city of Quebec as was Barabbas at Jerusalem. He is known to be a boxer, a pugilist, a bully and a disturber of the peace, always fond of showing off his strong muscles. His career is this: He has been most of his life a bartender. Some two or three years ago he obtained a license as a tavern keeper, and his license was subsequently taken away from him for cause. This is the character of the man who in the city of Quebec is entrusted with the enforcement of such a delicate law as the Military Service Act. Evanturel belongs to an old and respectable family, but unfortunately he is one of those degenerates who have gone down and down and down in the scale of life until to-day—for the sake of his family—I would not say what I think of him. At all events, he is not acceptable as a respectable citizen. He also is one of the officers entrusted by the Government with the enforcing of the Act. If such be the character of the officers of the law it is no wonder that this young man Mercier said to his friend: "Let us go out." As they were nearing the door they were met by two spotters, evidently under the control of Belanger and Evanturel, and were asked for their papers. Deslauriers produced his papers at once. Mercier fumbled in his pockets, but it so happened that he had not his papers with him. He had left them in the pocket of another coat. Thereupon he said to the officers: "I have not my papers with me; they are at home; will you come with me to the telephone; I will telephone to my parents at once to bring the papers." The officers would not grant this very reasonable request. Now, Sir, would it not strike everybody that the duty of those officers should have been to wait until he had telephoned to get his papers? But they

insisted on bringing the man to the station. A squabble ensued, and this was the origin of the trouble. Now, Sir, I do not at all intend to excuse the squabble which ensued in which there was a free fight between the Dominion police, the men I have just mentioned, and the crowd. Violence is always to be deprecated and must be condemned whenever it occurs. But, after all, there is some excuse to be given for a man who is provoked into violence. I believe that if nothing else had followed in the succeeding days there would have been peace in Quebec. This was the first act of the drama; this was the origin of the squabble on the 28th of March.

The following day the disturbance continued and on a far greater scale. I must say that upon this, my conclusion is—after having investigated the matter for my own sake, and having been in communication with my friends and my constituents in the city of Quebec, that the trouble which took place on Friday the 29th of March was caused by a secret association of some kind. What it is, I do not know. I am sure of one thing. The origin of that association is not in the city of Quebec. The instigators of the trouble are not Quebec men.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They are not Quebec men. I asked my friends and constituents to tell me who were the leaders of these riots, and one and all tell me that they did not know them. It is known as a fact, that on that Friday evening there was a motor car in which there were four persons who appeared to be the leaders of the movement, and so far as my information goes at the present time, those four persons do not belong to the city of Quebec. Who are those men? That the movement was organized is undoubted. Who were behind it? My impression is—I have no information upon this, but I will give my reasons for believing what I am going to say—that it is the same gang which attempted to terrorize the city of Montreal last summer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This gang was composed of the scum of the city of Montreal such scum as is to be found in every large city and is ready to create disturbance in every civil commotion. The leaders of it were penitentiary birds, convicts, who had been released by the Department of Justice some months previously. In saying that I do not desire to impugn the good faith of the Minister of Justice, but I do say this:

if he had exerted the least caution before releasing these men; if he had taken the trouble to secure information from the police officials of Montreal, he would have been told that these convicts were habitual criminals, penitentiary birds. They were arrested a short time afterwards. One of them committed suicide before arrest; he belonged to a very respectable family, and I shall not bring the name of that family into this House. Everybody in Montreal knows to whom I refer. The other man, an ex-convict, was a man of the most pronounced criminal tendencies—tendencies which he had inherited; he was a degenerate. The third man, Lalumière, is now in jail in Montreal awaiting trial. He was tried once before, but the jury could not agree. The other man was Desjardins, a detective employed by the Department of Justice; and it has been proved that he was one of the instigators of all the acts of violence which occurred in Montreal. This man is of such a character that he could not get bail in Montreal, and the Department of Justice accordingly deposited a cheque for $10,000 to guarantee his appearance in court. I may add that he too was tried,

5 p.m.

the jury could not agree, and again he has been freed on bail furnished by the Department of Justice.

What makes me say that these men are the instigators of all this trouble in the city of Quebec? This fact is certain; the leaders of the movement were not men from the city; they were strangers, wherever they came from. I speak positively with regard to this; I am quite satisfied that the statements which I now make cannot be contradicted. My reasons for believing that this is the same gang which operated in Montreal are as follows: on Friday or Saturday of last week placards were posted in the city of Quebec around the Canadian Pacific Railway station and in most of the principal streets in the division of St. Roch. These are the same placards which were posted in Montreal during last summer at the time of the agitation which then took place. They are the same print, on the same paper, showing the same cartoons and containing the same words. The friend from whom I have this information is in a position to know that these placards are the same as those posted in Montreal, and must be some which had not then been used. If this be the case, you have a clue to the circumstances which have brought about that riot.

Is the city of Quebec the only place in the Dominion where disturbances have oc-

curred? Have there not been disturbances in Toronto, in Calgary, in many other places? Perhaps these disturbances were not of the magnitude of those which took place at Quebec, but they were almost as bad. Is it not a fact that the Premier of Ontario had to take refuge against a hostile crowd not more than a month ago? All these things have happened. I do not say that by way of excusing what has taken place in Quebec; I say it simply by way of explanation. An hon. gentleman—I think it was the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens)—seemed to be astonished when I said that there was no inclination on the part of the province of Quebec to disobey the law. I say that there is no inclination on the part of the people there to disobey the law. The law is not popular; that I admit, but every man of official standing in the province, from the Attorney General down, has stated to the people that the law must be obeyed, unpopular though it be. And we want to obey it.

Sir, the trouble is not all on one side. There seems to be an inclination somewhere to put the blame on the civil authorities of Quebec city; to establish that on the part of the French Canadian population there is a disposition to evade or to break the law. I see in the Montreal Gazette of to-day—a very respectable paper usually—a despatch from Quebec with the following striking heading:

Civil Powers Make Trouble for Military.

It is a very serious indictment, to say that the civil powers are making trouble for the military. I received, a few hours ago from the office of the Attorney General of Quebec, this statement with regard to this very despatch:

Article in Montreal Gazette, page 1, column 8, entitled "Civil Powers Make Trouble for Military," is untrue and misleading. Both the civil and military authorities are working in perfect harmony and this statement can be confirmed by General Lessard himself.

The Government have availed themselves of the services of General Lessard, whom they have brought to Quebec to quell this disturbance. I congratulate the Government upon this step which they at last have taken. General Lessard should have been used long ago. If he had been called to service in the early months of the war, perhaps there would be no trouble to quell to-day in the city of Quebec. If recruiting in Quebec has not been as for my part I would wish, it must be remembered that after all the trouble is not on one side only. The Government is not free from blame in respect to their method of dealing with this matter in the province of Quebec. I do not wish to create any more bad blood than exists; I simply say in good faith to my friends on the other side of the House, that it would be unfortunate if the Government attempted to pass the city over to the military authorities and not to use the civil authorities. Let the military and the civil authorities work together, and I make bold to say that there will be no further trouble in the city of Quebec.

Speaking with what authority I may have as representative of Quebec city and as holding the position which I now occupy, I can say that in Quebec the people are prepared to accept these three principles: first, that the law must be obeyed; second, that property must be respected; third, that peace must be preserved.

That is the spirit in which I intend to discuss this matter. Heaven is my witness that on this occasion I have no intention of endeavouring to create further difficulty or further trouble. What I want is what I have always wanted in this war—to help so far as I can to win the war. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) was kind enough to refer to some ideas which I expressed in the city of Quebec many years ago. These ideas, Sir, I have never departed from, not even in the position which I took in this House against the Conscription Bill. As my hon. friend was good enough to quote from a remark which I made in Quebec, he might have quoted also from my last speech which I delivered in that city, when I opened the campaign in the last election. Did I there say anything at all to which he can take exception? Did I encourage the people of Quebec not to respect the law? On the contrary I said that the law must be respected, must be obeyed. My hon. friend asked me why I did not continue the course which I previously adopted; why I opposed the policy of conscription, and he linked my name with that of Mr. Bourassa. I see he is a close reader of Mr. Bourassa's paper. That being so, he must know that Bourassa is no longer a friend of mine; we parted company long ago, and we have never resumed it again. Let him read Le Devoir and he will see that ever since the beginning of the session Bourassa has been very severe on me. But I am not responsible for that. I follow my own course, whoever finds fault with it, or whoever approves; I am what I have always been.

As to Mr. Lavergne. He was at one time a very close friend of mine, but we parted

company also. Mr. Lavergne was a candidate in Montmagny in the last election, but the young man who was elected in that county with my support, sits in this House to-day behind me. The views of Bourassa and Lavergne are not my views. The separation is not of to-day only; it goes back to the years 1910 and 1911, when I was opposed by Bourassa and his friends. And upon what ground? I took the stand that it was within the power of the Parliament of Canada to decree whether or not we should take part in the wars of Great Britain. Bourassa and Lavergne held that under no circumstances should we take part in the wars of Great Britain. For this difference of opinion I incurred their enmity, and they fought for the Conservative party; and my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) sitting there amongst the large majority in this House, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Bourassa.

He may ask me, why did I oppose the policy of conscription? I will answer him. I opposed the policy of conscription because I am a man of common sense; because I know human nature; because I know the conditions in this country. I knew that compulsory service would not bring the same results as the voluntary system. My hon. friend has alluded to the fact that the province of Quebec has not done as much as it should have done. I agree; I wish it had done more. But there is one way and one way only to deal with my fellow-countrymen. If you attempt to coerce them, they have too much of the Celtic blood not to resent it; but appeal to their heart and their imagination, and you will find them responsive. If that had been done, there would have been very different results.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Then why did not the hon. gentleman, as the representative of the French Canadian race, speak to his French Canadians in that way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did speak in that way to my French Canadian countrymen. Let the hon. gentleman read my speech in the city of Quebec in the month of November last, and he will see if I did not speak in that way. My hon. friend may say that I have not succeeded as well as I might have done; I agree, but I have had to fight extremists at both ends, the jingoists at one end and the Nationalists at the other. The stand I always took on conscription—and I think I can appeal to the memory of those of my old friends who are now sitting on the opposite side of the House—was that under existing circumstances it would not produce the results that were expected of it. It is said that the voluntary system failed. Sir, if we compare what has been done under the voluntary system with what has been done under the compulsory system, I think it will be admitted that we could have obtained better results if we had persevered with the voluntary system. But I did not come prepared to discuss that question to-day; we may have another opportunity later on. I thought that to-day we were going to discuss the riots in Quebec.

My hon. friend has attacked the attitude of French Canadians toward the war, and my own in particular, and I have this to say to him: On this question he and I are at the very antipodes; he is in favour of a policy that I am not in favour of. Sir, is this the first time that in a British Parliament a man has been branded as a traitor as I have been in the press during the last election and since? Is this the first time that a man standing in a British Parliament has taken a stand on his country's war which was not in accordance with the passions of the moment? I remember that during the South African War a young man of great promise in the British House of Commons took the position that England was in the wrong, and demanded that the war should be abandoned. He arraigned the Government for their policy, and was insulted in the House of Commons and in the streets and mobbed. On one occasion he escaped violence only by escaping from a meeting in the disguise of a policeman. That man to-day, Sir, is the Prime Minister of England, Lloyd George himself. Sir, the shame is not on Lloyd George for having followed the dictates of his conscience. But, his judgment was wrong. I believe—nay, I am sure—that England was right in that war. I stated so at the time, and I state so now; England perhaps was not free from fault, but, Sir, it was Kruger himself who drew up the insolent ultimatum that brought on the war. There was another occasion upon which one of the greatest men of the last century opposed the Government of the day in carrying on a war, and that man was John Bright. With all the splendour of his majestic eloquence he arraigned the Government for entering on a war that he said was senseless and causeless, and the judgment of the historian will be that John Bright was right, and that Lloyd George, on a later occasion, was wrong.

There is still another occasion which I might recall to the memory of my hon.

friend. When the American colonies were goaded into insurrection by the British Government of that day, the great Earl of Chatham, who had done more for the glory and prosperity of England than any other man in many generations, came before the House with a resolution to the effect that the troops which the British Government had sent to fight the Americans should be recalled from America, and endeavours be made to satisfy their grievances. What is the language of the historian upon this proposal?

> It was in fact a proposal as startling and unexpected as that other very different one for an immediate war with Spain which he had submitted to a trembling Council, and it was the more courageous of the two. The man of decisive action was seen in both, and the wisdom of both proposals was justified by the event. It was the moment of crisis, and though the voices of the street and market place—

Mark the words—

> —would have derided the withdrawal of troops, as an act of cowardice, of weakness inexcusable in a mighty people, yet this was the one solution, and it was offered at the last available hour.

Sir, it is unfortunate, that at that time there was in the British Government men of the stamp of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) who were inclined to talk loudly and bully and brag. That is not my method. If the British Government had followed the advice of Lord Chatham probably they would have been able to obtain by conciliation what they failed to obtain by coercion.

Why do I bring this up? For this reason: Standing here in the closing years of my life, but still able to defend myself, I say that the policy that alone can unite this country is a policy of conciliation, and an appeal to all the best elements in us. That has been my policy for the fifty years that I have been in Parliament, and it shall remain my policy so long as God gives me health, and I hold a seat in this House.

It is true that to-day there are disturbances in Quebec, and I regret them as much as any man in the House, but if we are to accomplish what we desire in the province of Quebec—that is to say, the enforcement of the law, obedience to the law, preservation of property, and the maintenance of peace—for Heaven's sake let us drop once for all those fatal divisions and endeavour to create unity among our people. To-day, instead of this policy of conciliation, what have we? We have this last Order in Council presented by the Government, and this Order is not calculated to effect any good purpose towards winning the war. I desire as much as my hon. friend that England and France should be victorious, but I deprecate the methods which are adopted by this Order in Council. What do we find here? The first paragraph of this Order reads:

> Whereas on the 28th day of March last the opposition of a large number of the population of the city of Quebec to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder, broke out in open violence and serious riots ensued on that day and on subsequent days, in which the rioters destroyed the office of the Deputy Registrar appointed for the district of Quebec under the said Act, and moreover caused great damage to other property, and threatened further damage, and it became necessary for the restoration of order, the protection of property and the preservation of the King's peace that these riots should be suppressed by military authority;
>
> And whereas at common law it is the duty of a military officer with the troops under his command to interfere when such interference is necessary to put down riot, insurrection or civil disturbance.

With this statement of the law I have no fault to find. It is in fact the common law of England, as I have always understood it. The military authorities are not bound to wait until the civil authorities call for help, if, in their own judgment and conscience, they believe the civil authorities are not doing enough, and that the peace should be preserved by military authority. In such case, they have a right to interfere. I do not dispute that, and, so far as that goes, I agree with it entirely, but what I am not prepared to agree to is that the common law can be amended by Order in Council. It can be amended only by the power of Parliament, and Sir, what a falling down of the Government within the last three days. The Prime Minister referred to this very question three days ago, and he said:

> Further than that, if in any part of this country it appears that, by reason of the enforcement of this Act, the municipal or local authorities are unable or are not disposed to preserve public order, it will devolve upon the Government of this country to see that public order is preserved, and we intend to perform that duty.

The military authorities can step in, if they think the civil authorities are not performing their duty. The question then remains that if the military authorities proceed without reference to the civil authorities, it is for a jury to determine whether they are within their rights. If the military authorities are endeavouring to perform their duty, they may be amenable to a civil jury to say whether they have per-

formed their whole duty. The statement of the Prime Minister proceeds:

> The incidents which have taken place have made it apparent to the Government that some amendments will be necessary to the Military Service Act. One of those which is now in preparation is this: That persons who engage in active or forcible resistance to the enforcement of the Act shall be forthwith enrolled in the military forces of Canada, without regard to whether their class has been called out.

Three days ago the Prime Minister, speaking in his place, stated that, in order to put in uniform a man who is not to-day called upon to go on service by the law, it was necessary to have an amendment to the Military Act. To-day this is done by Order in Council. Where is the authority of the Governor in Council to amend the statute? My hon. friend will tell me he has that power under the War Measures Act. If he tells me that, I will tell him if he has that power under the War Measures Act, he has the same power to conscript everybody, without the authority of Parliament, simply by Order in Council. But he has not that authority, and he knows it well. He had to pass a statute last session in order to enforce conscription. That law has been passed, and now when he tells me that this law which was placed on the statute last year can be amended by Order in Council, I say it is simply an abuse of the powers which are vested in the Governor in Council, and it is assuming a power which the Governor in Council does not possess.

We are here to-day, proud to say that we are British subjects. At all events I am proud to say so. I have always proclaimed myself a British subject. No man is a greater admirer of British institutions than I am. And why? Because if there is one authority in the British Empire which is the supreme authority, it is not the power of the King, but it is the majesty of the law; and a law can be destroyed only by another law. But let me call attention of my hon. friend to this precedent: In 1798, when Ireland was in a state of rebellion, the French had sent an expedition to Ireland under the command of General Hoche, and Wolfe Tone, a member of that expedition, was captured by the military authorities, court-martialled and sentenced to death. But habeas corpus proceedings were taken, and Wolfe Tone was taken out of the custody of the military authorities, and declared a free subject—free from the military authorities altogether. My last word is this: We must have peace, we must have order, we must have protection for our property and the law must be observed. I say this with the greater authority in that I am not a believer in the law. I thought it was a mistake, but it has been adopted by the Canadian people, and the will of the people is the law.

Right hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been put forward in this debate. I shall not pretend, in making the few observations that I shall offer, to follow precisely everything that has been alleged by all the speakers. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has gone into these matters with a good deal of detail as to which it is perhaps not necessary that I should follow him. I should not care to commit myself absolutely to his conception of the events that occurred during the last session of Parliament. He, and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) as well, seemed to be impressed with the idea that the Military Service Act has been enforced with too great moderation in the province of Quebec, and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is impressed with a contrary appreciation of the situation in that province.

There were some observations made in regard to the newspaper press of the country and particularly the newspaper press in the province of Quebec. The general principle of British parliamentary government—and that principle has received no stronger illustration than in the United Kingdom itself—has been not to interfere with the right of free speech unless it is absolutely necessary by reason of a great emergency. Any one who has seen men, even during this war, airing their opinions and criticisms in Hyde Park will realize the truth of what I am saying. I do not know anything about the advertisement which is alleged to have been inserted in Le Devoir. I presume the hon. gentleman who brought it to the attention of the House is right in his conception that these matters have been left to some business agency apart altogether from any consideration of patronage and that the advertisement has found its way into the columns of Le Devoir in that way. I do not know of any other explanation.

Reference was also made by the hon. member for Simcoe to Col. Machin's interview with Col. Lavergne. I have documents under my hand to show that the interview which took place, I think at the suggestion of Mr. Taschereau, was not an interview

by Col. Machin in any official capacity as he so explained to Col. Lavergne at the time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Alleyn Taschereau?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Alleyn Taschereau. I have Mr. Taschereau's statement and Col. Machin's statement in regard to it. It is not necessary for me to stop to read these to the House. I shall give them to the press afterwards if necessary. At all events I believe that the statements of these gentlemen give a correct version of what occurred.

The hon. member for Simcoe seemed to think that very drastic amendments should be made to the Military Service Act. He suggests that every man in Canada should have been taken from his occupation and put under drill at once.

Mr. CURRIE: I did not say that; I said those in class "A".

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He suggests that every one in class "A" should be taken from his ordinary and usual avocation and put under drill at once. My hon. friend and the members of the House generally will realize that such was not the principle upon which the Military Service Act was passed. The Military Service Act received the approval of a very large majority in the last Parliament and it also received very strong support from the people of Canada in the last election. It was based upon the principle that we should endeavour to find out, as to every man in Canada, whether or not he would give better service at the front or better service in the avocation in which he is engaged. That was the principle which commended itself to us and that was the principle which was affirmed by the people at the last election. I do not deny that it may be necessary, and I have so stated in the House, to make amendments to the Military Service Act, and as my right hon. friend has observed, we have made one already. I shall come to his criticism of the action of the Government in that regard in a very few moments.

The hon. member for Vancouver, if I gathered his meaning correctly, seemed to be under the impression that there had been one application of this law in eight provinces of Canada and an entirely different application of it in the province of Quebec. So far as the efforts of the Government are concerned I must take the strongest possible objection to such a statement. There has been nothing of the kind. The effort of the Government has been to enforce this law impartially, considerately, firmly and without any distinction whatever in every province of Canada. That has been the purpose and it has been carried out to the best of our ability. I want to say, in justice to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), that no man could have worked more indefatigably to give that Act effect in the province of Quebec than he has done during all the time that he has had it under his administration. Hon. gentlemen who are suggesting that the Government have been lax in the enforcement of this law in Quebec should recollect that it has been enforced with sufficient firmness in that province to bring about the unfortunate conditions which have prevailed in the city of Quebec during the past week. On the one hand we are told that the disturbances in the city of Quebec are due to the fact that we have enforced this law too rigorously and too sternly——

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And on the other hand we are told that the law has been enforced in a very lax manner in that province.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not what I said. What I said was that the way in which the Act was being administered in the province of Quebec was entirely different from the way it was being administered in the other eight provinces.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I accept the correction of my hon. friend and I shall come to that in a moment. What step did the Government take when this Act was first proclaimed? The Minister of Justice brought a recommendation to Council that a Military Service Council should be formed. The Deputy Minister of Justice was a member of that Council of which the Minister of Justice was chairman. The gentlemen who were selected were very able and capable men. They were Colonel Biggar from Edmonton, Colonel Moss from Toronto, Colonel Machin from the western part of the province of Ontario and Mr. Loranger from Quebec. They have been active and indefatigable, giving their whole time to the work and there has been no step taken and no act done or left undone in so far as I am aware, without their absolute approval and concurrence.

I realize perfectly that the conditions in the province of Quebec have made it difficult, not to enforce the Act, but to enforce it with the expedition which the Government, and the country for that matter, would

have desired. I entirely understand and appreciate that, but I should like the House and the country to understand that there are some misapprehensions abroad as to what the total result of that Act has been up to the present time. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told us a moment ago the we would have had better results in procuring reinforcements for the overseas service if we had adhered to the voluntary system. He did not give us any evidence in support of that statement, and I venture to say that his view on that subject cannot be supported by any evidence.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the month of August last we recruited 3,117 men. In the month of September last we recruited 3,588 men, and there is not the slightest doubt that a good many of these men came to the colours for the reason that they knew compulsory service was about to be enforced.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Without that Bill before the House there is no question that the number who came forward in that way would have been very much smaller. What have we done during the last seven weeks? I have given the figures for August and September, which comprise nearly nine weeks, but in the last seven weeks, by means of the Military Service Act, we have brought to the colours 16,000 men. I venture to say, with the utmost possible confidence, that no such results, no results even approaching them, could have been attained if we had continued the system of voluntary service.

I should like to say further that since the first day of October last, which is about the date on which this Act was proclaimed, 50,000 men have joined the Canadian colours; 18,000 of these have been recruited in the United States, and 32,000 have been recruited under the Military Service Act. From the first day of October, 1917, to the thirtieth day of this present month of April, if the anticipated sailings for the present month are such, as I have no doubt they will be, we shall have sent overseas to the support of the gallant men who are fighting our battles there, about 47,000 Canadian soldiers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Now, with regard to conditions in the province of Quebec, I have stated publicly, and I state it here again, that in many parts of that province exemptions were granted almost wholesale by the tribunals of first instance. There is no doubt about that. What was the result? The Government had given its pledge to the people of Canada that it would see to it that that Act was enforced fairly, and impartially, and firmly in every province. What, then, was our duty? Our duty was to see to it that by appeals we brought these cases up to the Central Appeal Judge, so that in the end there would be a fair, a just, a uniform and an impartial administration of that Act for all the provinces and all the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have done that. A great many appeals have already come up from the province of Quebec to the Central Appeal Judge—appeals lodged by the Government of this country, and necessarily so, in order that there might be a just and fair enforcement of the Act. I believe that there are at the present time above twenty thousand appeals which have been disposed of by the appelate tribunals in the province of Quebec, and which are being brought up to the Central Appeal Judge as rapidly as possible.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Is it true that only six hundred of these appeals have reached the Central Appeal Judge?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not prepared to state how many have reached him. I say that that number I have mentioned are ready to come forward. In order that they may be brought forward they have to be classified, information has to be procured, a case has to be stated for the Central Appeal Judge, and eventually, when the appeals begin to come forward in rapidly increasing numbers in the immediate future, it will probably be necessary that the Central Appeal Judge, in order that they may be expeditiously disposed of, shall have further assistance, which he can obtain under the terms of the Military Service Act. But besides that, as I understand, there are more than twenty thousand other cases in the province of Quebec, nearly all, if not all, of which have been passed upon by the tribunals of first instance, but which have not yet been passed upon by the appelate tribunals. Of course, it was the duty of the Government, with such a mass of appeals in that province, to expedite by every possible means in its power the hearing of those appeals, and that the Government has done. The Minister of Justice, since he returned to Ottawa, about the middle of January, made a personal visit to the city of Montreal, saw the Chief Justice and the other judges of the courts there, and urged upon

them, in the national interest, the absolute necessity that they should lay everything else to one side and expedite these appeals. He had an interview also with Sir François Lemieux, Chief Justice of the Court in the Quebec district, and urged the same consideration upon him. The Minister of Justice found on the part of those judges an absolute disposition to lend themselves to the enforcement of the Act in this way. They have been disposing of these appeals very rapidly indeed in the city of Montreal, and I believe also in the city of Quebec. The appeals have been disposed of at the rate of about two thousand a week in Montreal; indeed, I am informed that all the civil business of the province has been put to one side by the provincial courts, and that those courts at the present time are occupying themselves absolutely and solely with the enforcement of the Military Service Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Under these circumstances, I venture to question whether under the terms of the Act as it stands to-day it would have been possible for the Government to have taken any measure which has not been taken. I also venture to believe that within the present month results will come from the enforcement of the Act by the disposal of these appeals which will be reasonably satisfactory to the Government, to the Parliament, and to the people of this country.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has spoken upon this question, sometimes with a good deal of warmth, and I desire to devote a few moments to certain of his observations. He stated in the early part of his remarks that the people of the district which he represents in Parliament, and in which these riots occurred, are highly sensitive to injustice. I do not know that the people there differ in that respect from the people of any other part of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All the people of Canada are sensitive to injustice, and all the people of Canada, I hope are law-abiding to as great an extent as those whom he represents. The right hon. gentleman states that on the occasion to which he alludes one of the young men produced his papers and the other did not; and, to the action of the officers on that occasion, he attributes the riots and disturbances which afterwards occurred. He attaches great importance to the fact that the young man was not permitted to telephone to his parents from the bowling alley, but was taken to the police station, and a telephone message, or some message, was there sent to his parents. That does not seem to be an incident which would reasonably account for the disturbance that subsequently took place. I assure my right hon. friend that incidents of the same character by the hundred have occurred in other parts of the country, and there has been no riot. I entirely admit that the enforcement of a law like this, without any previous system of registration, occasions a great deal of difficulty to the Government, and, very often, a great deal of inconvenience to the people among whom it is enforced. But we are in a time of war, and is there to be a riot in Quebec, or any where else, because, instead of permitting a young man to telephone to his home and bring his parents to him, he was taken to the police station and a message was sent from there? That was my right hon. friend's point, nothing more and nothing less. Upon that, and certain other considerations to which I shall call attention, he bases his argument. He says that the men who have been selected to enforce this Act in the province of Quebec are not of a proper type. But he also says that the higher officers who have been selected in that province are of the right type, and he found no fault with them. These constables were selected, I have not the slightest doubt, by the very men whom he commends, and he, and every hon. gentleman, must understand that when you seek for men to enforce an Act of this nature amongst an unsympathetic population you cannot always get men of the most polite and refined type.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Justice, and those who have been advising him in these matters, have undoubtedly done the best they could in that regard, and I find in the statements of my right hon. friend no justification whatever for his suggestion that these riots are due to some act of the Government

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And I feel that that observation, and cerain others, to which my right hon friend gave utterance, are particularly unfortunate in view of the conditions which prevail in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend says that the leaders in these disturbances were not Quebec men.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He said that they were not from Quebec city.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That they were not residents of Quebec city. I hope that is so. I do not know. But I do regret that, if they were not citizens of Quebec, the appeals which they made produced so great an effect upon the population of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend finds fault also with the Government because he thinks Gen. Lessard should have been employed sooner. My right hon. friend would not desire to mislead the House in any way, and therefore I presume that he has forgotten what I stated in the late Parliament. I personally sent for Gen. Lessard nearly two years ago and asked him to take charge of recruiting in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I not only asked him, but I very strongly urged him to do it; and after mature reflection and consideration he declined to undertake that duty. We sent him to the city of Quebec some months ago, and he remained there during the early part of the enforcement of this Act; and then, owing to requirements in the Maritime Provinces, he had to be sent there to deal with certain important matters. When this riot broke out we ordered him to proceed to Quebec and take command there, and he has done so. He has discharged his duty well and adequately and I do not doubt that he will continue so to do.

My right hon. friend then went on to criticise the Order in Council that we have brought down, and, in what sense I do not know, he said there has been a great falling down by the Government. He quoted some words which I uttered in this House a few days ago, and he intimated that in some way the Government had departed from that promise. I said that the Military Service Act was to be amended in a certain respect, and the Military Service Act has been amended in that respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend says that we should have come to Parliament. I say that, under the conditions that confront this country at the present time, we would have been derelict in our duty if we had waited to come to Parliament. I felt, and I still feel, that we should act at once, and we did act at once. It will be open to my right hon. friend, if he desires to do so, to challenge our action by a vote in this House.

He says that we should have the spirit of conciliation; that this is not the spirit of conciliation; that the Order in Council contains authority to give to the military control in any proclaimed district. That law is of general application throughout Canada, just as the Military Service Act is of general application. Whenever conditions arise in the province of Quebec, or in any part of that province, or in any other province in Canada, which bring it within the terms of that Order in Council, the powers which it confers will be exercised.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not for a moment agree that upon the considerations which my right hon. friend has put forward we could shrink from discharging a duty which we owe to the whole country at a time of riot and insurrection in Quebec city. My right hon. friend refers to the civil authorities. Why did not the civil authorities in the city of Quebec act when the riot first broke out?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The civil authorities did not act. Were we then to hold our hand? No, we are not to hold our hand. In this I think my right hon. friend agrees: that it was our duty to use such force as was found necessary to prevent disorder, to preserve public peace, and to ensure the enforcement of the Military Service Act. I would further suggest to my right hon. friend that expressions such as he has used are not helpful to that very conciliation for which he so strongly appeals. I concur in that appeal, but he tells us in a very eloquent period: "Now is the time to put aside all our differences, to stand together and unite as one people in the carrying on of this war;" then, in the same breath he attacks the Government in violent language and characterizes the passing of this necessary Order in Council as an abuse of power.

Some hon. MEMBERS: So it is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Do my hon. friends on the other side think that observations of that character are desirable under the conditions which prevail at present in this province?

Mr. McMASTER: We think that when Parliament is sitting the Government might trust the representatives of the Canadian people to legislate in accordance with the necessities of the situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And we think also that the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled will trust the Government in an emergency to act so that riot and insurrection shall not be repeated. Whether my hon. friend agrees with me or not, that is the policy by which this Government will stand or fall.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has not the Government of Canada the authority of the people, conferred under the War Measures Act, to act in such cases?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course it has. The War Measures Act of 1914 speaks for itself; it confers on the Government the most absolute authority in that regard. I entirely agree that under ordinary conditions it is proper for the Government to come to Parliament, and as a general rule we have observed that policy. But when there is emergency; when there is riot and insurrection, I venture to think that we would not be fit to sit on these benches unless we were prepared to act instantly. We have shown that we are prepared so to act, and, in the province of Quebec as elsewhere, we shall see to it that there is no obstruction to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, and that the King's peace is kept there as in every part of Canada.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 28, respecting The Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 29, respecting a patent of O. G. C. L. J. Overbeck.—Mr. Fripp.

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES.

MOTION BY MR. J. A. CURRIE TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE TO DISCUSS.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. J. A. Currie to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the rioting, agitation, disturbances, and non-observance of law in Quebec, together with all the circumstances, conditions and causes, near and remote, having any bearing on or connection therewith, resumed.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to say that I regret very much the disorderly scenes of which the city of Quebec has recently been the theatre. These disturbances should not have occurred, and those who are responsible for them have certainly incurred a very great responsibility. Whatever provocation there may have been, whatever abuses may have occurred, whatever resentment may have been caused by certain events which are still recent, there was no justification for rioting or unlawful resort to violence. The majesty of the law is supreme, and the law must be respected. I sincerely trust that in future better counsels will prevail and that the demand of my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be effectively responded to. But certainly the desired goal will not be reached as a result of the speeches we have been compelled to listen to this afternoon from the other side of the House. Order is frequently broken by passion, inadvertency, or blunder, but it can hardly be restored by monitors like the mover of this motion. He cannot even govern his own passion while condemning the impetuosity of others. Knowing the hon. gentleman as I do, I fully expected that he would use the unfortunate occurrences in the city of Quebec to gain what he thought would be a paltry advantage over political opponents—opponents, I might say, in the ranks of the Government, as well as on this side of the House. It has been suggested that we should let the vituperations of the hon. member pass unnoticed. I think every one will admit that since the opening of the session we on this side of the House have scrupulously refrained from doing or saying anything calculated to arouse passion or even excitement in the country. We have offered no criticism or comment on the disturbances that took place in the city of Quebec, being desirous that those whose obvious duty it was to restore peace and order should be untrammelled in every respect; but when hon. gentlemen have what I would call the insolence to come upon the floor of this House and throw mud at us—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. gentleman is using language that is hardly parliamentary.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw the word. I will say when hon. gentlemen insult us——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that is unparliamentary also.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Again I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not wish to clash with you, Sir, at the outset of my remarks. I will say when hon. gentlemen use language of a nature not calculated to please us—we can, of course, treat it with silent contempt. There is a limit, however, beyond which silence only invites further humiliation, and that is my excuse for answering the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). Perhaps some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House may be excused for attempting to divert attention from what has gone on in this House since the opening of the session. Quite a few of them have been daily shooting at the ministerial citadel, forgetful of the fact that it was garrisoned by themselves. It may be good tactics now to introduce a diversion and direct the shooting at the province of Quebec. The abusing of Quebec seems to be the only solid ground of this patriotic Union Government. If striking at the province of Quebec, if insulting us—I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker—if displeasing us is the only material that can cement the amalgamation, hon. gentlemen opposite are quite welcome to do it; we are able to withstand the onslaught. The history of the past and the lessons which have been bequeathed to us by our ancestors teach us that those who make the onslaught do not always come off victors in the fight. Certain supporters of the Government have been elected on the cry: "Quebec shall not rule Canada," and it is doubtless to be expected that the illegitimate products of such a narrow and brutal appeal will need the same food and fuel to maintain their spirit and effectiveness; and this must be the reason why the campaign against Quebec is still going on in so many quarters, while at the same time strong appeals are being made for unity and concord. The people of Quebec read and heard of both the abuse and the appeals. They read the sane articles of hon. members of this House when they are published in respectable newspapers and reviews, like the Canadian Magazine, for instance, and some of us even go to the extent of putting on a gas mask and reading the views expressed in the Orange Sentinel. Only a few days ago we were told by a certain minister of the Crown of the Ontario Government that we deserved to be classed with the Germans and Austrians. Now, everybody in the province of Quebec reads those utterances. That good Tory newspaper, the Quebec Chronicle, said of this particular minister that his statesmanship must be of the asinine kind; but that, I think, was most unfair to the ass, because even if the ass is as stupid as that gentleman, he is very much less of a mischief-maker. What is the purpose of all these attacks? Surely they are not made with the intention of converting us or changing our way of thinking. The campaign is not intended for circulation in our midst, and it is not conducted in a way calculated to have any good effect on our fellow-countrymen. Again, I ask, what is the purpose of that campaign? The only purpose I can see in it is to arouse passion and prejudice, and to create an ill feeling against two million fellow-Canadians for the sake of gaining a miserable political advantage. Especially is it to be regretted at this time when national unity is desired, not only for the successful prosecution of the war, but for the solution of the great national problems, and even the Imperial problems which will have to be solved during the after-war period. True it is that this eminent pork-seller and conserver of dead chickens, Sir Joseph Flavelle, notified us last year in his speech before the Canadian Club of Ottawa that we should have no voice in the solution of these problems, but he may have been mistaken, and the democratic people in all parts of the country may have just as much to say as the noble class of lords, barons, knights and others, of whom Sir Joseph Flavelle is so distinguished a representative. Sir, a better union is needed for Canada. Everybody admits that, except those who live out of hatred and discord and who nurse their wrath to keep it warm. But, Sir, the first condition of a possible union is mutual respect, to say nothing of common courtesy and politeness. Our partnership must be based on absolute equality and respect for pledges. We do not want to bury our Canadian aspirations, our customs, our higher traditions, ideals, and principles, even for the purpose of being friends. We believe that in this land which our forefathers discovered, and which they have built up and developed we have the right to live in the full enjoyment of liberty, and that nothing has ever happened to deprive us of that right. The sooner everybody realizes that it is impossible in this country for one of the great partners in the Canadian association to compel others to think as he does, or speak as he does, the better it will be for the country and for all concerned. The Germans have forced

the sons of Alsace and Lorraine to learn their ridiculous goose-step, but they have never won their hearts, and surely nobody in this country would like to copy Prussian methods. There is no disguising the fact that there is in Quebec province a disquieting feeling and a feeling of unrest, and it is, indeed, a tragedy to apply the fine word "union" to the work of disruption which the right hon. Prime Minister has been so unfortunate as to achieve. Conscription and the circumstances under which it was enacted and carried out are only amongst the causes of that feeling. The constant and permanent flow of insults and misrepresentations which our people have to suffer is a more direct cause. I was strongly opposed to conscription—yes, and I am still opposed to it, although I always told my electors and fellow-countrymen that they must obey and observe the law. I need not repeat the grounds of my opposition to conscription. But, Sir, those reasons have been deliberately and criminally misrepresented throughout Canada, and even in the British Empire, in order to secure the success of the Government. We opposed conscription because we believed the voluntary system was the only one suited for this country and the best system to obtain the end every one of us desired of winning the war. We fought against this measure because we believed the pledges of the Prime Minister and the other public men of this country ought to be respected and ought not to be treated as so many "scraps of paper." I opposed conscription because I thought it was a constitutional change and a radical departure from the principles which were agreed to by all those who were party to the building of Confederation. We have been accused of being indifferent or even hostile to the great cause of the Allies. It has been said everywhere that we were against further participation in the war, and that we wanted to desert the Canadian boys who are fighting on the glorious battlefields of France. No more infamous or diabolical lies have ever forced their way through human lips. Some people profess to be more generous and more patronizing. They say our attitude is due to our lack of understanding of the real conditions, and to our ignorance as to what is going on in the world. I have read that statement made by patriotic old ladies, kind clergymen and other supporters of the Government, and I am sure some of the members of this House must be of their opinion. I would like to know how many of those who thus believe that we are provincialist, sectional and living in gross ignorance of everything that is going on in the world, read more newspapers and other literature than I do, or than most of the gentlemen do who represent my province here. We are reading their newspapers and we are reading our own, which, as a rule, they cannot do. Most of us are reading British newspapers, and we read also the newspapers of old France, which, again, many cannot do. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that we can stand a fair comparison, as to our knowledge of what goes on in the world, with the exclusive readers of the Toronto News, the Ottawa Journal, the Free Press of Winnipeg, and even that radiant beacon light, the Orange Sentinel. As to the material effect of conscription, in regard to the help that Great Britain and her Allies shall receive by virtue of its enforcement, the facts, in spite of what the right hon. gentleman said this afternoon, already prove that we are right. All impartial authorities admit to-day that conscription has been a failure. A larger number of men would have been secured by voluntary enlistment, even at the rate enlistment was going on when conscription was introduced. Even newspapers friendly to the Government admit that a blunder was committed, and even the good old Tory organ, the Quebec Chronicle, in the edition of February 26, published an editorial, with which I will not weary the House, under the heading of "The Great Refusal," and the Chronicle was not excusing the other provinces any more than Quebec. Very naturally in Ontario the blame is placed at the door of Quebec.

The statistics show that the accusation is unfounded. What were the registrations in Ontario and Quebec respectively? I find that 125,750 men registered in Ontario and 117,104 registered in Quebec. There were 8,646 more men in Ontario than in Quebec in class one. According to a statement issued from Ottawa—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not been unduly strict in applying the rules in this debate but I have tried to prevent hon. members from entering into a discussion of the Military Service Act. It is quite germane to the discussion at various points, but the hon. member in proceeding to discuss the Military Service Act is not in order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to call your attention to the fact that I am called upon to answer statements made on the other side of the House this afternoon even by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understood the remarks of the Prime Minister, he drew no distinction as between provinces.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He said that in Quebec there were wholesale exemptions. The hon. member for North Simcoe said that also. I am going to prove that the comparison between Quebec and Ontario is a very fair one to make. According to a statement issued from Ottawa, up to the 10th January there were 94,197 exemptions in Ontario and 89,575 in Quebec. These figures are very illustrative but quite naturally our good friends from Ontario loudly protested and clamoured that these miserable people from Quebec were getting too many exemptions. They were seeing the mote in the eye of Quebec. Quite naturally also the Government instituted a large number of appeals against the Quebec exemptions and a small number of appeals against the Ontario exemptions, namely, at that date, January 10, 10,638 appeals in Ontario as against 25,115 in Quebec. A considerable number of appeals have been instituted in Quebec. I believe the hon. member for North Simcoe said that actually there were 60,000 appeals from exemptions in Quebec. That shows that appeals are made against exemptions in the province of Quebec and they do not seem to be made to such a large extent in the province of Ontario.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman says that his figures are very illuminating. Would it not be even more illuminating if he would just give us, in conjunction with these figures, the number of enlistments since the war started in Ontario and the number in Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe I would not be observing the ruling of Mr. Speaker if I were to do that. In spite of the pleasure that I would have in obliging my hon. friend, I prefer to remain parliamentary. Now, Sir, as to the delays which have been referred to in dealing with the appeals from the province of Quebec, I wish you to recollect the fact that according to the law, as made by this Parliament, there are only thirty-six judges in Quebec who are empowered to hear these appeals, while there are ninty-one judges to hear the smaller number of appeals instituted in Ontario. If there is a congestion in the Quebec courts, is that province, or anybody in Quebec, to be made responsible for it? Is it not again a clear case of the province of Quebec being made the scapegoat?

Apart from these regrettable troubles in Quebec, the young men of the province, have observed, and are observing, the law, notwithstanding, and in spite of all the provocations, insults, abuse and arbitrary deeds which would have had serious consequences among any other people. Why, this Government, as was said by my right hon. leader this afternoon, or rather its predecessor—because I hope no Liberals would have consented to do that—employed detectives, especially the notorious Tit-Noir Desjardins, who is well known in that province, for the purpose of giving money to ex-convicts liberated on ticket-of-leave by the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) to induce these men to commit criminal acts, to dynamite Lord Atholstan's property and to do other things of that nature. This man was actually indicted before the criminal courts, and when no respectable citizen undertook to give a bond on his behalf, the Department of Justice of Canada sent a cheque for $10,000 to get Tit-Noir Desjardins out of jail.

In the meantime the farmers are appealed to for greater production. Our province is a purely agricultural province and the farmers, while willing to do their utmost to help production, do not know whether they can undertake the work and rely upon the labour of their sons who are needed in the field. Lord Rhondda said lately that food power was co-equal with man power under the present circumstances and that relief must come from America. Mr. Lloyd George said that the food producer is a more needed soldier than the one who bears a rifle. I represent a county in which there are no cities or towns. It is a purely agricultural county, one of the best agricultural districts in eastern Canada. The population is entirely composed of farmers and there are, Mr. Speaker, actually 600 appeals pending before the tribunals from exemptions granted to these farmers' sons in Kamouraska county. If, according to Lord Rhondda, food power is co-equal with manpower, and if, according to Mr. Lloyd George, the man who cultivates the land is more needed than the one who carries a rifle, I claim that no man has the right to call these young men shirkers or slackers. They are acting for the best interests not only for Canada but for the British Empire. The most regrettable fact is, perhaps, the breaking of solemn pledges which has destroyed for a good many years the faith and confidence of an important part of the people in the honour and truthfulness of Canadian public men. But, Sir, we are being told: You have your opinion regarding the Military Service Act and you are entitled to that opinion; we have a

different opinion, we fought it out and the majority went against you.

What we have to do is to bow and gracefully acquiesce in the finding of the majority. I agree that the law must be observed, but I do not admit that the verdict at the last election was a fair verdict. That verdict was not given by all the people who were entitled to pronounce upon the issue, and the battle was fought on ground quite different from that involved in a reference to the people of the question of conscription. The late Government, before going to the country, ran away from the judgment of those who had elected them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member might explain to the House how he connects such statements with the subject at issue.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but if you will permit me I will explain how I came to take up this subject. It has been stated this afternoon by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), and repeated afterwards by the right hon. the Prime Minister, that the issue of conscription had been overwhelmingly approved by the people of Canada, and that everybody now should also approve it, and accept the verdict.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member himself has said that the law is on the statute book and must be obeyed.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must deal with the subject more closely.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am trying to explain what the feeling is in the province of Quebec at the present time, which I think is within the purview of the discussion before the House. Related to that feeling, in my humble opinion, is the fact that the verdict of the people, which is claimed by the gentlemen opposite as being an endorsation of their policy, cannot carry the influence and the consideration which a verdict obtained under ordinary, fair and natural circumstances, would naturally carry. But if you do not permit me to proceed, how am I to explain that everybody in the province of Quebec, as I think everywhere else in Canada, resents the tampering with the electoral law of the country on the part of the Government before appealing to the people?

Mr. SPEAKER: The door has already been opened too wide in this debate in permitting discussion of the Military Service Act. I certainly do not intend to permit the War-time Elections Act also to be discussed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I only want to explain the feeling of the people, but I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, except to the extent of saying, if you will permit me, that we have no friends, or practically no friends in the press of the country outside of my own province. Except in the province of Quebec the press is under the control of the present Government. We have been misrepresented for months and months. We have nobody to defend us, and the voice of my province has no other forum for expression than the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. No one disputes that this is a forum for the ventilation of grievances, but that has nothing to do with the subject before the House at the moment. The hon. member has ample opportunity, in various ways under the rules of discussing almost any subject, but not on the motion before the House at the moment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I will not refer to the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a sore spot.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will not refer to the fact that only a portion of the women of the country were permitted to vote, but I think I can fairly argue that the last election was not decided upon the issue of conscription. I think that is a fair answer to what has been said on the other side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish again to direct the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are considering a motion made under Rule 39 for the purpose of discussing the disturbances, and the agitations and non-observance of the law in Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) who moved the resolution did not refer to the Quebec riots. Surely if I cannot follow his example I am sitting on the wrong side of the House.

Mr. CURRIE: On two occasions it has been said that I did not refer to the Quebec riots. In my address I dealt with the riots in the province of Quebec generally.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In deference to the Speaker's ruling I will not deal further

with the issues upon which the election was fought.

Now, Sir, when speaking about the disturbances in Quebec, the Prime Minister made use of the following language, foreshadowing the Orders in Council which have been brought down this afternoon. As will be found at page 251 of Hansard, the right hon. gentleman said on April 2nd last:

> The incidents which have taken place have made it apparent to the Government that some amendments will be necessary to the Military Service Act. One of those which is now in preparation is this: That persons who engage in active or forcible resistance to the enforcement of the Act shall be forthwith enrolled in the military forces of Canada, without regard to whether their class has been called out; without regard to any exemption that they may have procured, and subject only to the consideration that they are within military age. I believe that is a proper principle to adopt. If any persons in this country are disposed to wage war upon the civil authorities of Canada engaged in the enforcement of this Act, then it seems to me they may well be given the authority to exercise their warlike spirit upon the enemies of this country.

Mr. MURPHY: Was that said before or after the disturbances in Quebec?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That was said after the disturbances in Quebec. The Prime Minister stated this afternoon that he would have been derelict in his duty had he proposed the legislation before passing the Orders in Council. When he announced that legislation the disturbances had taken place in Quebec. At that time he stated in Parliament that we would have legislation upon the subject and not an Order in Council, and the Prime Minister was certainly not more derelict in his duty three days ago than he is to-day. Something must have happened to change his mind, and it was not because he was afraid of being derelict to his duty. Let me say further, with all deference to the Prime Minister, that I wish he did not try to be either witty or dignified in that remark of his, for the joke was as cheap as the statesmanship was doubtful. Those words are quite in line with the remarks he uttered when introducing the Conscription Bill in this House, referring to what might happen when the soldiers returned from overseas. I fully understand that the right hon. gentleman has to cope with many difficulties. He has to please all elements in his party, and his following; but he should not forget that history will record his words and statements; and nothing will show as an excuse for such words, not even the smiles and other expressions of exuberant satisfaction of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best).

As to the Orders in Council in question, apart from being a violation of the rights of Parliament, and an unconstitutional subjection of civil power to military power, there is not any very great difference from what has been going on already on a large scale. Young men who are exempted, or who are under military age, have been violently arrested and sent to the barracks. This Order in Council will only make lawful what has heretofore been done illegally. As was once said in the Roman senate during a period of disorder: "It is the same thing to live in a country where all things are lawful than where nothing is lawful."

In that respect, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the case of one young man. I have just received a letter from one of my law partners, enclosing a copy of a letter he has sent to Col. J. L. McAvity, Officer Commanding, First Depot Battalion, New Brunswick Regiment, St. John, N.B., which reads as follows:

> Re—Alfred Bérubé, Son of Elisee of Ste. Heléne, Kamouraska County, P. Q.—
>
> This is a young man whom I know very well and who, while on a trip to Edmundston, N. B., with his brother Ernest, aged 18, was arrested, together with his brother, and they were both brought to your depot, it appears, under military custody as being recruits subject to the Military Service Act.
>
> I understand, from the certificate given to Ernest, that he has been authorized to return to his home, but that you are still keeping under custody the other one, Alfred, although evidence has been brought by himself and his family, by means of an authentic copy of his certificate of baptism, that he reached his 20th year on the 7th March, 1918, only.
>
> I have in my possession an authentic copy of this certificate, but I understand it is useless to send it to you as I am told by the mother that her son Alfred has one with him, which can be exhibited to you at any time.
>
> This man, belonging to the Province of Quebec and not being presently subject to the Military Service Act on account of his age, I do not see why he should be kept any longer in that way.
>
> His father being very ill, his mother has come to me asking me to write to my partner, Mr. Lapointe, M.P. for the County of Kamouraska, which I myself represent in the Local House, in order to have Mr. Lapointe bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia, but I thought advisable to write you directly and ask you to kindly yourself grant this request at once if you are in a position to do so. If not, will you kindly let me hear from you by the return of mail?
>
> Thanking you in anticipation, I remain,
>
> Yours truly,
>
> ADOLPHE STEIN.

Now, Sir, I am informed that recruits are being sent overseas every week from the

city of St. John. From my seat in Parliament, I demand the release of that young man who is detained illegally under military custody in St. John, N.B., and if that gentleman, Col. McAvity, is a Prussian, I hope the Minister of Militia will call him to his senses.

Sir, it is the imperative duty of the Government, and I appeal to them in that respect, to use discretion, tact and common sense. They should not forget that Quebec is not represented in this Administration, and I say that with all deference to my hon. friends the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne). Measures promulgated by the Government cannot carry the weight and influence with us which is carried by other measures in the enacting of which, or in the execution of which, the people had a voice and were effectively represented. That is one of the reasons why I protest against the amendments to the Military Service Act being made by means of Orders in Council. In the framing of these, nobody represents the feelings, sentiments and views of an important section of the people of this country. If they were enacted by Parliament, even if we have no representative on the Treasury benches, we have at least somebody to express our point of view. There is nobody at the council table who can express the feelings and represent the views and the mentality of our section of the people. I do not complain about it. I really do not wish to be represented in the Government under the present circumstances, and constituted as it now is. What I wish to argue is, that the Government should be more cautious and use more tact and prudence in this matter by reason of the fact that so large a portion of the people of this country are not represented in the Administration, and especially when dealing with that section of the people which is unrepresented. In courts of law, judges always take greater precautions when they have to decide cases of litigants who are not represented by counsel, and the same rule should govern in the dealings of the Government with the people of Quebec. Many respectable, law-abiding citizens tell me: We are not represented in the Government; we have nobody there to speak for us, but we wish to obey the law, and even the numerous Orders in Council; all we ask is to be treated in a fair and decent way. We do not want our young men who have lived up to the requirements of the law to be insulted, reviled, and illegally put in jail like criminals by blackguards and drunkards, like those who were in my own town last week. There, young men, duly exempted were arrested by drunken brutes—I cannot call them otherwise—and taken to jail handcuffed. I know that the task of the Government is a hard one, but surely they should use greater discrimination in the selection of their officers and agents.

I wish, in conclusion, to join with my right hon. leader in appealing to my fellow-countrymen of Quebec and elsewhere not to allow any resentment to get the better of their moderation, and not hurry themselves into actions contrary to the law, which, in their cooler moments, they would regard with horror. They have always been law-abiding citizens and they must remain so. The present crisis will come to an end. I sincerely hope and trust that better times are coming, when all conscientious public men will join hands for the purpose of putting an end to racial and sectional strife and eliminating from the public life of our country all men who want to sweep away the landmarks of right and justice and break down the traditional policies of Canada.

Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the address of the hon. member for the beautiful county of Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe)—and I join heartily with him in every word he has said about that splendid county, in which I have spent many a day—merely illustrates how things are going. I sat here this afternoon—and while there is not as much French blood in my veins, maybe, as in those of my good friend who has just spoken—I said to myself while the hon. member for North Simcoe was speaking: what an example of moderation, of fair and logical conclusion, what an example of sound argument. I did not hear any "brutality," or "insult," or any of the "nasty spirit" which seemed to impress itself upon the right hon. leader of the Opposition and upon my good friend from Kamouraska. Perhaps it is just the point of view that one takes of it. At all events, it illustrates the necessity of having measures, such as the one before us to-night, brought up and discussed fairly and squarely on the floor of this House instead of in the back hustings of the various constituencies in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

When I was a barefooted boy, I well remember my father taking me to a political meeting. He was a good old Orange Tory, thank God. What did we hear? That the Tory party was hand-in-glove with the Pope of Rome in the province of Quebec; that

the Tory party was hand-in-glove with a lot of Frenchmen that could not speak a word of English; that the Tory party was hand-in-glove with all the worst elements in the public life of the country.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: And the best.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We are not discussing best and worst; that is a matter of viewpoint. I said to my father: Is that the sort of outfit you are in alliance with? He said: pay no attention to that fellow, he is only a Grit spouter. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux)—charming, delightful, pleasant in manner—will remember that in the elections of 1896 he did not take particular pains to soothe the feeling of the people of the province of Quebec against the people of other provinces. Their cry was: "What? Are you going to vote for Tupper and the Tories who are spending $3,000,000 in the purchase of rifles to shoot down your sons and to drag them off to foreign wars?" The member for Maisonneuve will recall that the late Mr. Mackintosh, fine old member for the Eastern Townships, rose in his seat, pointed his finger at the member for Maisonneuve and told him that if he were in his proper place he would be standing not in the House of Commons,
9 p.m. but behind the bars, serving a sentence for treason. I recall these things only because it shows——

Mr. LEMIEUX: In friendship.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. Let me say that I was proud of the member for Maisonneuve when, while Minister of Militia, I asked him to assist in recruiting; he gave me his hand and did everything in his power to help on recruiting in Montreal. Moreover, his relatives went to the war, and, I believe, are there yet.

Time rolled on, and an election occurred in a place called Drummond and Arthabasca. The Nationalist party of Quebec are to-day charged, paraded, slated, by our good friends of the present Opposition for raising the standard of appeals to prejudice in Quebec. What did they do? They took the identical speeches, word for word, delivered by members of the Liberal party in the elections of 1896, and they used them throughout the counties of Drummond and Arthabasca. In other words, they simply turned the guns on themselves.

In my first election a young fellow called on me one day and said: I have the stuff that is going to elect you, sure. Good boy; I said; what is it? What is the denomination? He said: Come out here and I will show you a sample of some circulars I am sending out. He then showed me two circulars, one printed on a brilliant green paper, for circulation among the holy Romans, and the other printed on orange, for circulation among the Orangemen. The orange circular was to show what the Tory party had done for the Orange cause and what the other fellows had done against it; the green circular was to show the Romans what the Tory party had done for the holy Roman cause, and what the other fellows had done against it. I said: this is a fine specimen of literature; I will take these two. I remember that in the office there was an old stove with a sliding lid. I went out, put the lid to one side and dumped the whole outfit, orange and green together, into the fire—and that ended it. I found that the fellow had been to half a dozen other constituencies, Grit and Tory alike, peddling similar wares. This sort of thing may be all right for innocents abroad, but the time has arrived in Canada when this kind of stuff should be wiped out and these appeals to the public put an end to forever.

My good friend the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) has a grievance because some young fellow from his county was bagged the other day. Why, I myself was bagged the other day.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am ready to protest against that, too.

Mr. POWER: The officer who did the arrestation was discharged, I understand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The greatest compliment ever paid to me was that on this occasion I was taken to be only thirty-two years of age and that I had the most sprightly step of any young fellow in the building at that time. What did I do? I did swear a little, possibly; we might as well be frank, because when we let the truth into these matters we know just where we stand. Soon thereafter I communicated with the Minister of Justice intimating that this thing was not working out properly; that injustices were being done.

My friend points to an instance in the county of Kamouraska; why, I know of a dozen cases in my own county. One chap went to Toronto to meet his sweetheart, who was to arrive on a train from the West. Being about eighteen years of age, he was bagged at the station by one of these energetic policemen, and by the time they got through with him, six or eight hours later, his sweetheart's train had arrived. I do not know

whether some other fellow ran off with the girl in the meantime; anyway, he experienced a good deal of trouble in trying to find out where she had gone. What was necessary was not a riot or a fight, but a wink to my friend the Minister of Justice to indicate that in place of pursuing men who were within the age limit and should have gone to the front without compulsion, these officers were interfering with men who had no right to be interfered with in any shape, form or manner. I do not see any reason for asking men who are not within military age or who cannot possibly be supposed to go to the front, to carry birth certificates and that sort of thing in order to identify them when accosted by a policeman, big or little, sensible or otherwise. As I have said, I communicated my views personally to the Minister of Justice; I think what I have suggested is only common sense.

This occurrence is not pecular to Kamouraska or any other particular county; it is general throughout Canada, and in this respect the way the Act is administered, is the cause of dissatisfaction. I have known the member for Kamouraska for many years; he is a fair-minded man. Let us talk frankly and squarely; I do not wish to turn a solitary corner to-night for anything. In my home county in Ontario, what is the condition of affairs? We see boys obeying the law, marching off like gentlemen and true Canadians. They are within the age; they are not exempted; they go. We see others, their neighbours, dodging, hiking for the lumber camps, hiding themselves here and there. Do you mean to tell me that there is not resentment on the part of others whose sons have gone over when they see cases of this kind? Of course there is. They say to me: Why is Jones not taken? My son goes; this fellow on the next farm is exempted. With all due regard to the Minister of Justice, I suggest to him that if he will put these Dominion policemen or these gentlemen whom he has enrolled for the purpose in each of the ridings throughout the country, I for my part will tell him the name of every man in my riding who should go. I know them all, I can tell him the names, and I shall be glad to give them to him. Let him send the police after these delinquents, not after innocent men, bagging them and taking them off trains here and there throughout the country. There will then be better results and less grievances throughout the country. These things are not peculiar to the province of Quebec or to the county of Kamouraska, but in other parts of the country we do not raise riots or break heads over these matters. I shall not follow my hon. friend further than to point out that I enjoy a good, free fight, and when we get a good square open discussion right here in Parliament, let the members come out from under the tables and chairs. I was ashamed of the Unionist party this afternoon when only twenty-one members stood up in favour of having a discussion of this subject. They are all over twenty-one years of age and have heads on their shoulders; why then should they not stand up like men and frankly and fairly discuss this question, instead of crawling under the chairs and tables for fear of exciting somebody's feelings? Let us face the issue, let us wipe out the trouble once for all, and then these mountebank politicians going around raising trouble between Quebec and other parts of Canada, will have no one to listen to them.

Next to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid), I think I am the oldest member in this House. I have had a great many fights and I never yet made an address to an Orange gathering that I could not make to a Roman Catholic gathering. One of our prize tricks used to be to get a Liberal to go to an Orange centre and make an address under the impression that he was addressing Roman Catholics. I remember very well dear old John McMillan, of Huron. The fellow who drove him out to the meeting was a good Tory, and on the drive he pointed out who lived here and who lived there,—all good solid Roman Catholics, bound to vote the other way, as was their perfect right. McMillan, when he got to the hall, did not notice a big Orange drum and a big Orange flag hanging over the platform, but went on talking, thinking he had come to a Roman Catholic centre, about the rights of Irish Home Rulers and the tyranny of these Englishmen. He did not understand what was wrong until at the close of the meeting one of the fellows went up and told him he had turned thirty votes. That is the way it goes. Let us leave the side issues alone, and get in and fight the enemy to the finish. I remember once in South Africa I came to a big camp where I saw the Inniskillen Fusiliers, every man of them an Orangeman, and the Dublin Fusiliers, every man of them a Roman Catholic, with their arms around each other's necks. I said, " Hello, I thought you beggars were always

fighting each other," and the man replied, "We are never fighting each other, except when there is nobody else to fight." We have somebody else to fight just now, so let us put off fighting each other until after the war, and then we can go at it hammer and tongs, if you like. But in the meantime, let us stand shoulder to shoulder before the world to fight the Germans to a finish. What we want is to strengthen our boys in the trenches and give them backbone and confidence.

That brings me to another point, and I trust the House will excuse me if I give a few facts as to the cause of the falling off in recruiting in the province of Quebec. I did not purpose saying anything on this head, but for the remarks that fell from the right hon. leader of the Opposition. We may as well get at the facts. I will narrate the facts, and we can look for the causes afterwards, and in narrating the facts I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but if it be a question of hurting somebody's feelings or telling the truth I am going to tell the truth. When war broke out the first thing I did was to appoint a Roman Catholic chaplain, a dear old fellow, Jolicœur. He was a fine old fellow, and I venture to say he is as true a friend of the Allies to-day as can be found in the Dominion of Canada. I sent for him and said: "We are going to have our troops here at Valcartier to-morrow; that will be Sunday, and I want you to look after your boys; we have no place here, but will nail a few planks together and you can put a show on here." We had lots of old boards, and we fixed the old gentleman up. We wanted to meet the wishes of the French Canadian boys, and we tried to meet them every time. I communicated with the best French Canadian boys in the province of Quebec immediately. General Lessard—I made him a general, I promoted him, I made him what he is to-day, as far as titles go. When I sent for him and spoke about raising a French Canadian brigade he said that he would be the worst man in the province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, to take that in hand, because he did not like them, and they did not like him. The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence is a splendid fellow —and, incidentally, I hope the Minister of Militia will bring his salary up to what the other deputy ministers are getting. He is a French Canadian and did valiant service in the South African war as a medical officer; every man in the forces, if they had the choice, would go to General Fiset. He is one of the finest officers a man could have the privilege of serving with. I said to him:

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

"How the mischief can we get these fellows into line? Lessard does not want to go and Landry holds back." We did everything human beings could possibly do to get these lads, and let me say that during the early part of the campaign the recruiting of the French Canadian boys was magnificent, and further, their work at the front at Courcelette, on the Somme, and at every other place where they had an opportunity, as the hon. member for North Simcoe has said this afternoon, was everything that could be desired. I am sure that if the leader of the Opposition could only have seen the spirit of these men, old as he is, and weak as his nerves may be, I think he would have risen to the occasion, and instead of bowing to the less noble element would have taken up the flag of liberty in the great struggle and gone through the province of Quebec calling on the boys to stand behind the guns of their lads who were at the front. On more than one occasion I consulted the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). The hon. member for Maisonneuve, I think, did everything he possibly could; he did good service, I am free to say that, no matter what he did in the 1896 election, and I forgive him for all that. He did good service in this recruiting campaign, but the leader of the Opposition did not come out as I felt he should; but maybe I am wrong. He made three speeches so far as I could observe on recruiting, one at Napanee, the United Empire Loyalist centre, a splendid place to go and speak on recruiting. He got sick afterwards, I do not know from what cause, but he was laid up for a long time. Then he made a speech in Montreal and another in Quebec, I think. I read those speeches in both the French and English papers, and found three references to bilingualism and only two to recruiting. Those were all the recruiting meetings he spoke at, so far as I know.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the meetings in Sherbrooke?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not hear about those. I am glad to hear about them. What was the next step in recruiting? As I said, we offered a corps to every leading French Canadian officer. When an officer came to me, I would say, "Delighted; here is your commission—go ahead and raise a battalion," and a great many of them tried it, and succeeded for a time, but gradually the boys melted away. We observed this with sorrow. At Valcartier I offered General Landry the command of a brigade,

I offered him any French officers he should choose to command his battalions, but he did not materialize more than enough for two-thirds of one battalion from the province of Quebec. I spoke to General Lessard and General Landry; and General Fiset did his level best to get these men to raise battalions. As time wore on I secured not one or two, but twenty or thirty or forty or fifty of the best boys from the front trenches, and these lads distinguished themselves at St. Julien. Let me say here, that I was sorry to-day to hear some hon. gentlemen sneer at Colonel Currie when he remarked that he had been in the fight. It is the easiest thing in the world for a coward to sneer at the men who risked their lives, but Colonel Dansereau told me that he stood within six feet of Colonel Currie every hour of the first three days of that fight, until two o'clock Saturday, and my own son has a copy of the ord r which he gave Colonel Currie about two o'clock on Saturday afternoon, ordering him to withdraw from the fighting line, there to be replaced by two British battalions, and less than 200 men out of 1,000 marched out. We brought back these veterans.

I thought the name DeSalaberry would thrill the people of Quebec, but let us be frank and tell the story. I must say that I was proud of Colonel DeSalaberry. He went down to Rockland; he was practically assaulted by the parish priest, who threatened him with all sorts of penalties, practically drove him from the village, and ordered the boys not to enlist. The same thing holds true up and down the Ottawa valley. Colonel DeSalaberry came to me and told me there was no use his trying to raise a French Canadian battalion, that a great many of the clergymen were fired by the teaching of the Old Country clergymen who were expatriated from France years ago. Colonel DeSalaberry gave it up, and went over in command of an English battalion. I saw that he got his battalion. I thought the grandson of the hero of Chateauguay was entitled to some recognition, and he got it. But everywhere there was a hidden hand.

Take the case of the 41st Battalion. We had to enlist nearly 5,000 men to get 1,100. I think that is about the number. We enlisted nearly 5,000 men and they gradually melted away and finally we got about 1,100 to go over. I do not know the cause. I am telling facts as they occurred, and hon. gentlemen can look for the cause themselves. I suspected at once a German agency. I communicated that thought to some of my colleagues but we had no proof of it at the time.

I want to make another statement here of a fact which will not be denied. Some of these clergymen were expatriated from France for violation of the French laws I suppose. I am not going to discuss that because I do not know. But they were in the city of Quebec and eight of these clergymen were found with a collection of German propaganda circulated from the United States, coming into this country. I did not have them arrested. I simply refer you to the fact, but if you doubt it ask Inspector Green, a good Irishman, who was post office inspector, and I left it for him to settle with them. One of these gentlemen went to the United States and has since died. I think the others followed across the lines, but they were all busily engaged in circulating German propaganda through Quebec. It is not much wonder that these splendid boys, who would be only too glad to have upheld the honour of France, of Canada, of the Empire, and human liberty in this great war were influenced, many of them by teachings such as that. Some one said to me: "there is an officer at the front, Colonel J. B. White, of the Hawkesbury Lumber Company, who employed upwards of 200,000 men in his day in the Ottawa Valley, and he will raise a battalion inside of a week." We cabled for him and brought him home. He came to me and told me he would guarantee to raise me a French Canadian battalion inside of two weeks. I said "God bless you my boy, go ahead, I will give you every help I can." But I never dreamt he would get them. The French lads who had gone to the front did well, they were enthusiastic in the cause and did their level best. Dozens of men besides Colonel DeSalaberry tried to get the boys to enlist, but some influence was at work with them and they disappeared a few days after they came in. There was nothing of this kind in Ontario and there was no question of a Military Service Act. Everybody was loyal, and all were looking at the front line trenches. Colonel White came home and called a large number of his foremen together and said: "I want each of you to get me a few boys, and in a few days we will have a battalion." Inside of two weeks Colonel White came to me and said: "The jig is up; we cannot raise the men."

I am not going to turn a corner; we may as well face the facts and thresh it out and know where we stand. Colonel White said: "These foremen come to me and say the

men will not enlist; the clergy, these old country clergymen have disseminated the teachings that this is a just judgment on France for having expatriated the Church," and he could not get enough to form a corporal's guard in the whole of the Ottawa Valley. I gave Colonel White command of an English-speaking battalion. In the meantime Colonel White said: "They say that the advice of the clergy to them is to let the English-speaking people go to the front; you can go up into Ontario and get their jobs; stay at home and earn good money, and if they get killed you will retain their places."

Let me inform the right hon. leader of the Opposition that we held our counsel and worked on and on. I tried to get his assistance not only from my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), but from another gentleman, I forget his name.

An hon. MEMBER: Lavergne?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, no. It was the officer who commanded the battalion afterwards, Oliver Asselin. He is now at the front doing yeoman duty. He was Bourassa's editorial writer, I believe. We captured him, and a magnificent little fellow he is too, and this is where our good friend (Mr. Lemieux) came in largely. He raised a battalion and is commanding it at the front to-day, or is second in command of it. At all events he is with the forces at the front doing splendid service. Yet he is the man who so strongly espoused the Nationalist cause in Quebec in 1911. However, I take no particular stock in that phase of it. The leader of the Opposition brought in the name of Lloyd George as having been pro-Boer in 1900, and to-day leading the British Government. We had a similar instance of that in this country where a man held the British flag in his hand at St. Eustache in 1911 and said that if he had been with the boys in 1837 he would have shot holes through the British flag. Yet, Mr. Blondin is to-day leading a Canadian battalion at the front and doing his duty as a loyal British subject. I have every faith that if we only come out and discuss this thing on a high plane the result will be what we all desire it to be. I do not believe that there is one of 10,000 in Quebec who does not in his heart and conscience feel the desirability of winning this war to as great a degree as the most ultra Orangeman.

Something has been said about Armand Lavergne. I shall not speak of Armand Lavergne at any length but I merely wish to say that he was offered a battalion if he would raise one and go to the front. There was no stone left unturned in the effort, kindly, lovingly and affectionately, to prevail upon the French Canadian people to go and fight in the great cause. As far as I am concerned and as far as the Canadian Government is concerned, I challenge any man in the Dominion of Canada to stand up and say to the contrary.

This is the second time in my presence that the leader of the Opposition has seen fit after he was corrected to say that if General Lessard had been sent in he would have done wonders. He knows that the Prime Minister and I—and General Lessard will not deny it—gave General Lessard every opportunity, although General Fiset and I knew that he was not the man for the job. I went farther. I did myself the honour of attending the memorial service in Notre Dame church in Montreal when Archbishop Bruchesi delivered a magnificent oration. I had the honour of meeting Archbishop Bruchesi in the vestry and he told me that he was heart and soul with the Allies in this great cause but I am not at liberty to give the reasons why he was powerless to help in the cause. What he said, however, was satisfactory to me. I got Sir William Price to go with me to Cardinal Begin in Quebec, in his own palace, and I laid the matter before him. I wanted him to appoint chaplains in every county and we offered to put them in uniform, to give them every dignity and do everything that we could in that direction hoping that they would help us to raise men, but for some reason the plan did not succeed. I challenge any one from the province of Quebec to show where any young men from that province worthy of a commission failed to get it. I have gone to the fathers of the splendid boys in that province and said that if they wanted their sons to get training we would give them that training. There are young gentlemen sitting in this House, on the Opposition side, who have taken part in this war and there is not a man of them who can say that justice has not been done him. It cannot be asserted that the French Canadian people have not been fairly treated. Notwithstanding all the random nonsense that has been talked about it, I maintain that every preference has been shown towards them, that kindly treatment has been accorded them, but there is the "hidden hand" and for some unaccountable reason, unless boys were wildly enthusiastic they did not long materialize in the ranks. I offered to train the hon. gentleman (Mr

Boivin) who occupies the Chair in front of me to-night, and I offered to train other gentlemen on that side of the House if they would go out and raise battalions. I left no stone unturned to get these splendid boys into harness. Therefore, I say that the cry of Ontario prejudice and "Orangeiste" will not do. No men ever had a fairer opportunity given them than the boys of Quebec but the "hidden hand" was behind and stopped it all.

Now, in conclusion, let us drop all this tittle-tattle. They have had a row in the province of Quebec. I am not going to criticise anybody: the city police, the provincial police, the city authorities, or the Dominion authorities, but I do say that one ounce of sense would have settled the whole thing without any trouble. I believe that if the boys had been handled in the right way there would have been no trouble whatever. It is the easiest thing in the world to handle a mob. The leaders of a mob are generally hot-headed, enthusiastic fellows, but if one goes the right way about it it is easy to handle them.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Commonsense and tolerance.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is right, sir; if you and I had been handling it we would have had it fixed up long ago. We had no trouble in the great camp at Valcartier, where we had 37,000 men. The boys would go to Quebec by the hundreds and they would cut the Quebec boys out of their girls, but they took it good-humouredly. They knew the fellows would not be there long and they would have their chance later on. Everything went smoothly and we watched the situation to see that everybody was treated fairly. I am satisfied that if common sense had been exercised this trouble would not have occurred. I do not look upon it as a matter of very great importance, but it is of great importance to know what the unseen power is that has prevented these splendid boys—and there are no finer in the world—from following the dictates of their own impulses and joining the forces. What has prevented them—?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Let me tell you—bigotry.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am very sorry to hear that. I do not think these boys are actuated by bigotry; I know they are not, and I hope that the power behind them is not bigotry. Let us obey the law, let us put aside all these petty bickerings, let us cease these squabblings in Quebec and other parts of Canada and let us keep our eyes on the trenches at the front, where the boys are undergoing such terrific trials to-day. Let the leader of the Opposition join hands with the leader of the Government and work together in this great cause. If you could get a platform in the province of Quebec or Ontario large enough to hold this Government and a similar number of the Opposition it would be an appealing sight to see all these gentlemen and the leaders of the Opposition side of the House standing together on that platform and appealing to the boys to join the colours and go to the front. Let us pursue that line all over Canada instead of standing by with our eyes on the next election and on the treasury benches. I am no longer on the treasury benches and I am the happiest man in the world. I sit here and watch these worthy ministers on the treasury benches. I could see my good friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) blushing all sorts of colours to-day as his friends were digging into him. Be not carried away by any thought of the treasury benches. There will be treasury benches long after we are dead and forgotten. In the meantime, I appeal to the young men of Quebec to go to the assistance of their compatriots, the splendid, gallant French soldiers who have made the most heroic fight that men ever made in the history of the world, as well as to back up our own boys from Canada. Let us join hands together and make the military service law a success. Let us be done with all these bickerings and let us make a united appeal, whether to Orangemen, to English Canadians, or to French Canadians, to go to the front and help win the victory. I am not afraid to stand up in my own county and tell any young men who should be at the front that they have not done their duty. Let us take that line, and if we do good results will come.

Let me again remind the leader of the Opposition that in my early days I thought he was one of the greatest men in Canada. At that time I was carried away with the spirit of the man, engaged as he then was, in a struggle against the tyranny of the ultramontaine section of the church in the province of Quebec. I said: "There is a hero who is worthy of the emulation of everybody."

Sir WILFRED LAURIER: Platonic sentiment it was.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not a bit. When the ultramontaine wing of the Roman Church got control of the Quebec end of the Conservative party on a certain occasion, and when the Manitoba School ques-

tion came up, and certain gentlemen resigned because they were not getting all they thought they were entitled to, did I not organize thirty-five good members of Parliament and suggest to the right hon. gentleman, who was then leader of the Opposition, that it was his opportunity to make a stand for the rights of a free people and join with us in keeping these people where they belonged? I still have an admiration for him, but, like myself, he is getting old. But not too old, there is vigour enough in us yet. If the right hon. gentleman, and the right hon. leader of the Government bring forward any proposal with the object of uniting and effecting harmony between the two races I will support them. Let us come together and fill up the ranks, that is all I am desirous of seeing. I do not care twopence for political preferment, but I do want to see the boys at the front strengthened, our ranks filled, the German tyrant smashed, and human liberty triumph.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec W.): I am very pleased indeed to congratulate the last speaker (Sir Sam Hughes) upon the manner in which he has treated this side of the House in the few remarks he has just made. To tell the truth, Mr. Speaker, I was anticipating a speech of a very different character from him, and I must say that if we had had more speeches of the kind we probably would not have to deplore this evening the sad events that have taken place in Quebec. The position which I occupy, Mr. Speaker, is a peculiar one, bearing in mind the fact that I am the representative of a constituency in which some of the sad events which we so greatly deplore have occurred. I would not, Sir, be a real citizen of the old historic city of Quebec if I did not at once deplore the melancholy events in question. But if such sad events have taken place there must have been some very serious cause for their occurrence, and I believe that in the interest of the community it is as well that the whole truth be disclosed on this occasion.

At the outset let me say that I should be wanting in my duty did I not extend to the bereaved relatives of the victims an expression of the deepest sorrow, not only on behalf of my constituents, but also of the well-thinking population of Canada. Four innocent victims were struck down, and in trying to restore peace among a momentarily disturbed element of the population of Quebec a number of gallant soldiers were wounded. I shall venture to offer no justification or excuse for the acts which brought about such results. But I deeply deplore them, at the same time hoping that in the days to come we shall not see a repetition of such events in Toronto, or Montreal, or Halifax, or Vancouver, in Quebec, or in London, Ontario. I have said that the whole truth should be disclosed on this subject, and that I now propose to do. It is my well-considered opinion that the trouble that has occurred in Quebec was the result of direct provocation, resulting from the way the Military Service Act was applied in Quebec, and perhaps also a few local conditions. I am stating nothing new to the House when I say that we on this side, especially the French Canadian members, have been fighting the military law to the bitter end. I, for one, have done so, thinking that in doing so I was serving the best interests of the Empire. When the law was passed Quebec thought, rightly or wrongly—and I will not labour the point—that it was aimed only at Quebec. Because, Sir, that conclusion was not hard to draw. Either a conscription law was necessary or it was not; and when we saw the press of other parts of Canada stating that in their own provinces every one was going freely to join the colours, and that Quebec only was not responding, the conclusion was forced upon us, that this law was intended to hit at our province only. A conscription law is passed, Sir, when there is no other way to get at slackers or at cowards; and when I recall the declarations of the press of the country—that press bought for the purpose of carrying the idea into the rest of Canada —that Quebec was not doing its duty, I think I can establish that we were right in concluding that this law was imposed upon the people simply with a view of hitting at Quebec. I might even go as far as to say that if hon. members on the opposite side of the House will search their memories and look into their consciences they will recall that in the course of their speeches during the last election they constantly attacked the province of Quebec, declaring that it was the only province which was not answering the call to the colours. There were also many articles antagonistic to Quebec and the clergy published in the press. I will not read them all, but merely a few extracts, to show that the publication and spreading of such articles all over the country was not a good way to secure recruits in Quebec, nor of obtaining the good will of our population. As long ago as 1914, the Sentinel, under the signature of Puttenham, advised nothing more or less than civil war. It said:

The bilingual agitation should be destroyed. It is time our Government ceased to bandy words with these traitors.

That is Quebec.

Our Government should drive out of British territory the some forty thousand wicked monks and nuns who bring up the French Canadian youth in the idea of rebellion against the British Empire. There should be no truce with Rome. We must crush her or she will crush us. We must prepare at once for the imminent struggle with these French traitors and the sooner we begin the battle, the better it will be for our Dominion. Great Britain should rule Canada as she rules the waves.

And later on, what does he write?

The French Canadians have no heart for war. They are a peaceable people. We are not surprised that they have no military vocation. That is a mark of men of initiative. But the clergy have destroyed their initiative. . . The French Canadian never thinks for himself. In all important matters he goes and asks his superiors what he is to do. He is reduced to the state of a human machine.

I can quote many more selections like that, but I think these will suffice for the moment.

I heard the hon. member who preceded me say that so far as Quebec is concerned, every possible effort had been made to get recruits on the voluntary basis. In my humble opinion, and from the knowledge I have of what was going on in the province of Quebec during the period of voluntary recruiting, I do not think that everything possible was done. I follow the views expressed by my hon. leader in that regard. I think that if the Government had seriously tried to get recruits on the voluntary basis in Quebec they would have met with much more success than they are obtaining with the Military Service Act. We know, Sir, as positive facts, that certain officers offered to go to the front with their battalions as an entity, and every time their offers were turned down. Could I mention names? If I could I would mention Colonel Paquette, who through his own recruiting energy, raised a battalion of fifteen hundred men. Drafts were taken from this battalion and dispersed among other regiments commanded by officers who could not speak the language of the men who had joined the colours.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I interpose? The hon. member, I presume, does not intend to be unfair to state what is not true to the House. His statements are not borne out by the facts in any particular. Col. Paquette, and other French Canadians, were given command of their battalions. It was subsequently reported that Col. Paquette was totally unfitted to command a battalion at the front, on account of his health among other reasons, and on the recommendation of French Canadian commanding officers the men were drafted and sent overseas with other battalions.

Mr. PARENT: There is an explanation that I am, of course, bound to accept. The hon. gentleman was once Minister of Militia, and makes a statement which I must accept but at the same time—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I say further—

Mr. PARENT: At the same time, I may recall that the same statement, or something to the same effect, has been made by one of the present ministers of the Crown.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I go further? Col. Paquette was picked out by me long before the war to act as cadet officer. I had a very high opinion of him, and I raised several lively rows because Col. Paquette was not sent to the front. I made inquiries, and found, when I demanded explanations, that Col. Paquette was not fitted, physically and otherwise, to be sent to the front. I will not go into details. That was the report of the French Canadian officers. Col. Paquette was a great personal friend of my own, and I was very anxious to see him go.

Mr. PARENT: There are other cases, Mr. Speaker. There were offers made also, we are told, by Col. Gelly of Levis, to take his own battalion, and such offers have not been accepted by the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never heard of him, that must be after my time.

Mr. PARENT: I might also mention Col. Rioux, of Sherbrooke.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He was given every chance.

Mr. PARENT: These things are well known in the province of Quebec. The people know that the services of these men were offered to the Crown, and that these people wanted not to get the chance for the sake of showing off their medals across the seas, but with the purpose of going to fight. And we are told that over and over again all their offers were turned down by the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I correct my hon. friend about Col. Rioux, another great personal friend of my own. He was given every opportunity, and a number of his men, some forty or fifty, perhaps more,

joined the first contingent. I gave him every opportunity to raise a battalion later on. I forget the details. Gen. Fiset will know them.

Mr. PARENT: The hon. gentleman has spoken. I pass that officer. I will take the case of one to whom he paid a few compliments a moment ago, Major Asselin. Major Asselin got away through what circumstances and by what efforts? It was only through the press of the country, and through articles that he wrote and wrote over again in newspapers of Montreal, that he was able to go across. What did they do with him? Did they send him at once to England or France to fight? No, Sir, that very man who had offered his services in such a gallant way, was sent to Bermuda, and when he was in Bermuda with his French Canadian compatriots, there again he appealed to the Minister of Militia imploring to be sent across, but it took months and months before his voice could be heard.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Again let me correct my hon. friend. Col. Asselin and his battalion went to Bermuda of their own choice. A deputation of his officers came from Montreal and asked that they be rushed off to Bermuda to get themselves in shape rather than stay in Montreal. They wanted to get to Bermuda where they would be free from hidden influences and otherwise, and to oblige them, and at their own request, they were sent to Bermuda.

Mr. PARENT: I remember distinctly the articles at that time, Mr. Speaker. I have not got them right here under my hand. But the statements that have just been made have also been repeated by a minister of the Crown. These statements have been made publicly by Col. Blondin, who is actually a member of the Cabinet, and they are to the effect that voluntary recruiting in Quebec had not been given a fair chance. As between the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) and Col. Blondin, I do not know whose word I should take; but evidently the Government think that Col. Blondin's word is better because he is supposed to be a better man. Col. Blondin is still in the Cabinet and the hon. member for Victoria is out of it.

So much for that point, Sir; but I intended to speak particularly of the riot that occurred in the city of Quebec and the direct causes which brought it about. To my mind, in the methods employed in the application of the law we can find, first and foremost, the real cause of the rather small outbreak of feeling that took place a few days ago. As I have said, our people were opposed to the Military Service law, but being lovers of law, and desirous of abiding by it, they were content to accept that law as it was, and they were doing so. It has been said that they applied in masses for exemption. If, however, the masses had the right to apply for exemption, then there was no reason why they should not do so. But if, in the Quebec district, so many appeals were awaiting the decision of the tribunals, it was due undoubtedly to the lack of organization in the registrar's office in Quebec. Instead of taking on its own merits each of the original cases that had been judged by the local tribunals, appeals were considered in masses, and our civil courts were crowded with thousands of appeals at the same time. The courthouses were crowded with people, cripples among them, waiting for the hearing of their appeals. The French Canadian is a little disposed to laugh at anything that appears ridiculous, and it is natural that these occurrences should cause the law to appear ridiculous to him. Here they saw hundreds of men who obviously were not fit for military service crowding the civil courts of the district of Quebec. For three months not a civil case was tried by our courts; everything was for the Military Service Act. Seven judges sat at one time, all trying these cases. I say to the credit of our judges that they applied the law fairly, as they did all other laws under which they had to give decisions. But suddenly another judge from Three Rivers, Judge Desy, came to Quebec and started to decide a few cases. A few cases, did I say? About three or four hundred men passed through his hands within three or four days, and out of these at least eighty or ninety per cent were conscripted. I do not say that he was right, nor do I say that he was wrong. Young men who appeared before Judge Desy were conscripted, while others whose cases were of a similar nature and who came before Judge Flynn, ex-Prime Minister of Quebec, Judge Dorion, Judge Letellier and Judges Tessier, Cannon and McCorkill, were exempted. These young men who, under the decision of Judge Desy were required to join the colours would say to those who were exempted by the other judges: "Our circumstances are the same; why are we bound to join the colours while you are not? That was one of the reasons for dissatisfaction in Quebec district. There are

10 p.m.

other reasons, one of the chief of which was given this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition. It seems to me that the Government has an unlucky hand when it comes to make a choice of persons to apply this law. Not long ago they chose a man by the name of Tit-Noir Desjardins in Montreal for this purpose—such a man as you might call Gyp the Blood or Fritz the Boxer. In Quebec they wanted to change the colour entirely, and instead of having Tit-Noir Desjardins they have had a man named Tit-Blanc Bacon. You see, therefore, that it is Little Black in Montreal, but Little White in Quebec; but it is the kind of men that the polished, refined population of the old city of Quebec will not have anything to do with. When the Government charges officials with the duty of searching our pockets, they should make a choice of more respectable persons.

On Friday I was in front of the auditorium shortly after it was raided and by reliable persons I am told that during twenty or twenty-five minutes a small crowd of people—young children of fourteen or fifteen years of age—threw, not stones, but small pieces of ice at the windows. At that time the police were not there. Then from twenty to twenty-five men rushed in the theatre, climbed up the narrow stairs and within a few minutes the fire started. Those very same men came down and nobody knew one of them. We used to know the pepole in Quebec, but not one of the people in the big crowd outside the building knew who these men were. That appeared very strange, I must admit, but when I heard the same thing with reference to the Belanger affair the night previous, it seemed to me that it was more than a mere coincidence. It looked as if there was some hand at work which we could not trace. I have talked, not to Belanger himself but to his brother, who had seen the wounded Federal policeman the same afternoon. Bélanger knows every man in the city of Quebec who can fight, because he has been with them all. Bélanger says that he was attacked and beaten by about fifteen persons, and he did not know a single one of them. If that is true it is astonishing, but it would also prove, to the credit of the city of Quebec, that it is not our citizens who took part in the riots. Some one may say " Well, if it were such a small affair it should have been stopped right there by the people." The remark is fair, but the French Canadian has a good deal of imagination, is naturally attracted by any demonstration, but generally minds his business. Any one who knows our population well can easily understand the people gathering in the streets even after the police had told them to go home. They did undoubtedly gather in the streets, but that is all that they did. The next day was Saturday, of Holy Week. The citizens of Quebec and of our province are a religious people, and attend church faithfully on holy days. The services last to a late hour, and it is not surprising if the military found large crowds on the streets. To the credit of the soldiers I must say that they behaved gallantly. It is not pleasant to receive a piece of ice in the face, and some of the officers did receive a few, but they bore it patiently. A few of them, I must admit, took pleasure in doing a little more than was necessary. For instance, there was no reason to make a cavalry charge through the peaceful crowd, and no reason to stop the people on the streets as they did. Let me give one example, because there is nothing better than an example. I know a man who came out of church at five minutes past ten in the evening. When he passed the Auditorium theatre, a good crowd had assembled, and there were a good many soldiers there too, so this gentleman thought it just as well to go home. He had to take a narrow street leading from St. Jean street, up to Grand Allée. There was not another soul on the street, when suddenly an officer leading two hundred soldiers came down the middle of the street at a fast clip. The officer suddenly rushed to the man who was walking quietly home on the sidewalk, and said: "Turn back; you cannot pass here; if you were a respectable gentleman you would not be on the street at this hour." So the man had nothing else to do but join the crowd; it was surely not what the officer was asking for. If he had wanted the crowd to disperse he should have at least let the people go home. If you want to know who that man was, it is the person who is addressing you now.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to cite a couple of cases where an injustice has been done. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that the people of the city of Quebec had been indifferent to what was taking place; they did not help, he said; if that is so, it is partly due to an accumulation of such small cases of injustice as I shall cite. A man by the name of Lacroix did not appeal from the decision of the local exemption tribunal, as apparently he had no good grounds, his father being alive. When the time which he was

given to settle his affairs had expired he had to enlist, although his father had died in the meantime. Lacroix, who was earning from $2.50 to $3 a day, on the death of his father, became the support of his mother and four other persons. He tried to submit his case to the leave of absence board, but before the time fixed for hearing the case came the man had been sent to an unknown destination, and his family now have to depend on public charity.

Let me cite another case. Pierre Cantin is the son of a farmer, of St. Jean Chrysostome. In November last he obtained a certificate of exemption from the local tribunal. On Thursday, March 27, 1918, he came to the city of Quebec, where he was arrested by the Dominion officers and brought to the drill hall. He protested all the time that he possessed a certificate of exemption and showed it to the officers, but they took it away from him, pretending that it had expired and was of no value. Since that time he has been detained in what is called the blockhouse, but I am informed that habeas corpus proceedings are going to be taken.

Before taking my seat, I would like to make an appeal for harmony among the citizens of this country, the French Canadians as well as the English-speaking people. All the reasons which I have stated to-night are not sufficient, I admit, to justify the acts of ruffianism which have occurred in the city of Quebec and the depredations such as the burning of property and the stealing of goods in the stores of the city. I have not attempted to justify such damnable acts. I make this appeal in the hope that remedy for the situation might be found. If we are to have peace and harmony in this country, appeals to prejudice and repeated insults must cease. And to my fellow-citizens of another nationality I would say that if you knew the French Canadian as well as I do, and as well as the English-speaking element of Montreal and Quebec knows them, and if you came in contact more often with that population, surely you would not have the opinion that seems to exist in Ontario especially towards the citizens of Quebec. I would call the attention of hon. members to an article published yesterday, signed by J. H. Roberts who has spent about six or seven years in Quebec and makes an appeal to the Premier, which reads:

> Trust, then, that the good people of Toronto and Ontario generally will remember Quebec in this emergency; that you will be grateful for what we have done to help save Canada from the beer and wine curse being inflicted upon it, and that you will do everything that you can to bring about real unity between the French people of Quebec, my people. I say it as an English Protestant, Protestant from the top of my head to the sole of my feet, my dear French people of the province of Quebec, with whom I have labored these eight years, whom I have learned to love and admire, whose tolerance, forbearance and patience is beyond all description. I say let us work that we may have between those dear people and the rest of Canada a national unity that shall be worth while, that shall make us all say "Canada first," and get us working together for the common good against every enemy outside Canada and inside Canada for the good of all. (Applause.)

Such is the way those who know our population speak of it.

> And to my compatriots I would say: This unpopular law we have opposed but it has become the law of the land and it must be obeyed; in a constitutional government such as we have the majority rules and the majority has decided in favour of this law, it must be obeyed; trust that the time will soon come when the insults and the bad treatment you have received will return to those responsible for them; remember your past, twice through your loyalty and courage, this Canada was by you saved for England; loyalty and chivalry run in your blood; live up to your traditions.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): The question before the House this evening is the justification or non-justification of the riots in Quebec, and after having listened to a number of speeches I say the defence which has been put up on behalf of the rioters is to me the evidence of their condemnation, unless you take into account the ideal which governs the province of Quebec. To say that a man named Desjardins, or a man called Petit Blanc were scoundrels, or to say that the people of Quebec were sensitive when the law is enforced, is merely to say that the temper and disposition of the people is receptive to rioting, unless indeed you take into account the ideal which governs that province. Every nation is governed by an ideal, and national character is expressed by what is called patriotism, which is nothing more nor less than a passion, or an emotion, which is in the heart of every man. The emotion and the passion in the heart of every individual in the province of Quebec, collectively speaking, is that of a colony participating in the benefits of British connection, without doing anything towards the defence of the Empire, and, if need be, the independence of Canada in the end. That is the ideal which has been spread in the province of Quebec of recent years by certain leaders. The people are not apt to be in a receptive mood for patriotic effort in that province, and that accounts for the rioting which took place recently. I am in sympathy with the French Can-

adian people as a people, but their leaders are not entitled to much sympathy from me. I differ in toto from the views of the leaders of the people of Quebec, but the people themselves I do not blame, because they are governed by an emotion or a passion falsely impressed on them. I will prove my case out of the mouth of the leader of the Opposition, and others who have spoken this afternoon. There is no question that both political parties, prior to the last Federal election, expressed the opinion that there was a duty on Canadians to participate in this war. Sir, a duty is engendered from a principle, which, like eternal truth, never changes, and, therefore, duty cannot change or deviate any more than can the principle itself. If it was a duty before the war, then, unless circumstances changed, it was a duty at the beginning of the war for Canada to serve the Empire. But the circumstances had not changed, or, if they did, they changed in the respect that our duty became the more imperative. Sir, to show that a nation acts by emotion and passion, and that a nation is a collective body, with neither judgment nor intellectuality, but that absorption into the collective whole is made by emotion, I have only to recite you a few instances that took place at the beginning of the war. When war was declared men were staggered at the enormity of the impending disaster, and those who came from the old land and had relatives there were the first to think of enlisting and going to the succour of those they had left behind. There was passion and emotion in the hearts of those individuals. Then, shortly after that, you had the reports which came from time to time from the front of Senlis, of Dinant, of the outrage at Scarborough, of the execution of Edith Cavell, of the crucifixion of Canadian soldiers, of poisoning wells, and many other atrocities perpetuated by the Hun. Then Canadians flocked to the recruiting offices and enlisted. Some from the province of Quebec were moved in the same way, because it was the emotion within them that inspired them and not their individual judgment. That was the system of voluntary recruiting, not that there was an exercise of judgment, but because the passion within each impelled him to resent the atrocity that was perpetuated against Canada and the Empire.

But the time came, when that passion and emotion virtually died out. I cannot give you the reasons why, but I may hazard a guess at a few of them, and perhaps it was through the fact that we learned a very short time after the declaration of war that the British navy was impregnable, and that we were secure behind it, and it was also perhaps due to the fact that we had repeated reports of the atrocities of the Hun, served to us every morning and two or three times a day as a menu and we became callous by the repetition of atrocities which created the passion and emotion in the heart of every individual in Canada. Gradually we passed from the voluntary system into another system. I say if it was a duty at first to fight, it is still a duty to-day, and I will refer now to the statement which has been made in this House to-day that the farmer is just as much a soldier as the man who fights in the trenches. I say, yes he is, and he is required. But the war is a sacrifice of blood and not the service of digging spuds, and I will say, Sir, that when war is declared you are called upon, not only to produce food, but also to give the best of the blood of your country in defense of the principles for which you fight. If it were right to fight in the beginning it is right to fight now, and if the voluntary system has failed, then I say to you there are only two ways in which you may fight in this war, as to this, and I defy contradiction from any man in the House. Either you fight voluntarily or you fight by the interpositon of military organization. I agree with the leader of the Opposition that is is not democratic to impose military organization, but it is necessary, as the only alternative of continuing the fight, I say it follows that, if a military organization is necessary to continue this fight, every democratic principle in government must be suspended if it stands in the way of success. Each man's life belongs to the State and each man must take his place in the organic whole.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is that not democratic?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Do not interrupt.

Mr. MACKIE: I court interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. gentlemen wish to interrupt, they must rise in their places.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: May I ask a question?

Mr. MACKIE: Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is that doctrine not democratic?

Mr. MACKIE: That democracy which we had before the war, that democracy we had during the voluntary system, we would

have right now, if you people of the other provinces had done your duty as well as the people of the province of Alberta. But Sir, I say that the only alternative—

Mr. JOSEPH READ: May I ask a question?

Mr. MACKIE: Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The hon. gentleman dodges the question I ask him. Is the principle of universal compulsory military service not a democratic principle?

Mr. MACKIE: It cannot be a democratic principle, and, Mr. Speaker, because the moment that you impose a military organization upon a country, you must necessarily do away with democratic principles. Every man is ordered to take his place in the defence of his country and there is no alternative for him.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: That is democracy.

Mr. MACKIE: Well, you can have it your own way; I say it is not. If the hon. member will repair to my room some time to-morrow or on Monday, I will give him a number of volumes on the subject and he can study it for himself. When a country is at war there is only one object in view and that is victory. Citizens whose individuality is so strong that they will not submit themselves to restraint must either be compelled to accept that restraint or they should lose their citizenship. If the German people have to give up their individuality for the sake of the collective whole, then their opponents must necessarily do the same or else go down to defeat.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Sure; that is democracy.

Mr. MACKIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, Shakespeare asks: What's in a name? My hon. friend is entitled to all the distinctions in names that he likes. When the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, in 1899, for instance, spoke on this question of war, he enunciated those great principles which ought to have been enunciated in this war. Other gentlemen have read his speeches; so have I. I have had the greatest possible admiration for the right hon. gentleman and I have still to-day except for the fact that in 1917 he miscalculated results. But when he said: Let the people rule he understood the philsophy of crowds, he knew perfectly well that he did not mean to say what was printed in these pamphlets. He knew that people are moved en masse by ambition and passion and it was an election appeal that he was making to them for the purpose of returning him to power. I do not believe that the right hon. gentleman has changed the views which he enunciated in 1877, when he spoke on Liberalism in the province of Quebec; or in 1899, or in 1910 when he spoke at the Monument Nationale, Montreal, on the question of Imperialism, or in 1914 when he spoke in this House, in Toronto and elsewhere; or in 1916 when he again spoke in this House. Understanding the philosophy of nations, and the growth of emotion and passion, he threw those principles over in 1917 for the purpose of being returned to power. But he had forgotten that there are other men to-day who are taking a leading part in the province of Quebec, and taking over the fight for the achievement of another ideal than that he himself had set. He forgot also that these men have a greater grip on that province than he himself has to-day, and that they are being influenced by different ideals; and those who say that they will not stand for conscription are really standing for independence. I put this question to those men: To what nationality do you belong; to what nationality do you want to belong? They cannot split their nationality. A man is a British subject in Canada or he stands for independence or annexation. If the battle goes badly, as it might perhaps, the only alternative would be annexation; and the men who say in this House to-day, or at any time, that the system of voluntary recruiting was the only system, and that there was no other alternative, must necessarily draw the deduction from that position, that they stood and stand for the independence of Canada. Because if you are a British subject, you have a British nationality to protect and as the right hon. leader of the Opposition said: "In the matter of the South African war, and when he was attacked here in this House by men who have been attacking him recently, and within the last few years, because they desire to suppress him and to take his position. Sometime the best method of defence one will have is to attack." And that is the case. If in 1899, it was justifiable to speak that way, why do we not find the right hon. leader of the Opposition going through the province of Quebec at the present time and telling the people that the ideal which is governing them is not the ideal which should govern them, and that the best way to protect the Dominion of Canada to-day is not to wait until our shores are invaded, the best way to defend ourselves at the present time is to attack?

There is no question but that Germany's aim in conducting this war is world conquest, and anybody who tries to deny that has not followed the papers. But, Sir, I am getting away from my subject, which is the ideal of the province of Quebec. I want the right hon. leader of the Opposition to go through the province of Quebec and to read to the people statements that he made in 1899 at the time of the South African war. I will not take up the time of the House in doing so, but will just quote a few lines here and here. Let me quote the following utterance of his:

> It is inspiring to reflect that the cause for which you men of Canada are going to fight is the cause of justice, the cause of humanity, of civil rights and religious liberty.

What are we fighting for to-day? Again the right hon. gentleman said:

> Should any one of you unfortunately lose life or limb your country will feel that you have fully discharged the duty under which you place her this day by this sacrifice to Canada's glory, the glory of the empire, and, above all, to the cause of justice, humanity and liberty.

I thought those were beautiful sentiments, but to-day the expression is, "Let the people rule, and down with conscription." The right hon. gentleman is a man who understood the philosophy of nations. He played a political trick, which now he must repent. But he did not mean it. To show you that the right hon. gentleman did understand the philosophy of nations, let me read the language which he used in a speech at Quebec in 1899, when he said:

> I told you a moment ago that I would not swim with the current, I would endeavor to guide the current, and on that occasion I tried to do so. But a moment came in this question when President Kruger sent his insolent ultimatum, and there was a wave of indignation passing over all the British Empire, and I said there is no longer any hesitation, we must act, and we did act on October 14th.

He recognized that Canada in 1899 was moved by passion and emotion, just as it was in this present war. But there were some in Quebec who took exception to the policy determined on at that time. The province of Quebec manifested its ideal on that occasion just as it has done in the present war. And then the right hon. gentleman, speaking in Chicago, said:

> Can we not hope that if ever the banners of England and the banners of the United States are again to meet on the battlefield, they shall meet entwined together in the defence of some holy cause, in defence of holy justice, for the defence of the oppressed, for the enfranchisement of the down-trodden, and for the advancement of liberty, progress—

These were the sentiments that he then expressed, and he went on and said:

> Shall the sacrifice be all on the one side and none on the other?

These were beautiful expressions, but they are not being used to-day. The right hon. gentleman's famous speech on Liberalism, delivered at Quebec, I have read a dozen times. I have not yet learnt it by heart, but I am going to before the session is over. He was telling the French people about the liberties they were enjoying under the British flag, and for the purpose of expressing the idea better than he thought he could himself, he quoted Tennyson:

> It is the land that Freedom till,
> That sober-suited Freedom chose,
> The land where, girt with friends or foes,
> A man may speak the thing he will;
>
> A land of settled government,
> A land of just and old renown,
> Where Freedom slowly broadens down,
> From precedent to precedent;
>
> Where faction seldom gathers head,
> But by degrees to fullness wrought,
> The strength of some diffusive thought
> Hath time and space to work and spread.

This is really the country that we are asked to defend to-day, the country that the leader of the Opposition was telling his people was the land of liberty and freedom. Now, if the mass of the people of Quebec are wrong, it is due purely and simply to another ideal which has developed in the Dominion of Canada, because a national ideal may be divided. A nation need not be unanimous in its ideal. A nation, an empire, or a race is just like a group of individuals; you may have a sub-group. To-day if the labour group of the Dominion of Canada were unanimous in their ideals and agreed together they would become a menace to the nation itself, and there would necessarily be a clash. There is a sub-group in the Canadian nation to-day. That sub-group is the province of Quebec, which is governed by an ideal, an ideal which has spread from the leaders to the masses, whose thought has been trained in one particular direction, although the leader of the Opposition had taught them a better lesson from his entry into politics up to quite recently. But there are those who have followed him, or are going to follow him, who have been educating the province of Quebec in another way. There are leaders in that province who cannot sit in Parliament, and never will sit here, and they are the men who are particularly obnoxious to the rest of Canada.

In conclusion, those who state that the Government has furnished material whereby riots can be created in the province of Que-

bec are arguing against themselves, because it has reference to a nation with a temper and a disposition to be excited by the least possible thing. In war there is no choice, there is no individual liberty and freedom, and every man should take his place. One of the hon. members who spoke in this debate referred to two young men who were taken off the train at North Bay. I was on the same train and was accosted myself. Fortunately, I had a pass, which I showed to the Government officers, but even if I had no papers I could not be mistaken for a man of twenty-five years of age by any means. This illustrates that in war time men must be subjected to annoyance, and if they do not expect annoyance then they are not properly disposed towards war. I extend my sympathies to the mass of people in the province of Quebec, because it is not generally understood that these people are not acting from individual judgment or desire but from emotion and a passion which has been instilled into them by their leaders, leaders who differ with us in principle and are responsible for creating the riots which have taken place in that province recently.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec S.): Mr. Speaker, in the course of this evening's debate the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence referred to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on whom he had conferred certain favours, and, in wishing to prove his case, he said that he had always been in favour of the people of the province of Quebec. I think the ex-minister wished to refer to my humble self, and I think it is only fair to explain to the House the nature of the benefactions he has referred to. At the time that the hon. gentleman discovered me, I held the soft and somewhat lucrative, if not honorable, position of batman to a colonel on the staff, and from that he transferred me to be scout officer on the firing line, and then had me shot. Mr. Speaker, I think that the then Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) was probably carrying out, in my case, what he has been endeavouring to carry out ever since he began his public life, that is to get rid of the people in the province of Quebec as fast as he can, and to diminish the population of that province.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. POWER: Young as I am in years and in parliamentary experience, I cannot but feel that no condemnation is too strong and no censure too severe for those who, whilst the bodies of the unfortunate victims of the late riots are still unburied, have endeavoured to revive the questions which disturbed the electorate at the last election. And, Mr. Speaker, I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite that in their indignation at the outbreak of a few irresponsibles, they must not forget that at this very moment, this very evening probably, from 25,000 to 50,000 Quebeckers are fighting, bleeding and dying on the plains of Picardy and the hills of Flanders.

Mr. BEST: Oh.

Mr. POWER: I did not quite catch the remark of the hon. gentleman, but if he has anything to say I will take my seat.

Mr. BEST: There is not half that number of French Canadians fighting at the front.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of people from the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. POWER: I said that there were from 25,000 to 50,000 Quebeckers now fighting in France. I am sure that there are at least five or six battalions—and I know that the Minister of Militia will bear me out in this—and perhaps seven battalions, excluding the Forestry, Railway Construction, Medical units, and the reserve battalions in England. Surely some hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten to read their newspapers, or have forgotten that not long ago they read in the English papers of the deeds of the 22nd Battalion which stormed the Sugar Refinery and won the streets of Courcellete. Surely they have heard of what our men accomplished at Vimy. Surely they will remember the account cabled a few days ago by Phillip Gibbs of the work of a machine gun unit from Quebec, which for ten days helped to stay the advance of the victorious Hun. Some of their remarks make me think of something which happened in France during the disastrous days of June, 1916, when, unfortunately for the Canadian corps, a certain portion of it lost some lines of trenches, and was ordered to retake them. The attack was made, and the troops had to advance across 600 to 800 yards of open ground in broad daylight. A charge was made, and some 580 men were lost inside of an hour, and I do not know how many officers. Shortly afterwards, a British staff officer—staff officers do not as a rule visit the front line, came along and, after congratulating the colonel on the discipline and bravery of his men, said: "I wish particularly to make a remark about

the company on the left; the company on the left behaved themselves under fire like the very best of the regular troops." The colonel answered: "Those are the French Canadians." Very much surprised, the staff officer said: "The next man who says a word about the French Canadians, I would like to break his block off." That is the translation in the vernacular of what he said. In saying that, I have no warlike intentions towards hon. gentlemen opposite, because of reasons not unconnected with the war I am unable to indulge in fisticuffs. I only wish that English staff officer had been here to listen to the speech on the national ideals of the French Canadians delivered by the hon. gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Mackie), who has just spoken.

As member for one of the constituencies of the city of Quebec, I intend to do something which, perhaps, has not been done to the extent it might have been during the course of this debate, that is to talk about the Quebec riots. I represent a constituency somewhat mixed both as to race and as to the various classes which are contained therein. Something more than three-fifths are French Canadians and the remaining two-fifths are Irish and English Canadians. It is about equally divided between the professional and clerical classes and the labouring classes. Some disorders did occur in my constituency, but they were not brought about by any of my constituents. Unfortunately, the constituency contained the offices of two newspapers, L'Evenement and the Chronicle, which had aroused the ire of a certain portion of the population, and they were made victims of the attack. However, on Thursday, 28th March, a certain young man named Mercier, of whom you have all heard, was asked for his papers by one Evanturel or one Belanger, it matters not which, and on not being able to produce them, he offered to telephone for them or send for them to his home. A man named Moisan offered to go for them.

This offer was refused; the young man was taken to the police station, and afterwards released when his papers were produced. In the meantime the crowd got unruly; certain passages occurred between the crowd and the policemen. It has not been brought out in the debate that the man Belanger, whose pedigree you have heard, having safely escaped from the police station, returned because he had seen one of his old pals in the crowd who had said something to him. He came back and spoke to his pal about it, and that really started the whole fight. The whole thing would have been over with a few broken heads —rows such as that have occurred in other places. There were riots in Valcartier camp when some of the soldiers thought that the persons who sold tobacco and cigarettes to them were charging too much for the goods. I remember in the early days of the war that some of the soldiers tore down two or three of the stalls where cigarettes were sold, and there were a few broken heads. There have been riots, I understand, even in Camp Borden —I do not know why. I remember that there was a riot in Folkestone, England—perhaps some hon. gentlemen opposite were in Folkestone at that time—when some of the Canadian troops were displeased with the manner in which they had been treated by the British redcaps, the military police. A riot of considerable proportions occurred, and when the firemen came to turn on the hose they were served in the same way as it was attempted to serve the firemen in Quebec—the hose was cut, and they had to turn out British troops who were garrisoned in Folkestone to put down the riot. Nobody, however, thought of proclaiming martial law for the soldiers. If soldiers will get out of hand—anybody who has served as a soldier knows what discipline, particularly in the Canadian forces, means—if soldiers will get out of hand, I say, how much more must we expect the ordinary every-day mob to get out of hand.

On the evening of Thursday, or the following evening, the people were saying to each other throughout the town that they were going to the auditorium. On arriving there they did nothing for about twenty-five or thirty minutes. Some songs were sung and a few pieces of snow thrown, but no one was harmed. Finally, the crowd broke in. In order to reach that part of the auditorium building in which the registrar's office is situated one has to climb very narrow stairs, which can scarcely be mounted by two persons abreast. There were, I understand, in the district of Que-

11 p.m. bec—I have an answer on the subject to a question which I put to the Minister of Militia last week—some forty or forty-two Dominion detectives. Surely these detectives, on a stairway where not two men could climb abreast, if they were worth their salt; if they were worth anything to the Government which hired them and paid them to annoy the people of Quebec, should have defended the auditorium building and not have had to rely on the military power. However, the burning occurred, and on the following evening a

kind of attack, or, rather, a sing-song, occurred at the drill hall in Quebec. Two or three hundred young men came up from St. Roch's to the drill hall and there were met by the troops. I do not think it has been brought out so far in the reports of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Riot Act was read on this occasion. I happened to be present, and I heard it read by the troops. The crowd then were caused to disperse very easily, and little of any account was done. Early in the evening, before the Riot Act had been read, snow was thrown—and in that connection I wish to congratulate the troops for their forbearance in not acting any worse than they did.

Next day, Sunday, March 31, the troops were ordered to empty the stores in St. Roch's, lower town. While they were thus employed at the store of Herman Young and Company a certain amount of snow was thrown at them and there the first shot of what we might consider the riot part of the occurrences was fired. Though it has not yet been brought out by hon. gentlemen opposite, this first shot was fired by the troops, and three innocent citizens who were something like a quarter of a mile away, were wounded.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, the hon. gentleman realizes that that is not General Lessard's account.

Mr. POWER: I am quite aware that that is not General Lessard's account; General Lessard was not in town at the time. For the information of my right hon. friend, I may tell him that about six o'clock on Sunday I was entering the Garrison Club when I saw a party of soldiers coming up the street under command of Captain Dunn. I said: "What is the trouble?"—for everything seemed to be quiet at that time. He did not say very much; but he ordered his men along and they went up Citadel hill. Then Colonel Beaubien came along and said: "Did you have any trouble, Dunn?" "Yes, sir." "Any shots fired?" "Yes, sir; our men fired two or three shots; don't know if anybody was hurt." That is the source of my information. Whether this was reported by the military men to the Government, I know not, but I happened to be there by accident and this is what was said. However, I think that even then the situation might have been satisfactory. On Sunday night the rioters, that is to say, the young men who had taken part in these disgraceful scenes—I cannot but condemn them and will condemn them as long as I can—these young men were about satiated; they had seen that force was to be used; they had seen fixed bayonets and realized that the militia were determined to put down all riots and rebellion with a strong hand. Things, therefore, were becoming quiet.

Mr. MORPHY: Who were these young men, and where did they live? Were they from St. Roch's?

Mr. POWER: I am not from St. Roch's; I have not very much acquaintance with the people there. Moreover, I have been away for the past three years and do not know many of the younger generation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Tell him why you were away from Quebec.

Mr. POWER: As I was about to say, on Sunday night the rioting was about over. The rioters were to a certain extent cowed by the display of arms. At that period the Government officials in Quebec—that is to say the then public representative, Mr. Taschereau, who is now registrar, accompanied by one Colonel Machin, who, I understand, went to Quebec as the representative of the Militia Council, spoke to Armand Lavergne. I wish to state here positively that Armand Lavergne has never been, is not, and possibly never will be a political friend of mine. I have nothing to do with taking up his defence; I am only stating the facts of the case from my own personal knowledge and from the information which I have been able to secure. Armand Lavergne was summoned to the Chateau Frontenac by telephone, and there was asked if there was anything that he could suggest with a view to putting down the riots. Armand suggested that he speak to the rioters. so I understand—and I think we are in a position to prove from Armand's own words —that he was asked by Colonel Machin and Captain Carruthers (whose position I do not know) if he would attempt to appease the crowd. Armand told them he would, and left the Chateau Frontenac after they had wished him Godspeed, and told him that anything he said would be accepted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That was a pretty large order.

Mr. POWER: It was; it is the largeness of the order that surprises me, particularly when given to Armand Lavergne, who is supposed to be the arch-rebel of Quebec, as he states himself. However, Armand met the rioters and told them he had been instructed by his friends in the Government to allay the troubles, and asked them to go quietly to their homes, saying that if they did the Government would see to it that

the troops would no longer patrol the streets, and if possible the obnoxious detectives would be withdrawn. Now, I see by the newspapers that the Government have to that extent carried out Armand's promises on their behalf, for they have withdrawn the detectives in the last few days. Armand made those promises, and the crowd went home. On the same evening Armand returned to the Chateau Frontenac and was congratulated on his work by the public representative in Quebec and by Colonel Machin, a member of the Militia Council, and the representative of the Minister of Militia.

Major-General MEWBURN: He has nothing whatever to do with the Militia Department.

Mr. POWER: I accept the minister's statement. I should have said the representative of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: He is certainly not my representative.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I sincerely hope the Government will not go back on Machin.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that Armand Lavergne was my representative.

Major-General MEWBURN: The hon. gentleman said that Colonel Machin was the representative of the Militia Council, and I said no, he was not.

Mr. POWER: After all these denials by the Government, I do not know exactly who Colonel Machin is, but he appeared to have some official position.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want any misunderstanding. Colonel Machin was the representative of the Military Service Council, and we have no apologies to make for him.

Mr. POWER: The Minister of Militia and the Minister of Justice may have a fight on this matter, but I am neutral. At all events, Colonel Machin represented somebody, because the Prime Minister read a report from him. Whoever he was, he congratulated Armand Lavergne on his work on the evening of Sunday, March 31.

Mr. DAVIDSON: How does the hon. gentleman know this?

Mr. POWER: If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish my argument, I will produce all the evidence on that point, if necessary. The next day, Quebec was quiet; the riot was over. Much as we have all said against Armand Lavergne, the riot was over. Not that I think it was due altogether to Armand's efforts; I am under the impression that the young men had discovered they had gone too far, and that it was time to stop. The next afternoon proclamations were issued all over the city of Quebec to the effect that no public meetings would be held, and the soldiers would be on Jacques Cartier Square to see that no meetings were held. It had been promised, rightly or wrongly, on behalf of the Government, that the Government's answer would be given the following evening at eight o'clock on Jacques Cartier Square. At eight o'clock that evening there were twenty-five machine guns and a thousand troops on Jacques Cartier Square. Nothing happened till about eleven in the evening, except that pedestrians walking along the streets were ordered to move on, move on, move on, and the order was reinforced sometimes by a feigned and sometimes by a real prod of a bayonet, which was beastly uncomfortable to the citizens of Quebec, to such an extent that hostilities occurred at eleven o'clock. I have endeavoured to give a true and impartial account of the happenings in Quebec during these five days. I left on Monday evening.

I now come to discuss the causes which to my mind brought about the first and some of the subsequent outbreaks. The people of Quebec are under the impression that perhaps the first outbreak, and even the second when the auditorium was burned, and perhaps the third, when a demonstration was made outside the drill hall, might have been made by some children of St. Roch's and St. Sauveur, but there is no doubt whatever in the minds of the citizens of Quebec—in fact there is evidence—that any subsequent attacks on the part of the crowd were entirely due to utter strangers to the city and district of Quebec.

I have already gone at greater length into the history of the events of these five tragic days to the city of Quebec, but if the House will permit me I will now endeavour as briefly as possible to give some of the proximate causes of the outbreak. As the House is aware, when the proclamation was issued under the Military Service Act, the province of Quebec reported as well, I think, as any province of the Dominion, and when the appeals were neard the province of Quebec had about the same number of exemptions as the province of Ontario; I think there was a difference of some eight thousand. On the other hand the Government appeals in the province of Quebec were something like

thirty or forty thousand, but appeals on the part of individuals were very few. These appeals began to be heard some time in January. The judges heard witnesses, allowed the conscript to state his case, and to be represented by counsel, and the case was heard like an ordinary civil case. Everything went well. Later on, the Government or the Minister of Justice, or someone else in authority—because after my experience with Colonel Machin I do not know just where to place the responsibility—decided that perhaps the law was being too well observed in Quebec, that they reported well, and that their exemptions were being pleaded well. But the rumbling of the storm which broke out this evening, was being heard in the other provinces, and it was suddenly decided to clean up in six weeks the cases which in the ordinary course of events would have taken six months to decide. Hundreds of people were summoned to the courts; relatives and children came to hear these exemption cases. There is nothing discussed except exemption and exemption and exemption. So long as the cases were carefully listened to, nothing was done; but from the moment that a judge was brought from Three Rivers, conditions changed. As a member of the Bar, I have the utmost respect for the Bench, but a certain judge was brought from Three Rivers, and with all the brutality which characterized Judge Jeffries in the worst time of English history, he refused to listen to draftees, treating them rudely, would not allow attorneys to state their clients' cases, insulted any one who appeared in court——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; the hon. gentleman is not in order in making such a statement with respect to a member of the Bench.

Mr. POWER: I withdraw my statements with regard to the judge. However, there was a feeling in Quebec that certain members of the Bench were more or less inclined to be adverse to the draftees. Even that did not affect things very much until the Government adopted the system of Government by Order in Council. First, an Order in Council was passed to the effect that the family physician was no longer to be considered as an expert in the case, that his finding was to be submitted to the Board of Medical Review, and the decision of the Board of Medical Review was to be final. In one case a family physician produced a sworn certificate before the judge to the effect that Mr. So-and-So was an epileptic and had suffered from epileptic fits all his life. That man went before the Board of Medical Review and he was classed A-1 because he could not have an epileptic fit at the proper time to convince the Board of Medical Review. These cases were well known. Everybody in Quebec talked about them.

Then, we had another Order in Council to the effect that the delays foreseen by the law—that is three days and, in some cases, twenty days, to allow for appeal from the decision of the first tribunal—would no longer count. Apparently, from the interpretation which we have had of this Order in Council, these delays were only to count in favour of the Government. A poor devil who wished to apply for his exemption, and who had been in the bush somewhere, or in the back blocks, had not a chance within the twenty days and was conscripted; whereas, if through lack of diligence on the part of the officers of the Government, the public representatives, and others, they had forgotten to apply for the review of a certain man's exemption, the Government representatives were perfectly at liberty to take the law into their own hands and see that the appeal was carried on. There was a further Order in Council prohibiting rehearing, but with that I am not familiar.

However, these are only some of the causes. The question of the men who were placed in charge of the enforcement of the Military Service Act has already been very fully dealt with by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, but there were other things which were said, and I think with some show of justice, because arrests took place in Montreal and it was stated that certain Dominion detectives held up people on the streets, and, if their papers were not exactly right, these Dominion detectives asked them to give them $2, or $5, or $10, and they would let them go free. I understand that certain people were arrested in Montreal under those circumstances. There was another rumour. This is for the information of my hon. friend who asked me a question some time ago. I hope to be able to substantiate it at some other time, because I cannot substantiate it to-night. But it is a rumour and I am giving the causes of the riot. It was rumoured among the people that the Dominion detectives were in the habit of tearing up the exemption papers.

Mr. MORPHY: Were these the papers of persons who were strangers to the city of Quebec?

Mr. POWER: The rumour was that certain of these detectives had torn up papers belonging to exempted men.

Mr. MORPHY: Of the city of Quebec?

Mr. POWER: Of the city of Quebec and the province of Quebec, presumably. I understood from the Prime Minister that such disgraceful occurrences took place all over Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say occurrences, such as the tearing up of papers, had taken place anywhere in Canada. I did not allude to the subject at all. I never heard of it.

Mr. POWER: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. I was speaking in the more general sense. The right hon. gentleman had said that such abuses as had taken place in the enforcement of the Military Service Act —and I presume that would cover the case that I have mentioned—had taken place in other portions of Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said that in other portions of Canada men had been asked for their exemption papers and if their exemption papers were not produced they were taken into custody until they were produced.

Mr. POWER: I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that the abuses by Dominion detectives had taken place in other parts of Canada. However, these were the causes of the riot. I do not intend to go into any further discussion as to the more remote causes of the feeling in Quebec, but I do say that the fact that the Government, in its enforcement of the Military Service Act, changed the law and employed these detectives in the way which I have indicated contributed to the causes which were responsible for the outbreak in Quebec.

Instead of asking the House to moderate its views on this subject, instead of asking the country to be patient with Quebec, instead, after having studied the question, of saying: This was an outbreak which might have been avoided had we been more careful in our exercise of power, the Government have come before this House and said: We will see to it that coercion is used in the province of Quebec. They have deposited on the table of this House an Order in Council such as I do not think ever was passed in any other British country in the world. Extraordinary power has been placed in the hands of military officers. I respect the uniform of His Majesty and every one who wears it but we have put it in the power of the military officer to arrest on sight any man whom he thinks is committing a breach of the peace. This poor individual is to be tried by court martial. The civil law of the Dominion, and of the province of Quebec, is laid on one side in order that the military authorities may have full sway. I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who should know the history of his motherland; he ought to be able to tell us whether, from his reading of history, the 700 years of coercion in Ireland has effected anything to bring Ireland more into line to help Great Britain and the Allies in the present war. I appeal to the verdict of history. We have seen Poland persecuted, its nationality lost, its religion taken away, but Poland after 200 years is still Poland and the people still long to breathe the breath of Polish freedom. We have also seen Alsace-Lorraine torn away from Mother France, and still, forty-four years afterwards, Alsace-Lorraine is one of the reasons which brought about the bloody conflict in Europe to-day. Should, Mr. Speaker, coercion be applied, as it is evident that the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to apply it, should our laws be set aside, should the civil laws of the province be set aside—laws guaranteed by treaty and sanctified by tradition—and everything that we consider just, fair, and honourable in the province of Quebec, be set aside, I am sorry to say that I do not expect it will profit hon. gentlemen opposite in any degree. As one who is for the fullest participation in this war I am sorry to say, considering those whose spirit has been outraged and whose better feelings have all been disgusted by the treatment of the Government, that it will be impossible for us, if we have to use two men for every man we get, it will be impossible for us to put the same force on the battlefields of Europe that I think we should place there. For as long as the feeling of hon. gentlemen opposite is as it is, you will have to maintain a garrison in the city of Quebec, and the effort of taking the men you need will be difficult beyond measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Sedition.

Mr. POWER: I am, as I have already said, for the fullest participation in the war. Too many of my dearest, truest and best comrades, the truest and best comrades that a man could have, now lie buried in the ground trodden by the sacreligious foot of the Hun, and I am sure they never will rest until Canada puts forth its best efforts to wrest from the Hun the land in which they now lie.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): It is not my intention to occupy very many minutes of the time of the House at this late hour. I wish, however, to say a word or two on this subject which I consider is of very great importance, not only to the Canada of the present day, but the Canada of the future. We owe a duty to our Canadian boys who have already gone overseas, as well as to those who have enlisted and have yet to go. We also owe a duty to the generations yet to come in this country, and it is our place, as public men occupying a responsible position, to do what we can to relieve such situations, and prevent the occurrences of such acts as have taken place recently in the city of Quebec. I am in entire accord with the leader of the Opposition when he says that the law must be obeyed in this country, that property must be respected and peace preserved. I am also in entire accord with the expressions of certain gentlemen who have preceded me on this side of the House, who have uttered the desire—an earnest desire, if I may judge from their words—that we may ultimately get peace and concord, and unity, in the Dominion of Canada. I do not think, however, that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was very happy in his speech if he desired to bring about peace and concord in Canada. True, the hon. gentleman was reading from a manuscript which he had doubtless prepared some time ago, no doubt thinking that some mud would be slung from this side of the House, or some insults indulged in, but notwithstanding the fact that there was nothing of the kind, he had, of course, to follow his manuscript and got it off his chest, and I presume he is quite happy now. The hon. gentleman from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) paid his respects to certain of the press of Ontario, and particularly did he pay his respects to a certain newspaper called the Orange Sentinel, remarking that he would venture to read that paper if he were provided with a gas mask. It does seem to me, having witnessed the efforts of the hon. member in this House on a great many different occasions, that that hon. gentleman should be immune from gas of any kind. I was under the impression that he was not susceptible to gas attacks, inasmuch as he has manufactured so much gas himself that I am sure he would long ago have been asphyxiated if gas would do the job.

The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), in speaking on this motion, said that the French Canadian had a good deal of imagination, and he proceeded to convince us of that fact by giving us a demonstration of French Canadian imagination. In the course of his remarks, on several occasions, he had to be corrected and facts substituted in place of imagination by the hon. member from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). But the efforts of the hon. member for Quebec West along imaginative lines are nothing as compared with those of the hon. gentleman from Quebec South (Mr. Power). I venture to say that, if the French Canadian is possessed of a vivid imagination, the hon. member for Quebec South deserves to take rank as the leader and chief of all the imaginative people of the province from which he comes. He drew on his imagination very largely, starting out with a statement which I do not think he should have made—which I know he should not have made, and which he had no warrant for making—charging the Minister of Militia with a desire to get rid of the people of Quebec as fast as possible by sending them to the war. Never in this House has a more unworthy sentiment fallen from the lips of any member of this assembly. According to the rules of the House I cannot use words which would express my feelings with regard to that statement as I think they should be expressed. But that is the sort of thing which, to my mind, indicates the real kernel of the trouble which occurred in the city of Quebec. If a portion of that city will send as its representative to this House a gentleman who will go so far as to make a statement such as the hon. member for Quebec South has made, I think I can find in that some ground for the cause of the trouble in the city of Quebec. I could not help but ask myself, when he made that and several other statements of a very extravagant character, how much did this hon. gentleman do to prevent these riots in the city of Quebec. It is quite evident from his own remarks that he was on the scene a good part of the time. He has described to us the course of events from hour to hour; he has told us that he was right there looking on when the Riot Act was read, and he saw many of the acts which were committed. What did the hon. gentleman do to try to calm the people, and to get them, some his own constituents, to go home and behave themselves as they should? I wonder what the hon. member has ever done to teach the people of his part of the country what their duties and responsibilities were with respect to this war?

An hon. MEMBER: He went to the front.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is all very well, and that makes it all the more strange to me why an hon. gentleman who has been over to the front, and who knows the needs of our men, should assume the attitude which he has in this House to-night, when he made the charge which he has made against the Minister of Militia. I think that is exceedingly strange coming from a gentleman who has had on the King's uniform.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, in the course of his remarks, stated that a more peaceable and law abiding community could not be found in the Dominion of Canada than that of the city of Quebec. That may be so. The hon. leader of the Opposition has represented that constituency for a great many years, and he ought to know it intimately. It occurs to me that they chose a rather peculiar way of showing their peaceable intentions. I am also struck with this fact. The leader of the Opposition has told us that it was not the people from the city of Quebec who were the ringleaders in the riot; no, they came from the city of Montreal. He is unloading his sinners off onto another constituency in the province of Quebec. And who are they? Ex-convicts, thugs, scoundrels of the worst type. And these strangers came to the city of Quebec, which has been represented for some forty years by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. Though it has been represented by the right hon. gentleman, and has had the advantage of his intimate knowledge and his ideas of peace, love and harmony, and should consequently excel in those virtues, we find that city departing from or forgetting the teachings which, I assume, the right hon gentleman has given to the people all these years, suddenly forsaking the doctrines of peace, love, harmony and unity preached to them for forty years, and being carried away by the leadership of four or five ex-convicts, thugs and scoundrels from the city of Montreal. That may be the case, but it does seem strange to me.

There was one course taken by all the hon. gentlemen, including the right hon. gentleman himself, in regard to this trouble: they laid the blame on the Military Service Act and the administration of that Act. The right hon. gentleman went into particulars in regard to the man Belanger, who was a boxer, a fighter and a man of muscle, and another man, associated with him as one of the Dominion police, was also of not very good character. He told us that they stopped a young man named Mercier and asked him to produce his papers. This young man said: "I have not the papers with me, they are at my house." They refused to allow him to telephone for them, and the right hon. gentleman thought that that was a crime on their part. As I understand it, these Dominion police are appointed to perform certain duties. They know what their duties were, and it is not included in these duties that they are to allow men to telephone or to make other excuses for non-presentation of their papers. I also understand from the Act that men of military age are supposed to carry their papers with them, and I can readily understand that. There have been hundreds and thousands of cases throughout the country in other provinces where men have not had their papers at the time they were asked for them, and where they had to go with the officers until such time as they produced their papers. The right hon. gentleman takes the stand that the authorities who were enforcing the Act were to blame because they did not allow this man to telephone to his house requesting that his papers be sent down; and that the Government is censurable because men who, according to the right hon. gentleman, did not appear to be of the best character were appointed to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Act. Well, what does the right hon. gentleman want in the administration of this law in the province of Quebec? When a man is appointed a Dominion policeman for this purpose, must he show his pedigree? Must he pin on his person in a conspicuous place a list of this ancestors for several generations back? When he calls upon a man to show his papers, must he put on kid gloves? Why do hon. gentlemen opposite demand for the province of Quebec a different procedure from that asked by the people of any other province? They tell us that the people of Quebec, especially those of Quebec city, are of a very sensitive nature. Well, that may be; they seem to think more of their own feelings than of the feelings of others. The member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has informed us of what took place in connection with these disturbances. The mob threw pieces of snow and chunks of ice; and the hon. gentleman congratulates the troops on the way they stood these attacks. I am sure that the troops, when they read his words in Hansard, will be delighted to know that they have his congratulations; it is about all they get from him. The troops, then, are to be congratulated because they allowed the mob to throw bricks and chunks of ice at them. This happened

on two or three occasions. On the first occasion they show a good deal of forbearance. It happens again, and there is more forbearance. More congratulations from the member for Quebec South, more ice and snow and bricks and stones from the mob. A splendid spirit on the part of the troops; a magnificent spirit, I suppose, on the part of the mob in the city of Quebec. So this goes on, until not content with throwing stones and ice, breaking into and tearing down buildings and nearly murdering a couple of men; not content with all that, the mob get out their revolvers and shotguns and undertake to shoot up the soldiers. And now the hon. gentleman complains because Quebec was put under martial law; because the military took charge of the situation and intend to round these fellows up and send them overseas so that they may exercise their fighting propensities on the Huns instead of against the boys on this side who want to go over and fight our common enemy.

I am not in sympathy with those who have criticised the administration of the Military Service Act. I was one of the members of the House who voted for and helped to pass that Act, and when I gave it my support I supported those clauses which provided for tribunals, appeal judges, and so on. As we have provided this machinery for carrying out the law, the people of Quebec as well as of the other provinces should have the right to exercise their full powers under the Act. Why has there been so much delay in the province of Quebec as compared with other provinces? Hon. gentlemen have called attention to the number of exemptions and the number of appeals, but they have not taken into consideration also the enlistments from the other provinces, which they should do in order to give the figures fairly. However, I pass that by. In Quebec, then, they were merely exercising their right in appealing against the decisions of tribunals. There were more appeals in Quebec because there were more men in the province eligible under the Military Service Act, and there were more men eligible because fewer men had gone from the province to fight overseas under the voluntary system. This meant congestion in the hearing of appeals. The appeals have not gone forward as rapidly as they have in the other provinces—and why? Simply because the sentiment behind the Act in the province of Quebec was different from the sentiment behind the Act in the other provinces. What are the underlying causes of the disturbances which have taken place in Quebec city and in other parts of the province of Quebec? About eight years ago, speaking in this House, I made the statement that there was in the province of Quebec an anti-British or anti-Imperial sentiment. I was severely taken to task by hon. members on both sides of the House for having so expressed myself, but within the last few years, since the war started, the conduct of the province of Quebec has thoroughly justified my statement of seven or eight years ago. If there is such a sentiment in the province of Quebec, why does it exist? I believe that it does exist, although I am sorry to hold that belief. I think the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) struck the nail squarely on the head this evening in the excellent speech he made when he said that in that province they have different ideals, and that there has been wrong teaching. Wrong teaching by whom? Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go into details, or to go back into the history of this country, but were I so disposed I could quote different utterances of the leader of the Opposition which, in my judgment, have not been conducive to cementing the relations between Quebec and the other provinces of the Dominion and the Mother Country. I could, if I so desired, quote many utterances of the right hon. gentleman which have furnished an excuse to those in the province of Quebec who desire an excuse for evading military service. I have them under my hand; I could give them to the House; I have done so on more occasions than one. Moreover, I have done so in the presence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition; so that I cannot be accused of saying in his absence what I would not say in his presence. I regret it as much as any man who wishes to see this country what I believe it was intended to be, a great country, and what it can only be if we have a united people. Those of the province of Quebec who have enlisted and gone to the front have proved themselves as courageous and as brave as any men who have left the shores of Canada; I have that from personal conversation with different officers who have stood with these men over there, and I cannot think that these men who have gone overseas and helped to make the record that Canada has achieved are different from the great majority of the people of the province of Quebec; but there are certain elements in the province of Quebec which have kept those people from doing their duty, and I propose to state in just a few words what those elements are.

First of all, I say that one of the causes for the sentiment which exists in that prov-

ince—and this is back of the rioting which has taken place there recently, and back of the hostility to the Military Service Act,—is men like Bourassa and Lavergne who have misled the people of that province, and inasmuch as Bourassa and Lavergne repeat in their speeches statements which have fallen from the lips of the right hon. leader of the Opposition I hold him primarily responsible as the original teacher of those false doctrines, and he must bear his share of the responsibility. There is a way of dealing with men like Bourassa and Lavergne—a way which I suggested in this House a couple of years ago, on more than one occasion. Lavergne should have been stripped of his rank as colonel long ago, because he is a disgrace to the rank he holds; that also should have been done out of regard to the men who were in khaki and are in khaki at the present time. It is all nonsense to say that if you do that, you will place him on a pedestal as a martyr, which is just what he wants. I do not believe it for a moment. You put a man like Lavergne or Bourassa behind the bars for treasonable or seditious utterance, and do you think he will boast of the fact that he is behind the bars? Not on your life. He will whine like the cur he is. That is one way of dealing with that sort of people.

Another thing that should be done is to suppress, and suppress immediately, papers like Le Devoir which have not scrupled to scatter their seditious doctrines throughout Quebec and so influence the minds of the people. We are in a state of war and these matters should not be handled with kid gloves. It is either right for a paper to be allowed to circulate that publishes seditious language, or it is wrong, and I do not think there is a man in this House who thinks it is right that such a paper should circulate, and it seems to me, then that the only thing we have to ask ourselves is: Has this paper circulated seditious utterances, and does it continue to do so? If so, our course of action is clear; there is only one thing to do.

There is another cause for all the trouble in Quebec, and I will refer to it in just a word. I have said that I believe that one of the causes of the trouble is wrong teaching by such men as I have referred to. Another cause for this wrong attitude and mistaken sentiment on the part of the majority of the people in the province of Quebec is the attitude of the Roman Catholic church in that province. For some reason or other, the attitude of the great majority of the Roman Catholic clergy of that province is opposed to the Military Service Act, and opposed to this country taking its part in the war which we in Ontario and other provinces think it should take. I have never in my life uttered one word derogatory of the religion of any man, and I hope I never shall. It is not my purpose to discuss the rights and wrongs of this or that religious belief. I wish every man, no matter what his religious belief may be, Godspeed on his journey as he sees it through life, and I hope he will succeed in getting to the proper place when he leaves this world. But while I have no word of criticism in regard to the Roman Catholic religion, I say that when a church, be it Roman Catholic, Presbyterian or any other denomination, enters the domain of politics and takes an active and influencing part in directing the destinies of this country, and tells the people what to do in a great crisis such as this, I have a perfect right to discuss the matter with them. I do not attack their right to express their views; if they wish to enter the arena and place their reasons before the public they have a perfect right to do so; but I trust that no person will then find fault with me if I pass my opinion upon their views.

I do not intend to state here why the attitude of the Roman Catholic church in the province of Quebec is what I believe it to be, but I do say that in those two reasons—the hostility of the majority of the clergy of that province to the Military Service Act and to full participation by Canada in the war, and secondly, to wrong teaching by such men as I have alluded to—you have the causes leading up to the disturbances which took place in the city of Quebec last week.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to represent in this House of Commons of Canada the constituency of Dorchester, I was under the impression that I would be called here to give, according to the very modest experience which I possess, my views on the legislation which would be submitted for consideration. I have been here now ten days, and I have listened very attentively to the discussions which have taken place. I have had two surprises already, and perhaps I shall have more before the session is ended. Last year, the whole press of this country, Liberal and Tory, proclaimed to the country that a Union Government had been formed, composed of the best elements of our population, to help Canada take her part in the war. But since the session

commenced, we have seen just what kind of Union Government it was that was formed at Ottawa. Last week my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce introduced a Bill, and hon. members on his own side of the House took occasion to make a very violent attack on the minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: On the Bill.

Mr. CANNON: The minister was behind the Bill, or the Bill was in front of the minister. I think the minister was more badly hit than the Bill because the Bill passed. When I left Quebec a day or so ago, I looked into the faces of women who had lived hours of tragedy and of drama. We had soldiers in our streets of Quebec by the thousands. Every street corner was guarded with machine guns. Quebec was practically under martial law. We were experiencing all the difficulties and troubles of actual war. Nevertheless hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House take the occasion of these troubles to bring on a debate, and not to remedy the conditions, not to suggest measures which would bring peace to the people in Quebec and throughout the rest of the Dominion. When the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) rose in this House, he rose, not as a patriot, not as a Canadian, thinking only of Canada, but he was thinking of his own petty and mean interests as a local provincial and parochial politician from Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should qualify his language. He should withdraw the words "mean," "politician." They are hardly parliamentary.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision. I withdraw the words which are not parliamentary. I only wanted to point out to the House that I thought is was very unfortunate that an event of the importance and of the gravity of that which happened in Quebec should be taken as the occasion of such a debate as we have heard in the House to-day. Have we spoken, Mr. Speaker, of the riots in Quebec? Have the members on the other side of the House suggested remedies? I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) making an attack on the Roman Catholic clergy. I have heard members on the other side making attacks on the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I have heard them making attacks on the French Canadians as a race. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I thought in this House of Commons of Canada that, no matter what province you came from, no matter what nationality you belonged to, no matter what creed you believed in, there was one ideal which was common to everybody—the love of our common country. I do not think, Sir, that discussions like that which took place to-day will help Canada to become the big, prosperous and great nation she should become. Hon. members on the other side of the House have been very wide in their remarks. The scope of their speeches has extended over the whole political situation in Canada. They have pointed out different reasons for the situation which exists in Quebec to-day. Will you let me say that the members of the Government are responsible for the situation in Quebec to-day, on account of the policy which they have followed, on account of the policy which they persist in, unfortunately, to-day, of coercing the province. I do not wish to say that the ministers have bad intentions; I do not wish to say the Government is doing it with the object of arousing ill-feeling in the province of Quebec. But I say that the attitude of the Government for the last four or five years has been of such a nature that ill-feeling has been aroused, and that the Government ought to take measures to appease the people of Quebec. What happened, Mr. Speaker? We have heard the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) talking about Mr. Bourassa, talking about Mr. Armand Lavergne and saying that Bourassa and Armand Lavergne were the real cause of the whole trouble. I am not here to defend Bourassa. I have never been a political supporter of Mr. Bourassa, and never endorsed his political ideas. On the contrary, I have always fought his candidates. I was a candidate in 1911 in the county of Charlevoix. I stood there as a Liberal candidate, supporting the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I stood for the Naval Bill introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and I stood for participation by Canada in Imperial wars. But at that time Mr. Bourassa was not denounced by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), nor by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), as a cause of danger or as a reason for sedition in the province of Quebec. Bourassa was brought by the friends of the hon. members in the province of Ontario, and he spoke to the people of Ontario in order to defeat the hon. leader of the Opposition. What was the programme of Mr. Bourassa at that time? I do not wish to insist on

this point, but I only want to point out that in 1911 Bourassa and his school, supported, financed, paid and organized by the Tory party, went through the province of Quebec, and said that we did not owe anything to England, and they were applauded by members of the Tory party who afterwards became members of the Borden Government. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the House of one incident. In the by-election in 1910, in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, I supported the policy of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who was leading the fight against the Conservative candidate. Mr. Monk was a minister in the Borden Cabinet. Mr. Sevigny, Mr. Blondin and Mr. Lavergne were there. And who was supplying the money to beat the Liberal candidate? The Montreal organization, backed and inspired by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), if my information is reliable. That night, when the result of the election in Drummond-Arthabaska was announced—the hon. Minister of Railways laughs. He may laugh, but I am quite convinced he knows what I am saying now is true.

An hon. MEMBER: You have got the wrong minister.

Mr. CANNON: On election night, when the Liberal candidate was defeated, when the Nationalist doctrine in Quebec received its first support and triumph, a member of the present Government telegraphed Armand Lavergne and said: "Anything to beat Laurier." The hon. member for North Simcoe, this afternoon rose in this House to inquire about the reason of the riots in Quebec. I will give the real reasons. I have given the first, and I will give later the proximate reason of these riots. Let us go further, and examine the history of the last five years. When the elections of 1911 were held in Ontario, the Tory organization, led by the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), waved the British flag, and said that in the province of Quebec everybody was disloyal and everybody was a traitor, whereas in the same province, Armand Lavergne, Henri Bourassa and all that crowd were fighting the fight of the Tory party.

You succeeded. The Tory party came into power. Those who had promised in the counties of Ontario, and in the counties of the English provinces, to save the British Empire, were the first to give the fattest portfolios to their new Nationalist friends to reward them for their share in the victory. Canada had this extraordinary and remarkable spectacle of an ultra loyalist like the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) sitting close to Mr. Monk, who would not fight for England. That is the second cause of the riots in Quebec. It was the want of sincerity on the part of our public men when the Cabinet was formed.

Let us go farther. A gentleman who is still a member of the Cabinet, although he is not a member of this House or a member of the Senate, a man who is kept in this Cabinet against every principle of constitutional law, a man who has no right to sit in the Cabinet because he has no responsibility towards the people, a man who bored holes in the British flag in many counties in Quebec, has been drawing $7,000 from the Crown since my right hon. friend has been the Prime Minister of this country. Third reason for the riots in Quebec.

My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) wants to know why the people of Quebec are displeased. I will tell him. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that a province like the province of Quebec, which has been the pioneer province of this country, a province that has sent to this Parliament the brightest men that Canadian politics had known, will consent to be represented by a man who has lost his deposit in one constituency and who has been beaten in another by 2,000 votes? French Canadians may have defects, but they have one quality, and that is the quality of self-respect. When a race has self-respect that race has the right to be respected by the Government of the country. Fourth reason for the riots in Quebec.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) claims that Le Devoir ought to be suppressed. I am also of that opinion. Suppress it. But I am sure of one thing, and that is that the Government has not the courage to do it. It is no use coming before this House to lie to the country. What we want are the facts and nothing else. Le Devoir is a menace; suppress it. Orders in Council are easily passed. Why will not Le Devoir be suppressed? I will tell you—because it is financed by Tory money. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) is the man who financed Le Devoir in 1911 so as to beat my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for St. Antoine is not in the House. I am sorry. If he were here I would say just the same thing.

An hon. MEMBER: And he would not deny it.

Mr. CANNON: The money that was given to Le Devoir to preach this doctrine of sedition, this unpatriotic principle of non-participation by Canada in Imperial wars, came from the Tory party. Every word which was printed, every sheet that was distributed in Quebec was paid for with Tory money—

An hon. MEMBER: The country's money.

Mr. CANNON: And probably the country's money. How is that money being reimbursed to the hon. member for St. Antoine?—boot contracts for the troops over in Europe. Mr. Speaker, that is the fifth reason for the riots in Quebec.

I wish to congratulate my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) on the very moderate speech which he has made. I have had very bad information about the hon. member. I understand that last year there was a certain discussion into which my humble personality was mixed and certain things that were said were reported to me. I am quite sure that my hon. friend from Simcoe was not in as good humour then as he was to-day. I congratulate him and I also congratulate the hon. the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). I can tell my hon. friend that in Quebec there are some people who do not like him. Why, I do not know. If my hon. friend would go to Quebec oftener and speak the way he has spoken to-night everybody would like him. The unfortunate side of the situation between Ontario and Quebec is that the people of Ontario do not travel often enough in Quebec. If the two peoples would meet, if the two populations would mix, all this friction would soon disappear and this trouble would be a thing of the past.

I am quite sure, Sir, that you have heard it said in the House that I was a rebel. It has been said. It was said, I understand, last year that if I was elected to this House, I would not be allowed to take my seat because I was worse than Louis Riel.

Mr. BUREAU: Who said that?

Mr. CANNON: I forget who said it. I am very charitable and even if I did remember who said it I would pretend that I did not remember. But I can tell this House that I am no rebel, that I am a plain, simple, good-intentioned Liberal.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Very simple.

Mr. CANNON: I may be very simple but I will try to be complex as fast as I can. This afternoon I heard certain hon. members talking about the riots in Quebec. I was present. I had gone there to spend the week-end with my family and that is no sin. These troubles, I understand, were not serious at the outset. As a matter of fact, nobody considered them very serious. Who is responsible for the occurrence on Monday night I do not know and it does not belong to me to lay the blame on any shoulders. Col. Machin came to take charge of the situation and, as representative of the Federal Government, what did he say and what did he do?

He was then, mind you, representing the Government. He put the whole situation into the hands of one man, who has been denounced by every speaker on the other side of the House this afternoon. I refer to Col. Armand Lavergne. The Prime Minister has mentioned statements from Col. Machin and Mr. Taschereau. The statements referred to have not been read, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read you an affidavit or sworn declaration that I have received from Mr. Lavergne. The papers in Ottawa were kind enough to say that that affidavit had been handed to me by my friend, Mr. Lavergne. I do not deny that Mr. Lavergne is a friend of mine socially. Politically, we have never been friends, but I do not believe in beating a man when he is down, and if the Government has committed a blunder of putting the situation into the hands of Armand Lavergne, I think it is my duty as a member of the House to acquaint the public with the facts. That is why I am going to read Col. Lavergne's affidavit:

I, Armand Lavergne, of the City of Quebec, advocate, being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, DOTH SAY AND DECLARE:—

1. Sunday the Thirty-first of March, about 6.45 p.m., at my house where I was confined by a slight attack of grippe, I was called to the phone by Mr. Alleyn Taschereau, Public Representative of the Minister of Justice for District E, under the Military Service Act.

I understand that since this affidavit has been sworn to Mr. Taschereau's position has been changed, and instead of being simply the representative of the Department of Justice in the city of Quebec, he is the registrar of the whole district. Therefore, there is no doubt whatsoever as to his official status and standing.

2. Mr. Taschereau, who has been for long a personal friend of mine, requested me to go over immediately to the Chateau Frontenac, and meet him at Room 301, stating that he had something very important and urgent to talk to me about;

3. When I got there, about a quarter past seven, I was introduced to Col. Machin, and another gentleman by the name of Carruthers, Captain or Colonel;

I do not know who the Mr. Carruthers referred to is, but perhaps some member of the Cabinet will give us that information.

4. After a few friendly words, Colonel Machin asked me what I thought of the present situation in Quebec City, how it was caused and the best means to face it;

5. I told Col. Machin that in my humble opinion the situation had been brought about by the choice and lack of tact of the Government federal detectives charged with enforcing the Military Service Act. On this point we all agreed;

6. I then said that my impression was that the whole thing could be stopped if anybody was willing to go and meet the rioters, speak to them, tell them that those detectives which are known in the city as very low characters, would not have anything more to do with the enforcing of the Act, and that the troops who were patrolling the streets would be returned to barracks. If that were done all the trouble would soon end;

7. Colonel Machin, or one of the other parties present, informed me that we should try to avoid bloodshed, as the troops that night were going to fire;

8. To this I agreed willingly. As Colonel Machin, myself, and others present, were desirous to bring the thing to an end as soon as possible, with the least serious consequences. I suggested sending anybody, and said that as far as I was concerned, I was willing to do it if I could state the above-mentioned conditions, namely, the removal of objectionable detectives and retirement of troops;

9. Colonel Machin told me that he had not the necessary authority to assure me of that, but that he would do his best to have those things accepted in Ottawa, and he thanked me for my willingness as to the best means to end the trouble;

10. He then asked me to dine with him—

That would have been a rather funny dinner.

—which I refused, saying, that I was going to try immediately, to which he consented, and wished me Godspeed;

11. I left the Chateau Frontenac and went down to headquarters, where I saw General Landry, Officer Commanding Military Division No. 5. I told General Landry that I had seen Colonel Machin, and what I proposed to do. He told me it was the best service I could do them, and the City, under the circumstances. I then asked him where he expected the most serious trouble to break out that night. General Landry told me the rioters had just burnt the store of Martineau on St. Joseph Street, and he was informed they were coming to Lower Town to the Mechanics' Supply, via St. Paul Street, and asked me to go down that way and meet them;

12. I then left and went down alone by Mountain Hill, St. Peter and St. Paul Streets. Opposite the Mechanics' Supply I met two municipal policemen, and asked them for any sign of rioters, which they told me they had not yet. I then walked out St. Paul Street and met a small group opposite the C. P. R. Station, composed of about thirty, which group came to my notice as they were walking on the sidewalk, by some whistles being blown, and some of them yelling "Let us go down (en bas)". I made a sign to them with my hand to stop and asked them where they were going. Their welcome to my question was very equivocal, so I said to them "You know who I am", gave them my name, and told them that if they went further they would be mowed down by the troops; that, on the other hand, I was the bearer of a message of peace if they would stop trouble. After some discussion, their number had then increased around me to about three or four hundred, who could hear what I was saying, I made them the above proposals, and a few of them suggested my addressing them to the whole crowd, which might number one thousand or fifteen hundred. I got up on a Ford automobile, which was there, and repeated what I had said, and asked them to disperse, stating that the military authorities would rely on their honour to keep quiet, and that they in their turn could rely on the honour of the military authorities to have things in the City restored to their normal state the next day if they would be peaceful that night, and if the military authorities kept their word, to pledge themselves (the rioters) to create no further disturbance on any of the following days. To this they agreed in great majority enthusiastically, although I had to meet objections and insults from a very few seattered individuals;

13. After that someone suggested that a great crowd was assembled on the Jacques Cartier Market Place, and to prevent any trouble from them that I should go and repeat my remarks there, to which I agreed;

14. The crowd was swung back, and we walked back to the Jacques Market Place, where I repeated practically the above remarks before an audience of five or six thousand persons. The people then again pledged themselves to keep peace, and the propositions I was bearer of were greeted with enthusiasm, except from the same few scattered voices;

15. After that, they requested me to let them accompany me to the Chateau, but I begged them to disperse and go home immediately. I boarded a street car, came up to the Chateau, and reported to Col. Machin, who thanked me for what I had done, and I told them that although I understood that the troops had to be kept in readiness, if they were taken away from public view I felt assured perfect quiet would reign in the city. He agreed with me, and said he would report same to General Lessard. I then reported by telephone to General Landry, stating the same opinion, and also personally, to General Lessard, who appeared at the Chateau a few minutes later. I just say that of all the people I saw last night in the crowd of rioters, I knew nobody personally except one man, to whom I had not spoken for the last five years. When I went home about one o'clock, practically all the troops had gone back to headquarters, and no trouble had been reported since.

I also want to state further that if it had not been for Colonel Machin's earnest request and sincere desire for peace, I would not have take any action in the matter, and I have signed:

Armand Lavergne.

SWORN before me in Quebec this First day of April, 1918.

H. E. Lavigueur,
Maire de Quebec.

I think that, in justice to Mr. Lavergne, and in order that the House may have a

complete story of the facts as they happened in Quebec, it is very important that that affidavit should have been read.

I do not wish to prolong these remarks. I only wish to say that when this Government introduced conscription the feeling in Quebec was very adverse. As a matter of fact, I have been a candidate against conscription, and I am not afraid to repeat that I have not changed my attitude, and I am still opposed to conscription. I am not against it because I am against the British Empire; I am not against conscription because I do not wish to help the British armies in this war, but I am against it because I think that conscription is not the best means to help the British Empire. And one of the main reasons for that belief is that it has divided our country; and as was said many years ago, a nation divided against itself must perish. But conscription passed, and passed with most extraordinary and exception methods. I have no right to judge those methods, but what happened later was also a cause of the riots in Quebec. The Government did something which is not usually done. It announced, before the elections were even announced, that the elections were going to be won. And why? Because they had deprived part of the population of their vote. And I admired this afternoon the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) when he frankly admitted that if it had not been for the Franchise Act the Government would have been beaten. I do not think that the province of Quebec was well pleased to see this Government elected by the means chosen.

Now, a few very brief remarks as to the application of the law itself. After the elections were over, the people of Quebec, after fighting the Government and being defeated, took their medicine like men. They obeyed the law, they registered, there was no trouble; everything went fine. When did the real trouble start? When the Government, against the constitutional rights of this country, started amending the Military Service Act by Order in Council. That Act was passed last year and is the law of our country. We have to obey the law, and every citizen has to abide by the law of his country. But I maintain that no Government no matter how strong it may be, has a right to tear up the British Constitution and enact laws by Order in Council without consulting Parliament. A few days ago the Military Service Council sent the members of this House a pamphlet entitled "The Military Service Act, 1917, Manual," and also giving particulars as to the regulations. A few months ago I received another pamphlet bearing exactly the same title, but if you read the two pamphlets you will see a difference. The Military Service Act has been changed in its essentials without the people or Parliament being consulted. In what sense? My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is a man whose legal experience I admire. He has been a member of the judiciary of our province, and is at the head of the Justice Department. I may tell him that I do not believe one word of what hon. gentlemen opposite said this afternoon about the administration of his department. I have confidence in the Minister of Justice, and, although he has been attacked by his own friends, I tell him that my confidence in him is not shaken. Has the hon. Minister of Justice advised his confreres that such change should be made in the law? It was changed in three ways. First, the man who was before a court had the right, according to the law and the existing regulations, to adduce medical evidence as to his present condition, whether he was A1, or B, C, D or E. Under this regulation doctors were brought into court, and family doctors and physicians were examined. The Government has passed a new regulation, putting in the hands of three doctors forming or composing a board of revision the final decision as to the physical capacity of the conscript, without the right of appeal to the judge. The judge cannot change that decision. Since when—and I appeal to the Minister of Justice—has a judge been bound by the decision of an expert? It is against every principle of common law in this country. May I add that as far as the city of Quebec is concerned, I do not know if the Government acted with bad intentions, but when that board of revision was formed, instead of choosing in the city of Quebec physicians and doctors who were fully competent, they chose, I do not say doctors who were not competent, but doctors who did not belong to that city or to our province, who did not talk the language of the people who were brought before them, and who asked for information and when the conscript gave it the doctors did not understand it. Is that a fit condition of things? I am quite sure that the minister did not know things like that were happening in Quebec, because if he did there would have been a change.

Another change has been made. The regulations enacted were to the effect that the military authorities or the conscript himself had twenty days in which to appeal and not a day more. Therefore, if,

after a man had received a favourable decision, twenty days had expired, the man could go home according to law and say: "My case is settled, I will not be worried any more." But on account of the incompetency of the officials in Quebec, appeals have not been taken within the twenty days. And what did the people of Quebec hear ten days ago? That this Government, without consulting the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, had provided that the military authorities could appeal whenever they wished, whereas the conscript had not more than twenty days within which to appeal, as under the old regulations. Is that fair? A man goes before a tribunal, he is exempted, and then, three, four, or six months later, he may be dragged again before the court and have his case reopened. That is not British justice; that is not British law. I am sure that a law of that kind would never have passed in England, and if any Government had dared to pass it, they would not have lasted twenty-four hours afterward. The people of the province of Quebec do not want privileges; we do not want favours; we want justice and nothing else. This is a third change in the law that the Government had no right to make, having regard to constitutional authority and precedent. An hon. gentleman smiles; but I tell him that I know what I am talking about. According to constitutional usage in England and in Canada this Military Service Act cannot be amended except by Parliament itself. The Prime Minister this afternoon talked about the War Measures Act. If the War Measures Act is a war measure, wide enough in its scope to change the character and the essence of the constitution, it has no binding effect upon the people. Not even the Parliament of Canada has the right to change or alter the constitution of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and elementary question. Two years ago the gentlemen then sitting on the treasury benches thought that it would be good for their political health if they took steps to extend the term of Parliament. It was a matter of less consequence than amending the Military Service Act or than changing a law which calls people from their homes and occupations and business to do military service on the other side of the water. Did they pass an Order in Council? Did they use the War Measures Act? They could not; they had no right to do so. Why? Because the extension of the parliamentary term meant an amendment to our constitution, and the only power that can amend our constitution is the Imperial Parliament. Since when has our constitution provided that the representatives of the Canadian people shall no longer be consulted on matters of this kind? Why are we here, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CURRIE: Because we are here.

Mr. CANNON: It may be that the hon. gentleman does not know, but I do know. Why are we here? To pass Daylight Saving Bills? To be consulted on petty and mean measures? To deal with what the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) the other day called fads and freaks? But when it is proposed to suspend the common law of our country, to close the courts of our provinces, to deprive the population of liberty and freedom and constitutional privileges, we, the representatives of the people, are not consulted. Mr. Speaker, your parliamentary experience is very wide, but I should be surprised if you could quote a precedent from British, Canadian or American constitutional history—I shall not say similar, but even a slightly analogous instance—to justify the step which the Prime Minister of Canada has taken to-day. Motions are called, and without giving us the right to discuss the matter the Prime Minister lays on the Table an Order in Council destroying every constitutional guarantee that we in the province of Quebec and you in the other provinces have. Is that fair? Is that the proper way to govern this country? I say that it is not. What are the aims and objects of the allied nations in the great war which is now being fought? It is that of maintaining liberty and freedom for the universe and for humanity.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CANNON: I hear an hon. gentleman say "hear, hear." I believe it is an hon. gentleman who has fought for liberty and freedom in Flanders, and I congratulate him on having done so. I would ask him, however, to put the same energy into fighting in this country for the preservation and maintenance of the freedom of his own people. The House of Commons of Canada has today witnessed as sad a spectacle as ever was witnessed by any Parliament in the British Empire. Why so? Because, first, this Order in Council has destroyed every constitutional guarantee; and, second, in this country there should be no question of coercion. We should be united. Why is it that in the city of Ottawa, at the Chateau Laurier, on the street, when members of the House of Commons meet, they

exchange a friendly handshake and friendly views, but the moment they enter the House they seem to forget their friendliness and their common united interests? No matter what may have been said, the province of Quebec is very useful to the rest of the Dominion and has done much to build up our country. Quebec has produced great statesmen; I have only to point to my right hon. leader, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who is certainly the most distinguished man that Canadian politics has produced. The people of Quebec want to live in peace with the other provinces, but how can we live in peace unless the attitude maintained at present by certain elements of the population ceases? The Solicitor General in the present Government (Mr. Guthrie), for instance, addressing a public meeting in the province of Ontario, narrows his mind to such an extent as to declare that, luckily for Australia, it has no province of Quebec. How can you have union in this country, how can you have harmony in this country when the president of the Council makes such declarations as he did during the last election campaign? How can you have union and concord in this country when a man like the Hon. G. H. Ferguson declares on the floor of the Ontario Legislature that French Canadians are no more needed in the province of Ontario than Germans or Austrians? How can you have union in this country when you have the press of this country insulting Quebec every day? The Orange Sentinel is a sheet which ought to be suppressed. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has declared that Le Devoir ought to be suppressed. I agree with him, but he ought also to agree with me in asking for the suppression of the Orange Sentinel for the same reason. Much to my surprise and astonishment the Prime Minister of this country announced this afternoon that there was a revolution and sedition in Quebec. For a definition of sedition, Mr. Speaker, I would refer you to Article 132 of the Criminal Code, and the decision given by Lord Halsbury in England. If the Prime Minister is sincere in his desire for union and peace among the peoples of this country, let him suppress the Orange Sentinel and have its editor arrested, just as Le Devoir ought to be suppressed and its editor arrested. What is bad in Quebec is no better in Ontario. Let us hope that better days are coming. Let us hope that in the English provinces there will arise a man of the broadmindedness of the former leaders of the parties in this country. Let us hope that Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Oliver Mowat will have worthy successors. Let us hope that once more from Ontario Liberalism will be heard. Let us hope that once more from Ontario a voice will speak as the old Liberals used to speak in this Canada of ours when we used to fight for liberty and freedom. Let us hope the spirit of Lyon Mackenzie, of Mowat, Blake, Ross and Macdonald is not dead. Let us hope that Ontario will again do something for liberalism in Canada. When we have real liberal-minded people in the English-speaking provinces, if they will come to our province, they will be welcomed, because in the province of Quebec there is no narrow-mindedness; we are broadminded. We have sent to this House fifteen English-speaking members elected by fifteen French-speaking constituencies; I should like to know what county in Ontario, with an English-speaking population, would elect a French-speaking candidate. What is the use of wasting our time as we have been doing this afternoon talking about Quebec and Ontario. There should not be any Quebec or Ontario; it should be Canada. So far as I am concerned, in my personal business, I do not ask whether a man comes from Nova Scotia or Saskatchewan, whether he is Irish, Scotch or English; as long as he is an honest respectable Canadian, that is good enough for me. I regret that we in this country have never well understood Canadianism. You may love England. England is the mother country of the vast majority of the people of this country, and it is only natural that English-speaking people should love England. England is lovable on acount of its great institutions and its great history. But why did our forefathers come to this country? They came to settle in a new country, where we could be loyal British subjects in being loyal Canadians, and I think that the moment that the people of this country realize this truth all these small, petty, mean provincial troubles will disappear.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): I have no desire at this time of the morning to take up the time of the House, but I believe this is a subject which interests people in Canada at this time more than any other. The people of Canada are anxious to know the reason for the recent disturbances in the city of Quebec, and I have listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the reasons put forth by the speakers on the other side of the House. The

last speaker, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) asked a very pertinent question towards the close of his remarks. He asked why we were here. He did not give an answer but I will give one. The majority of the members of this House are here to see that our men overseas get proper reinforcements, to see that every part of Canada, so far as we can make laws to accomplish that purpose, shall provide an equal and fair proportion of those reinforcements. A great many reasons or excuses have been given to-day for the disturbance in Quebec. The reason put forth by the leader of the Opposition was that a certain officer employed by the Department of Justice asked a young man in a very uncivil manner to show his exemption papers, and when he could not do so, arrested him. Consequently, there was a riot, which I believe cost the lives of many innocent citizens. For the benefit of those members who do not understand the circumstances in other provinces, I may say we have exactly the same thing to contend with in Ontario and every other part of Canada. I know one point within a short distance of where I reside where a man may be called upon to show his papers ten times a day. If he boards a train, he has to show them, most assuredly, and show them again before he gets off, and if it is a junction point he may have to show them five or six times in one afternoon; but there are no riots up there; we have killed nobody; we have not had to dig any one out of the snow. The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), who was on the ground at the time, gave a variety of reasons for the disturbances and incidentally I suppose rehearsed some of his election speech. He said the reason the Military Service Act was enforced upon this country was in order to get rid of the poor habitant of Quebec, send him over to France and get rid of him as soon as possible. If that were our object, we have not been very successful. A few minutes later the hon. gentleman said that there were twenty-five to fifty thousand men on the fields of Picardy to-day from the province of Quebec. I venture to say, and I believe I can say it without danger of successful contradiction, that there has never been in any part of France, 5,000 French Canadians at any one time. It is all right enough to praise the 22nd Battalion, and we do it. We give the French Canadian soldier every credit, and he deserves it, but unfortunately the only infrantry battalion from Quebec which has ever seen France is the 22nd, or about 1,000 men. We know these facts. And as a matter of fact hundreds of men were taken from Alberta and other provinces to reinforce that one single battalion, which is at the front at the present time, and these men were not even French Canadian by origin, but men speaking the English language. The hon. gentleman goes on to tell us that this Act is applied differently—or he infers that this Act is applied differently—in the province of Quebec, and that is the real cause for the riots. He does not say for an instant, that he, as a member of this House, did anything to stop the riots, or counsel these men in a better way, or to lead them in the right way. We have every reason to suppose from his own words that he did nothing to counteract the trouble in Quebec.

Then we come to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). He has a different version, although he says he was present at the time, and he goes very far afield when giving the reasons for the riot in Quebec. But he went into the matter very carefully and he gave the reasons, first, second, third and fourth, and what do you suppose were the reasons which he gave? 1st he says that there was an election in the county of Drummond-Arthabaska, and that the Grit representative was not elected That is reason number one—a Liberal candidate in the Drummond-Arthabaska election in 1910 was defeated. Reason number two is that during the election of 1911, only seven years ago, there was an unholy alliance between the Tories of that time, or some of them, and the Nationalists of Quebec. I do not intend to take the time of this House with the discussion of a matter of this kind. We all know it is absolutely beside the question of the present time, and it is only done for the purpose of camouflaging the real issue as it stands to-day. Reason number three was that the present Postmaster General had been or was drawing a salary of $7,000, and he is not at the present time a member of the House, having been defeated in 1911.

The fourth reason was that Le Devoir had not been suppressed. I think it is idle even to discuss matters of this kind. This gentleman knows perfectly well that the only reason which can be given which will hold good in the matter of the disturbances in the province of Quebec is that these poor misguided men have been deliberately misled by the leaders in the province in which they reside. We know perfectly well that these men of themselves are peaceful, law-

abiding citizens, but they have been badly led from time to time, and they have been persuaded that if they would raise certain disturbances, or take certain action, this Government would be weak enough, or supine enough, to allow them to get off, and permit the Act to fall into disuse.

Mr. BUREAU: That is absolutely false.

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. gentleman says that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. BUREAU: I do.

Mr. ARTHURS: In the riding which I had the honour to represent in the last election this argument was used openly from the platform in places where there were French Canadian voters. It was represented to the voters that if they voted for the candidate supported by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the Opposition, he would secure for them immunity so far as military service is concerned, and personally I have not the slightest doubt that was done in every constituency in Canada where it was necessary to get the French Canadian vote.

Mr. BUREAU: Who was the French Canadian leader who stated that in the hon. gentleman's riding?

Mr. ARTHURS: I am not talking about French Canadian leaders, but I refer to the man who opposed me, and his statements were on a parity with the statements of all the French Canadian leaders, and I know the statement was made throughout Ontario.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman said Quebec just now.

Mr. ARTHURS: I believe it was made in Quebec in exactly the same way.

Mr. BUREAU: It was not.

Mr. ARTHURS: Another complaint made by the hon. gentleman from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) was that this Government had got in, and this Act was being enforced—why? Because the late Government had deprived certain citizens of the country of the right to vote; or in other words, that had we given a vote to the alien, the men who had no interest in the country, who knew nothing about our interests, whose interests and leaning and longings were all for the old land of Germany or Austria from which they came, the result would have been different. He suggested that if we had allow these three or four hundred thousand aliens to swamp the vote of the Canadians in this country his party would have been successful, and there would have been no riot in Quebec. I honestly believe that statement is true, but the people of Canada were not so inclined, and at the election on the 17th of December they not only gave this Government a mandate to enforce the Military Service Act, to take the necessary number of men for the reinforcements at the front, but they said that this Act which deprived these Germans of the right to vote as British citizens was absolutely to their liking and was good common sense.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Members of the Cabinet said quite the contrary, and yet the Cabinet has been sustained. The War-time Elections Act was not the policy of the present Government, it was the policy of the preceding Government; and many of the men who sit in the Cabinet to-day denounced it, and quite properly so.

Mr. ARTHURS: I think, Mr. Speaker, that one member to-day, the hon. member for North Simcoe has very properly said that the members behind the Government on this occasion are not rubber stamps, that we have minds of our own, and that we say exactly what we think. If I am asked what I think about that particular measure I will say this: That if the present Government are not in favour of it their judgment is not as good as the judgment of the late Government, because the late Government were absolutely right in passing a measure of that kind. So far as I am personally concerned I believe the verdict of the people on the 17th of December last, means one thing, if no other, namely that the people of Canada gave to this Government, whether they are Unionist or Conservative or whatever they may be, the mandate to support the boys who so sorely need that support to-day. They gave them the right to take, not 100,000 or 200,000, or whatever men were necessary for reinforcements, but they gave their mandate that, so far as humanly possible, every part of Canada should do its share in supplying men. I think it is idle to give excuses. I think the representatives of Quebec would employ their time far better if they would apologize for the occurrences in Quebec, instead of trying to defend them.

Mr. T. VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, your French Canadian colleagues, and especially the residents of the city of Quebec, who are members of this House, have a special interest in the subject-matter of the present debate. In both of these capacities, I feel that it is my duty not to remain silent. No doubt we are

passing through a serious stage. Overseas millions of men are engaged in the fight, and we are proud indeed that in this battle for the supremacy of civilization and democracy, we count hundreds of thousands of our compatriots. Two weeks ago the struggle entered upon what many believe to be its final stage. I think, as has been pointed out by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), it is beyond question that very much depends upon the issue, and the hearts of the people of the whole country are lifted up in intercession that the right may prevail. It is therefore deplorable beyond expression that at such a time as this an ugly outbreak and disturbance of the peace should occur, in this country. For us Quebeckers and French Canadians it is sickening and almost unbelievable to think that such shocking incidents should take place in our dear, old, peaceful city of Quebec. Nobody resents it more than we do. For the outsider the incident will have only an historic importance. Many will come to Quebec to visit the spot where it occurred, to see the places where the machine guns were laid on the mob and to see the streets where the men fell. But we Quebeckers who live there shall constantly have a remembrance of the disgrace that took place last week.

By what I have been able to gather, from what has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, the necessity for the drastic enactments contained in the Orders in Council laid on the table of the House was due to the lack of response on the part of the French Canadians to the appeal to them to willingly enlist, either under the system of voluntary recruiting or since the Compulsory Military Service Act was brought into force.

Sir, allow me to take exception to that statement. There is no lack of ideals on the part of the French Canadians. The ideals of the French Canadians are not emotions and passions, as was stated a few moments ago. The patriotism of the French Canadians of the province of Quebec lies in a clear comprehension of the true interests of this country. This clear comprehension, Sir, is not alone the heritage or the property of the French Canadians. The clear comprehension of the interests of every country has been the decisive motive that has led every country and dictated the action of every country in this war. What did the English statesmen consider before they decided to enter the war on the side of France and the other Allies? A few days before the declaration of war the French Ambassador at Petrograd, in consultation with his Russian colleague, tried to induce the English Ambassador to make a formal declaration that England would be on the side of France and Russia if war broke out. What did Sir Edward Grey instruct his ambassador to respond? He said that England would not side in the war with France and Russia unless British interests required it. That is contained clearly in the diplomatic papers. The French Ambassador urged England to declare that she would be on the side of France and Russia, and he went so far as to say that if such a declaration were made war would not be declared by Germany. Notwithstanding that, English diplomacy stood by the contention that England would not enter the war unless British interests required it. While Sir Edward Grey was declaring that unless British interests would lead England into the war——

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, ——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I was held down pretty closely to the rules and I would suggest to you that the hon. member is travelling pretty far from the question before the House.

Mr. VIEN: I understand the point of the order raised, but I made an assertion, and what I am saying is preliminary to establishing it. I made the assertion that the French Canadians in the province of Quebec comprehended the interests of this country, and that in looking at the situation purely from the point of view of Canadian interests, they are acting in the same way as the British diplomats did. I do not blame England for having considered British interests before committing the country to war. We considered that Canadian interests were at stake and we looked at that directly. A few months after the declaration of war a message of the President of the United States was issued urging the people of that country to stay neutral because that was in the interest of the United States. Only after three years had passed did the United States enter the war. Did they enter the war when Belgium was invaded, when France was attacked and invaded? No, Sir, during those three years the United States, following the same course, doing business as usual, were trading with Germany and Austria, were supplying the enemies of the Allies with munitions, food and weapons to invade Belgium and France, But one day German submarines came across the

ocean, American ships were sunk and American lives were lost. One day the Lusitania was sunk and hundreds of Americans perished. Then the United States entered the war because American interests were at stake. I say, Sir, that true Canadian patriotism must not be carried off its feet simply by the fixed idea that the war can be run only with men, that the war can be won only through the instrumentality of the Military Service Act, and that even if we take another standpoint we are not patriots and true Canadians.

Sir, it has been stated to-day that we did not respond to the Military Service Act, and that has aroused the sentiment of the population of the other provinces against the province of Quebec. We have sent four hundred thousand men overseas, we have spent almost two thousand million dollars, and we now stand alongside the United States, who, for three years, have enriched themselves with the millions derived from trading with Germany, and who during that period did not send a single man overseas. If we are allied in this war we are partners in the same enterprise and to the same end; but in a partnership every partner must do his duty. What would you think of two merchants, partners in a store if one would go in the morning and open the store, sell to customers the whole day long and put money in the cash box when it was empty, and the other would go at nine o'clock, smoke a cigar, simply chat with the customers, take one half of the earnings when he required it, and walk away at night? Such a partnership would not be fair, and would not long continue. Sir, if we are partners in the war the United States must do their share, and they have the men to enable them to do so. It is useless to contend that Canada must send one hundred thousand men more to win the war; the men are not required. The men are required only for the political purposes of those who apply the Military Service Act. Why do the Americans refrain from sending men to the front? Their contention is that they have no ships. How is it, then, that after sending overseas four hundred thousand men we have the vessels wherewith to send one hundred thousand more, and yet the Americans have no ships for the transportation of their soldiers?

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (Perth N.): Where does the hon. gentleman get the information that no American troops have been sent overseas?

[Mr. Vien.]

Mr. VIEN: I do not say that no American troops have been sent, but I take the declaration of the United States Minister of War for anything I say in this regard. A certain number of American troops have gone overseas, but there are two million men now available in the United States. Why do not the United States send those two million men across the ocean? Because they say, they have no ships with which to transport them.

Mr. CURRIE: Is the hon. gentleman trying to make the argument that Canada should not reinforce her men at the front, but leave them to die like rats in the trenches until such time as two million Americans were sent over? If so what has that got to do with the resolution before the House?

Mr. VIEN: I was coming to that point. I am trying to make that point clear to the minds of my English-speaking friends. I have often discussed the matter with them, and I have met with the same objection that the hon. member for North Simcoe has now raised. I say that the contention of the Government is simply a matter of pride, a matter of fulfilling a promise which was certainly made without due consideration. Why should we keep five divisions, or four divisions, or two divisions at the front? If, Sir, we have sufficient men to maintain two divisions at the front and two divisions in the rear, let us keep two divisions in the rear. Sir, we must not forget—and this is an answer to my hon. friend, the contradictor,—that France handed over a portion of its front to England, that England assigned a portion of its front to Canada. Why should not Canada to-day hand over a portion of its front to the United States? We have for three years during the war done our duty. Why should we not now, when we are called upon to make a greater effort, allow our partners in the war to do, not better than we have done, but just as much. Sir, this is the point of view of many French Canadians. They look at the matter from a purely Canadian point of view, because it will not be in the interests of Canada to ruin the human, the vital force of the Dominion, and ruin its credit.

In so far as the sending of 100,000 men overseas is essential to the winning of the war, if it were so, I would immediately approve of it, but I say that it is not essential, because if a hundred thousand Canadians were kept here, a hundred thousand Americans could be sent overseas to do their

duty and take their share, and in that light we view the true interest of the Canadian people. We are not in Canada for one year or for twenty-five years; we must foresee the after-the-war conditions, and in so doing must consider to what extent our effort financially, and in so far as man power is concerned, must go.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? There are, I believe 4,000 odd French Canadians fighting bravely at the front. Does the argument of the hon. gentleman mean that no further French Canadians should go to support them, and that we should depend upon Americans to support those brave French Canadians at the front?

Mr. VIEN: That is not at all my argument. I take a much wider, a Canadian, point of view. I am not making any discrimination or undue distinction between any portion of the elements of Canada in the ranks of our troops overseas, and in so far as that is concerned, to answer my hon. friend, I might point out what I heard said in a speech at Niagara. When British-born citizens came to settle in Canada before the war, I learn from reliable sources, there was a certain appellation applied to them. They were called "English sparrows" in some circles here, because the English sparrow has had the bad characteristic of going to its neighbour's nest and eating the eggs. When the war broke out, what occurred? The province of Ontario was glad to rank and to number among her sons 60,000 of these "English sparrows," who were not Canadian-born. We had no "English sparrows" in the province of Quebec. The men who have been sent overseas from our stock are Canadian-born citizens.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And many more than four thousand.

Mr. MORPHY: The number is 4,826.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, Sir, I have it from a chaplain who was there from the beginning. There are over twenty thousand French Canadians at the front, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. VIEN: I want to make this argument to show that the population of the province of Quebec were not carried away by simple emotion and passion. They are directed in their conduct during the war by a true understanding of the real interest of Canada and they are foreseeing post bellum conditions.

I have answered the hon. gentleman who said that we were carried away simply by emotion and passion. Let us come now to the sad events which have occurred in Quebec. A complete statement of the facts is now in the possession of the House, and they have been ably narrated by hon. members who have already spoken. I do not wish to cover the ground again, but I think that too great stress cannot be placed upon the fact that among the population of the province of Quebec the disturbance has received the unreserved condemnation of the great mass of all classes. The churches, the liberal professions, the industrial commercial and labor leaders, and the local press have unanimously joined in reprobating it. To bear me out in that statement, and to leave no doubt whatever in the minds of hon. gentlemen, allow me to invoke the unimpeachable testimony of Major General Lessard himself. On the 3rd April, in his statement to the press, as I read it in the five o'clock edition of the Ottawa Journal, he qualifies the whole incident as "the disgraceful conduct of a small number indeed of irresponsible persons inspired and directed by outside agents." I have cited his words textually. That fact was absolutely evident to everybody down there. I was in Quebec on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, and although not an eyewitness of everything that occured, I have made it a point to collect reliable information right at the scene of the disturbance. On the 2nd of April, the Prime Minister made a statement to this House which appears on page 250 of the unrevised Hansard. I cannot agree with my right hon. friend in so far as his appreciation of the action of the local police is concerned, but in the main his statement is corroborated by the subsequent reports laid on the Table. Allow me to make a very brief summary of what took place and of what the Prime Minister said.

The incidents commenced on Thursday evening. On that evening some Dominion officers were pursued and sustained some injuries from the handling to which they were subjected, but nothing more of importance—I cite the very words of the Prime Minister—seems to have occurred that evening. On Friday an attack was made on the registry office which was ransacked, but very little loss of important documents occurred. The same evening two newspaper offices were attacked and damaged, but there was no great material loss, and there was no bloodshed. On Saturday evening

there was some disorder, the mob appeared very unruly, and military patrols of the local garrison were ordered out, but still there was no bloodshed. That is all that occurred before the active intervention of the military, according to the Prime Minister's own statement, and as supplemented by the reports published in Hansard. It is greatly to be regretted that the newspapers were at first supplied by the Canadian Press with grossly erroneous and exaggerated reports.

The Canadian Press was most unfortunate indeed in the choice of its local representative; or else if the events were correctly reported, and afterwards viciously exaggerated before they were communicated to the newspapers, that is tantamount to an odious conspiracy, and the public has the right to know what influences were brought to bear on the official of the Canadian press and for what purpose this course was taken.

As soon as the disorder broke out, with an apparently commanded unanimity, the press interpreted it as a general loosening of a previously determined and well-organized opposition on the part of the population of the whole province against the application of the Military Service Act. As if to excite a still greater animosity against Quebec, the first disturbance, which now boils down to a simple row, was greatly exaggerated. Belanger, the Government spotter, was reported dying in a hospital, whereas he had simply been black-eyed and had returned home unmolested during the day. Those who have visited the auditorium since the occurrence know that the fire damaged only a few rooms. The breaking of a few windows in the auditorium annex and the commencement of fire, easily extinguished, were reported as the complete wrecking of the whole auditorium and its destruction by fire. What the Prime Minister sums up as a very small loss of important records—Hansard page 250—was reported to be the destruction of all the records absolutely essential to the successful application of the Act in Quebec. Immediately after, again with an apparently commanded unanimity, the press intoned a hymn of hate against the oldest province of the Dominion, against one third of the population of this country. This was the prelude to an equally unanimous appeal to the Government for a sturdy treatment of Quebec, which course the Prime Minister later announced and which we now know has been followed. The conduct of the Canadian Press was in the first place, extremely dangerous, as likely to inflame against each other, as it did, the already excited minds of English and French-speaking people, and as likely to drive the rioters to further excesses. Secondly, it created in the minds of the people the impression that the population of the city and the province at large were backing the disturbance, which, we know, was contrary to the fact. I am pleased to see that as soon as the various newspapers had time to send a special representative to the scene, they immediately proclaimed that the great mass of the population disapproved the movement. As General Lessard puts it, the whole affair was the result of the disgraceful conduct of a small number indeed of irresponsible persons, inspired and directed by outside aid. But the harm was done, and a thorough investigation should be made to place the responsibility where it should lie. The press is a power in this country, but the essential condition of the privileges and liberties which it enjoys is that it should not become mischievous and a danger to public peace. On the other hand, the newspapers which in good faith published reports received from the Canadian press should see that they are not deceived in future, and that the offenders are punished. Before long it is not improbable that we shall know what influence was brought to bear on the official of the Canadian press to cause it to give out such grossly exaggerated reports.

Let us now consider the intervention of the military, and whether it was justified by the facts. All members of the House will agree that in such a riot or outbreak the first consideration of the officers should be that of preventing bloodshed. Bloodshed is the most regrettable incident of the whole affair. On the first evening some Dominion officers suffered injury through the handling to which they were subjected. On the second evening the registry office was ransacked, but little loss of important records occurred. The newspaper offices were wrecked, but there was no bloodshed, and the mayor thought that he could deal with the situation; that military assistance was not required. But by reference to Hansard, page 300, it will be seen that the Government intervened; they sent to Quebec a Toronto regiment, which paraded the streets with machine guns; and then the bloodshed took place. Happily the situation is now well under control. To many the action of the Government in causing the military to intervene in the Quebec trouble will appear to be a strong and commend-

able move. I shall agree with them if such a course was, first, in conformity with the cardinal principles of British Government; second, in conformity with the law of this country; third, justified by the facts; fourth, prudently carried out. We all agree that peace and good order must prevail; their maintenance is the very object of the existence of public institutions. Strong action on the part of the public authority in its proper sphere is desirable. The aid of the military and the civil power in some circumstances is also desirable, and it is especially provided for by the law. But, on the other hand, it has always been a cardinal principle of British government that the military power should be the servant, not the master, of the civil authority. Our compatriots the Orangemen—I shall call them my compatriots, for they are Canadians and so am I—my compatriots, the Orangemen of this country, still gloriously celebrate on the 12th July the Battle of the Boyne. But the Battle of the Boyne was the final incident of a big revolution. The real results of the revolution had been previously embodied in 1689 in the Bill of Rights which supplemented the Magna Charta. Among other things laid down in the Bill of Rights was the denial of the two things against which we are now fighting—the Divine right of Kings or Kaiserism—and secondly, militarism. To deny the Divine right of Kings, the Bill of Rights provided that the civil list which up to that time it had been customary to vote for life on the accession of each sovereign would in future be voted yearly. To safeguard against militarism and to prevent the Army from being controlled by the King, the Bill provided that the Army Act should also be voted yearly. King William III, one of the greatest soldiers who ever sat upon the British throne, only came to the throne by solemnly abjuring the exaltation of the military over the civil power. These principles are the rock bottom upon which is based the British Constitution, and they constantly receive the wholehearted support of every true Englishman.

These principles have received constant application, in Great Britain, the United States and Canada. The United States went so far as to wage the War of Independence to guard against the enforcement of an obnoxious tax by armed force. In Canada this Parliament has restricted by statute the interference of the military power in civil affairs, even for the maintenance of peace and good order. Our Militia Act not only specifies the case in which the militia can be called out in aid of the civil power, but carefully prescribes the procedure, which is supplemented by the King's Regulations. It will be illuminating at this moment to read the provisions of the Militia Act, contained in section 80 and the following sections of chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

80. The Active Militia, or any corps thereof, shall be liable to be called out, within or without the municipality in which such corps is raised or organized, for active service, with their arms and ammunition, in aid of the civil power, in any case in which a riot or disturbance of the peace requiring such service occurs, or is, in the opinion of the civil authority hereinafter designated in that behalf, anticipated as likely to occur, and, in either case, beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, or to prevent or deal with.

81. The district officer commanding in any locality, if he is present in the locality and able to act, or if he is not so present, or from sickness or other cause is unable to act, the senior officer of the Active Militia in any locality, not from sickness or other cause unable to act, shall call out the Active Militia, or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, when thereunto required in writing by the civil authority hereinafter designated in that behalf: Provided that so far as the Permanent Force is available, a sufficient number of the Force is to be employed upon the duty of preventing or suppressing such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance before recourse is had to other militia corps, and shall replace such other militia corps if so called out upon duty so soon as and to the extent the Permanent Force shall thereafter become available.

The Act specifically provides that the active militia shall not be called out on active service unless required, in writing, by the civil authority. We have also the British North America Act, which entrusts the provincial legislatures with the maintenance of peace and good order, with authority to enact police regulations. In this country, as well as in England and the United States, the police organizations are essentially municipal, and everything pertaining to municipal matters comes under the jurisdiction of the provincial authority. (British North America Act, section 92, pp. 8 and 16.) These principles have been upheld time and again by the Privy Council. Thus, in British institutions the military power is made the servant of the civil authority. Our Constitution leaves to the province the maintenance of peace and good order in all municipal affairs. Even in the administration of justice the provincial Attorney General is the proper authority. The Militia Act limits to very specific cases the

intervention of the military power, in aid and upon the request of the civil authorities.

Let us now come back to the complete facts of this case. The disturbance of the peace was local in character. At first there was no bloodshed, but some government policemen were roughly handled, a few windows were broken, some documents destroyed and building set on fire. The police could not prevent everything, but they did prevent bloodshed. The general officer commanding assures the mayor that military assistance is available, but the mayor declares that he can deal with the situation, that military assistance is not required, and that he is able to cope alone with any outbreak. This is contained in the statement laid on the Table by the Prime Minister himself, and reported on page 300 of Hansard. In such a case was the Government justified in calling on the military to intervene? No, Sir. The cardinal principles of British government, the constitutional laws of this country, the special Act provided to govern the militia, condemn the Government and the military authorities. Until then no bloodshed had taken place. It was only when the Government had chosen to reinforce the garrison at Quebec, and bring into action all the military machinery, that blood was shed. Was that course justified? The Prime Minister himself has taken the trouble to give evidence to the country. (Hansard, page 250.) An adequate effort by the local authority would have put down the disturbance. Then, surely in the case of failure by the municipal authorities, an appeal from them to the local garrison would have been amply sufficient.

The mayor was in conference with the general officer commanding and was supplied by him with a copy of the Riot Act. He proceeded to the place of the disturbance and succeeded in reducing the effect of the disturbance, the result being that while some windows were smashed, there was very little loss of property. Without authority and without necessity, the federal authority inflamed the smouldering embers by bringing to Quebec a Toronto regiment. Other cities in the past have been the theatre of such deplorable incidents, but the military authorities never intervened before being called upon to lend assistance to the civil powers, as provided by law. What would the good people of Toronto say if, in order to quell a disturbance in that city, a Quebec regiment were sent there with machine guns. They would pelt with rocks and stones the damned Frenchmen from Quebec. Excuse the expression, but I want to be accurate —they would shoot at them with firearms of various kinds. This is what was done in Quebec. (See Prime Minister's speech, Hansard page 251). The facts narrated by the Prime Minister would never justify such an outrageous intervention by the militia. This was a gross and most imprudent transgression of the law. This incident exemplifies the soundness of the principles laid down by the right hon. leader of the Opposition; that is to say, the desirability of at all times following the law. The fact that one illegality will lead to another and as a logical consequence——

Mr. CURRIE: I rise to a point of order. We are starting a new Parliament. I am quite willing the leader of the House should make a statement from written notes, but I think it is time we drew the line at these long drawn speeches being read off by members of the House.

Mr. VIEN: I understand the point of order, and I am willing to submit to it. I will explain the reason of it before the ruling is given. It was simply to get through more rapidly and save the time of the House.

Mr. CURRIE: Take it as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule of the House is very explicit that written speeches may not be used.

Mr. VIEN: As a consequence of this transgression of the law by the Government, and the outrage on the people of Quebec by calling Toronto regiments to parade in their streets with machine guns—

Mr. CURRIE: I again call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has not obeyed the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman from West Simcoe rises again to a point of order, and says that the hon. gentleman is not obeying the rule, but that he persists in reading the speech.

Mr. VIEN: I will abide by your ruling, but I think that my hon. friend is very severe, indeed, in the application of the rule, on this side of the House, but he himself was called to order many times by the Chair when he delivered his own address. He is very severe indeed towards a new member of this House delivering a speech in a tongue not his own. If my hon. friend were to deliver a speech in French he might be obliged to use some notes, and to read them, and I am paying to the majority

of this House the compliment of speaking in their own tongue, although the French is an official language in this country. It seems to me that I am badly repaid for my goodwill. I will simply have to take a little more time, because the rule which prevents me reading my notes does not prevent me from consulting them. I said, Sir, that, as a consequence of this transgression, and of the outrage to the people of Quebec by calling Toronto regiments to Quebec to march through their streets with machine guns, the excitement of the mob naturally greatly increased, and then only did bloodshed ocur. The Prime Minister has endeavoured to shirk responsibility from his shoulders, and to very generously shift it to the municipal authorities of Quebec, stating, and I might be allowed to use this note to quote, textually, the words of the Prime Minister, so that my hon. friend might not take exception to it. At page 251 he said:

> The disturbance might have been put down without much difficulty, if proper effort had been made by civic authorities.

The Prime Minister, to my mind, only succeeded in clearly establishing that the affair was a purely local one, such as occasionally occurs in every city, and nothing warranted the nation-wide importance which was given to it by the press and by the Government. The Government which so forcibly declared its intention to see that the law is strictly adhered to gave us a very poor example of obedience to the law. As wrong is ordinarily followed by wrong, and as one illegality leads to another, the military intervention has caused serious bloodshed, the responsibility for which lies exclusively with the Government. The Prime Minister's insinuation that the local authorities were not disposed to observe public order is not worthy of his high office. (Page 251 of Hansard). No statement is less warranted by the facts. In the state of excitement of the mob, the police did very well, indeed, to prevent bloodshed and limit the effect of the disturbance to rough handling of some undiscriminating Government spotters. The breaking of a few windows and a little loss of important records were all that occurred. The disorder, Sir, would surely have died away with no other consequences, had not the Government been guilty of a very unwise, ill-timed, unlawful and outrageous intervention. During this occurrence, the local authorities showed great wisdom and consideration, and knowledge of the character of the population. The Government, if not actuated by political motives, have not shown justifiable grounds for their action and their intervention. The Orders in Council which have been laid on the Table of the House involve a serious departure from the ordinary course of constitutional law in England. Disturbances more serious than the riots at Quebec have occurred in England and Ireland and the Government of England did not see fit to suspend the constitution of the country. Might I cite one instance in which the Government of Great Britain might have been justified in taking drastic steps? Will my friends the Orangemen of this country kindly remember what occurred when King Carson organized an army of 60,000 men to resist the application of Home Rule? He armed these men with the outspoken intention of resisting the application of the law. Did the British Government suspend the constitution? Did the British Government recall the Magna Charta or the Bill of Rights? No such thing was done. British institutions were strictly adhered to. What did England itself do in Ireland during this war? A Military Service Act was enacted in England. Was it applied to Ireland? No. Why? Because the Irish people did not want it.

Mr. BOYCE: What have we to do with Ireland? The hon. gentleman has travelled all over the world.

Mr. VIEN: I am citing these instances to show that the Government, on the present occasion, put aside the constitution of the country, that they were not justified by the circumstances and that they will find no precedent to sustain their conduct in this regard. They will not find any precedent in England, in Ireland, in Australia, in America or any place in the world.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Except Germany.

Mr. VIEN: Except Germany, and I was coming to that. We are fighting against Kaiserism, against bossism, against Prussianism. What are these appellations? What do they mean? They mean the encroachment of an organized military Government against the freedom of modern democracy. If we want to make the world free for democracy, which is stated to be the intention of the allied countries, we must not follow the same path that the Kaiser has followed on the other side. We must not introduce into this country Prussianism and Kaiserism with their results.

Canadian blood has been shed in Quebec. A few years ago a great strike broke out in France. The employees of the various public utilities quit work. The telegraphers and

the railway employees left their employment. They organized themselves to prevent others from working in connection with the public utilities. The Prime Minister of France then took the necessary steps to put down the disturbance and after having used all his power to accomplish that result he was able to go to the French Parliament and to show to the whole world that his hands were clean of French blood. I very much regret indeed to say that after the repression of the Quebec riot the Prime Minister of this country is not able to say to this country that in suppressing that local disturbance his hands are clean of Canadian blood.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Yes, and innocent blood.

Mr. VIEN: And innocent blood. It is a most regrettable incident. It is a most unfortunate feature of that incident that it should have been given such grossly exaggerated proportions, that it should have caused the Government to set aside the principles of British Government. There is an incipient apprehension in this country and in this House when we see the constant trend in the political movement in the direction of superseding the civil power by the military power. What is the real effect of the Orders in Council which have been laid on the Table of the House? The real effect, Sir, is to take away the judicial power from the properly constituted authority, and to vest and merge it in the executive power. This has never been done under the British flag since the Bill of Rights. It is now twenty minutes after two, and I will no longer occupy the attention of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear .

Mr. VIEN: Some of my friends on the other side appear to think that I have taken too much time already.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Go on.

Mr. VIEN: We will certainly not be afraid of whatever threat the Government of Canada choose to hold out to the French Canadian element, or to the province of Quebec. We are law-abiding citizens. We were equally so under voluntary enlistment law, because there was no compulsion then. We are still law-abiding citizens when we take advantage of the provisions of the Act to enforce our civil rights, and I think it is a vicious insinuation to characterize the action of the French Canadians in that respect as absolutely unpatriotic, as was done this afternoon. I think that if a better understanding of the French Canadian point of view were arrived at by the English-speaking side of the House no such thing would be possible. I think that through a more intimate intercourse we could come to understand each other's point of view more intelligently and more closely. We do not criticize the English-speaking element of Canada, neither do we want to impose our views on them. We do not wish to enact laws to govern them, our desire is that they shall be free to do as they please under the British flag. But, at the same time, Sir, we claim the same privileges for ourselves. If this is a free country, and we are to continue to enjoy the liberty to which we are entitled, all will be well. But I say that the provisions contained in the Order in Council laid on the Table to-day are opposed to that liberty, and if they are put into force I am afraid this beautiful Canada of ours will not be a happy country to live in. I am afraid that grave danger of disruption is impending, and that the Government is not taking the necessary steps to eliminate that danger in the future. As I have already said, we are law-abiding citizens, and we will continue to be so, but there is not the slightest reason why a vicious reflection should be made on the character of a whole population because of the occurrence of a riot of a merely local character.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (Calgary, E.): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be doing very much less than my duty to my constituents who elected me to Parliament on the 17th of December last, to say nothing of ignoring my own very strong feelings on the subject, were I to remain silent and not to express my views on the subject under discussion. I come not from Ontario, nor from any part of Quebec, where possibly historic conditions may be responsible for local feeling or prejudices, but from western Canada, where I can assure you there is no feeling or prejudice against any nationality or any special race. In the West we regard ourselves as Canadians and we think that answers all requirements. For us there are no especially favoured communities; and we feel that as Canadians, as members of a free community of the British Empire we have very great rights and privileges, and that it is our duty now, and whenever occasion may demand, to fight as fully as may be in our power for those rights and privileges. I do not think I am taking an unreasonable view in expressing the belief that the willingness to fight for the rights and privileges we enjoy should be coexistent with their enjoyment. I am absolutely free, as I

believe the people generally in our province are absolutely free, from any prejudice. But we do feel, for two reasons—first, that we need the men, and secondly, because the province from which I come, and perhaps other parts of Canada have done more towards sending men overseas than have been done in the province of Quebec—that more men should be sent to the firing line from that province. The mandate which was given to me, equally, I believe, with the mandate which was given to other members who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of December last, was that we should come to Ottawa and do our utmost to enforce the Military Service Act, not only in a similar manner in each province, but also that like results should be obtained from one end of Canada to the other. That, I feel, is the reason that I was sent here by my constituents, and, to be frank, I have grave doubts as to whether I was sent here for any other reason. Such being the case and such being my own personal belief and feeling, I intend to do what little I can here to see that the Act in question is carried out absolutely and entirely.

As regards the riots that have taken place in Quebec, I do not think the Government have gone too far in the way in which they have attempted, and have to some extent succeeded in enforcing this Act in that province. The previous enlistments in the province of Quebec for service overseas were not nearly as great as in other parts of Canada, and while, under the Military Service Act, one hundred and seventeen thousand men have registered—there are still a great many who have not done so—the province of Quebec has sent overseas only some three thousand, or less. Under the circumstances it seems to me that we have a right to demand that more men shall be obtained from that province. I believe that the enforcement of the Military Service Act up to date in the province of Quebec has not been successful. Therefore, it is necessary for such changes to be made in the Act as will ensure a greater degree of success. I wish to congratulate the Government on the Orders in Council dealing with this subject which they have brought down. I believe that each and every one of them will make the Military Service Act more successful, and our opinion is that the changes necessary to render the Act more successful must be made.

I feel that if it is not made successful, and that if we do not obtain, and obtain speedily, from the province of Quebec as many soldiers to go overseas as the rest of Canada has furnished, each and every one of us who have come here with very, very clear orders given on the 17th day of December, will have failed to do our duty in carrying out our instructions, and that we are not worthy to represent the people who have sent us here.

I have listened to-day to various speeches by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, in which they have professed a willingness to obey the law, and to participate, as far as Canada is concerned, fairly and equally in this war. I am not going to say what may be the actual beliefs or feelings of those hon. gentlemen, but it does occur to me, after listening to their speeches, that the result of their words cannot in any sense be calculated to cause those who follow them to be more anxious or more likely to obey the law; nor do I think that the consequence or effect of their words will in any way increase recruiting. By the plainest of logic, and the use of the most ordinary commonsense, one cannot come to the conclusion that these hon. gentlemen are very anxious to assist recruiting or exceedingly anxious that the law should be obeyed. I would not care to be in the position of those hon. gentlemen, who can exercise influence over their people to the proper end, and who have influenced them in the manner which they have taken here to-day. Various arguments have been put up, the usual arguments we have heard before, that these men should be retained at home for food production. Food production and other industries are all very fine. But men are needed at the front, and when men go overseas, very often they get killed, and each part of Canada should bear its share of that risk. I know of no reason why that should not be.

I would remind hon. gentlemen that they are here to-day enjoying the rights and privileges of British citizenship, and while they are right in protecting those rights and privileges, if we do not send men overseas, and if we do not do our part, and others do not do theirs, we shall see such a sweeping away of British rights and privileges that there will be none left. I have seen the work of the Germans. I have been overseas and have seen them doing their work. And we on this side are doing what should be done in this country to preserve these various rights and privileges, about which we have heard so much talk.

Another point which is very significant to me is that these riots have broken out at the exact period when overseas we can almost see the fate of our country and of

these British rights and privileges, the fate of all that I consider to be decent and worth living for in this world, trembling in the balance. And it occurs to me that, at a time when people who think at all upon these subjects are in a state of great anxiety as to what may occur, those people in Quebec who engaged in these riots and those in sympathy with them have given very significant evidence of their feelings towards the struggle in which we are engaged, and I think the Government should take that fact into consideration. I do not believe that, even with the Orders in Council that have come down, the Military Service Act now will get the men we will have to have as speedily as we require them, and I believe the Government will have to make even more drastic changes in this Act in order to give to Canada, the Empire and the world the men needed at this moment, in order to keep faith with the people who sent us here on the 17th of December.

One more point. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated to-day that riots had burst forth in different parts of Canada, and referred to the city of Calgary, one of the constituencies of which I have the honour to represent. The riots which took place there occurred some years ago. They were not against the Military Service Act, or against the authorities, but they were riots which broke out against the property of various persons whom the soldiers there believed to be Germans, and who, in some cases, were of German sympathy. That was the nature of the riots which took place in Calgary.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): Mr. Speaker, although the debate has already been very extensive, I feel it my duty to add a few words. In commencing, I must state that, although I believe the Military Service Act was introduced to the House with the predominating idea of winning the election rather than of winning the war, and was only camouflage of the same sort as was used in 1911, yet I believe that the law must be obeyed, and that we should all regret the riots which occurred at Quebec last week. If, Mr. Speaker, you will listen to me for a few moments I believe I can prove to your satisfaction that these troubles have been partly brought about by lack of tact on the part of the Government, as well as by the unfair attacks, endorsed by the Government, of the English-speaking papers, not only of Canada, but of the United States and of England.

It is obvious to me that since the Military Service Act came into force, the sun has not risen once without insults and unjustified attacks being made on the province of Quebec and the Catholics. It would only be repeating what everybody in this House knows and has read about, if I were to enumerate the unanimous accusations of the English press to the effect that the province of Quebec is not obeying the law. You can conceive, Mr. Speaker, how the ultra-loyalists of the province of Ontario would have resented attacks of that nature, and to what extremes they would have gone, if the French press had daily said that Ontario was less obedient to the law than the province of Quebec. I am going to prove to you that it is a fact, not by argument or deduction, but by merciless statistics. I do not want to bring this as a criticism, but only to show the unfairness of these attacks.

On the 12th of January, 1918, the population of Ontario was 2,582,000, that of Quebec, 2,263,000. The men of Class 1 conscriptable in Ontario numbered 153,066, and those in Quebec, 124,343. How many of them registered? On January 12th, 1918, in Ontario, 127,750, and in Quebec, 117,104. Then in the loyal province of Ontario, on January 12th, 1918, there were 27,316 deserters, while in Quebec there were only 7,239. In Ontario, 118,128 claimed exemption, and in Quebec 115,707; in Ontario 94,197 exemptions were granted, and in Quebec 89,575. In Ontario there were 21,276 appeals from local tribunals, and in Quebec 27,683. But while the majority of appeals in Ontario were made by the applicants for exemption, the majority of appeals in Quebec were made by the military authorities. Of 23,931 demands for exemption disallowed in Ontario, 13,293 conscripts only submitted to the decision, while out of 26,132 demands for exemption disallowed in Quebec, 23,564 conscripts submitted to the decision of the tribunals. The military authorities appealed from 25,115 local decisions in Quebec, and from only 10,638 in Ontario. The proportion of appeals in the province of Quebec by the military authorities was 90 per cent, and in Ontario 50 per cent, and furthermore on the 5th of March 1918 there were 1,337 deserters in Toronto, 384 in Kingston making 1,721 in these two Ontario cities while Montreal had 708 and Quebec 36, a total of only 744. Should we wonder, therefore, why the newspapers have been saying that appeals in Quebec have been hindering the

application of the law? The hindrance comes not from the citizens of Quebec, but from the Government. And there is another point to consider. In Ontario 91 county judges are hearing appeals, while in Quebec only 34 judges of the Superior Court are so engaged. These figures clearly establish that the province from which the illustrious mover of this resolution comes has not complied with the law to the extent that the province of Quebec has. Can you imagine what would have happened if the roles had been reversed and Ontario had voted against the Act, as Quebec did, and had then been asked to comply with the law? My imagination forcibly gives me the vision of scenes similar to those which were enacted in this country, when the forefathers of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) pelted the carriage of Lord Elgin with bricks and rotten eggs and burned the parliament buildings. I will read from the book of Archibald MacMechan on The Winning of Popular Government a few paragraphs concerning this incident in our history. They are as follows:

When I left the House of Parliament——

Lord Elgin is speaking himself; this was in 1849.

When I left the House of Parliament, I was received with mingled cheers and hootings by a crowd by no means numerous, which surrounded the entrance of the building. A small knot of individuals consisting, it has since been ascertained, of persons of a respectable class in society, pelted the carriage with missiles which they must have brought with them for the purpose.

The article continues:

The "missiles" which could not be picked up in the street were rotten eggs. One of them struck Lord Elgin in the face. That was the Canadian method of expressing disapproval of a governor general for acting in strict accordance with the principles of responsible government. But this was only part of the price he had to pay for doing right. Worse was to follow.

Immediately after this outrage a notice was issued from one of the newspapers calling an open-air meeting in the Champ de Mars. Towards evening the excitement increased, and the fire-bells jangled a tocsin to call the people into the streets. The Champ de Mars soon filled with a tumultous mob, roaring its approbation of wild speeches which denounced the "tyranny " of the governor general and the Reformers. A cry arose, "To the Parliament House!" and the mob streamed westward, wrecking in its passage the office of Hincks's paper the Pilot. The House was in session, and though warned by Sir Allan MacNab that a riot was in progress, it hesitated to take the extreme step of calling out the military to protect its dignity. At this time the whole police force of the city numbered only seventy-two men, and, in emergencies, law and order were maintained with the aid of the regiments in garrison, or by a force of special constables. Soon the House found that Sir Allan's warning was against no imaginary danger. Volleys of stones suddenly crashed through the lighted windows, and the members fled for their lives. The rabble flowed into the building and took possession of the Assembly hall. Here they broke in pieces the furniture, the fittings, the chandeliers. One of the rioters, a man with a broken nose, seated himself in the Speaker's chair and shouted, "I dissolve this House." It seems like a scene from a Paris émeute rather than an actual event in a staid Canadian city. Soon a cry was heard. "The Parliament House is on fire." Another band of rioters had set the western wing alight, and, in a quarter of an hour, the whole building was a mass of flames. Although the firemen turned out promptly, they were forcibly prevented by the mob from doing their duty, until the soldiers came to their support, and then it was too late to save the building. Next day only the ruined walls were standing. The Library of Parliament was burned in spite of efforts to save it, and the student of Canadian history will always mourn the loss of irreplaceable records and manuscripts in that tragic blaze.

Now, what was the reason for this affray? Was it because the lives of the English-speaking citizens were endangered, was it because their institutions or their religion were threatened? Had there been any violence or exactions? No, the reason was that the Governor General had sanctioned a Bill passed by a Parliament with a majority of English-speaking citizens to indemnify those who had not taken part in the Rebellion of 1837, and whose property had been wantonly damaged. The law did not attack the lives of these most loyal citizens, but their pockets, and it was more important than their own lives and the blood of their fellow citizens. Mr. Speaker, I relate these facts not to excuse what happened at Quebec, but to show what might have happened if conscription had been voted down by Ontario and enforced by the Government. I am not 'au fait' of provocating acts in Quebec, but I know what happened in Montreal. Men were arrested even when they had their exemption papers in their possession. Their papers were taken away from them and the men put in jail until writs of habeas corpus were taken in the courts of Montreal.

It might be interesting if I informed the House how many writs of habeas corpus have been taken in Montreal from the 27th February, 1918, until to-day. There were thirteen. One was taken by P. L. Charre on February 27, the next day the military authorities through Colonel Hibbard, declared that the man was wrongfully arrested and did not oppose the writ. On the 1st March, E. St. Denis made a petition, and was liberated

for the same reason on March 16. On the 4th of March, D. Giaconimi made a petition and was liberated the next day. On the 9th, E. Ciamarro made the same petition and was liberated on the 12th of March. On the 11th, Joseph Fortin made the same petition and was liberated on the 14th. On the 21st, H. W. Dodd, made the same petition and was liberated two days after. On the 23rd, J. Paulicci made the same petition and was liberated three days after; and so on. The names of the other men who made the same petition and were declared to have been wrongfully arrested were A. J. Villeneuve, J. Romani, Henri Fugère, Louis Paquette, Charles Dubé.

I have here an affidavit in the case of Henry W. Dodd, who was arrested on the 21st of March, and liberated on the 23rd.

That your Petitioner, on the 29th day of November, filed in the hands of the Registrar, under the Military Service Act, for the District of Montreal, an Appeal from the decision of the local tribunal, which Appeal the Registrar acknowledged having received on the 3rd day of December;

That your Petitioner was summoned to appear on the 21st December before Honourable Mr. Justice Duclos on his claim for exemption, and his case was continued until the 7th of January, 1918, in order that he may be examined by the Revisory Board in the meanwhile;

That on the 24th day of December, the Military Medical Revisory Board declared that your Petitioner was of category "E", and therefore on the 7th day of January, 1918, Honourable Mr. Justice Duclos rendered judgment accordingly, allowing the Appeal, the Appellant having been placed in Class "E";

That, nevertheless, on the 4th day of March, 1918, your Petitioner while at work in his office was informed that one Major McKenzie wanted him at the Military Headquarters;

That on the said date your Petitioner, although having produced his papers, showing that he had been placed in Category "E", and that, consequently, he was permanently exempted from all Military Service, was lodged in the military prison in the Guy Street Barracks;

That the said Major McKenzie pretended that your Petitioner having been placed in Category A2 on the 12th of October by the military doctors had to undergo another examination and to follow a treatment at the Montreal General Hospital;

That on the 5th day of March your Petitioner was taken under guard from the Guy Street Barracks to the Montreal General Hospital where he was detained until the 11th day of March, during which time he was guarded day and night;

That on the 11th day of March your Petitioner was removed from the hospital and was again confined in the Military Prison at the Guy Street Barracks, and had to suffer the most ignominious and injurious treatment, as if he had been serving a sentence;

That on the 15th day of March he was put in uniform and permanently attached to the 1st Quebec Regiment under the orders of Major General E. W. Wilson and Lt.-Colonel Piché;

That your Petitioner, has, on many occasions, prayed the Respondent to see that his liberty be given him, stating that he had been exempted from Service by judgment of the Honourable Mr. Justice Duclos on the 7th day of January, 1918, and had been placed in Category "E" by the Medical Advisory Board;

That the papers which he had in his possession on the 4th day of March were taken from him;

That the Respondents have always refused to grant to your Petitioner his liberty;

Mr. Speaker, I was present on the morning when the petition was presented before the Hon. Mr. Justice Lamothe in Montreal. and Lieut. Col. Hibbard, who represented the military authorities, stated that the facts mentioned in this petition were true and the man was liberated. This is one of the reasons—I do not say it is an excuse—why riots occurred in Quebec. If the law had been applied in the same way in Quebec as it has been in Montreal, if men had been robbed of their exemption papers, confined in prison and only released by the arm of the civil law by habeas corpus proceedings there is no wonder the people are excited, and resort to serious measures, and no wonder these regrettable incidents occurred in Quebec.

In closing, I wish to answer the remark made by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), who asserted that Le Devoir had published seditious articles, and that Henri Bourassa ought to be interned. It is not my duty, nor my intention to defend Bourassa in this House. He is well able to defend himself; but if I judge the knowledge of French of the hon. member for North Simcoe by his love for it, he certainly has not read those seditious articles in French. If he has read a translation, and the translation was made, as they generally are, for the sole purpose of creating racial and religious feeling, I submit that the hon. member for North Simcoe, before rendering judgment on those articles, ought to take a special course in French. French is like good music and it might have a good effect on him. "La musique adoucit les mœurs."

Mr. E. D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, since the hour is late I will be brief, and as the point at issue has, till now, been argued in English I will pay a tribute of homage to Her Majesty in the French tongue by using it to convey the few remarks I wish to make anent the important question which forms the subject matter of the present debate.

First of all, I believe it my duty to reply to the attacks directed against the clergy

of the province of Quebec by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). The hon. member—it is, moreover, a habit with him,—did not miss this opportunity to criticize the French Canadian clergy of my province. According to him, it is the clergy who have instilled into our people their present state of mind, and what is happening to-day is due to their influence.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have in nowise to blush for the actions of our clergy, and that, under all circumstances the wisdom of their guidance has led us through the paths of right, of honour and of duty. If the hon. member for Frontenac has the least knowledge of Canadian history he cannot ignore the fact that at the time of the war which resulted in American independence it was the clergy of the province of Quebec who advised the French Canadians to refuse the advantages offered them by the Americans who sought to enlist the aid of the Canadians in the struggle for independence.

Neither is anybody ignorant of the fact that when the Government, last year, inaugurated national registration by means of cards called national service cards, the clergy took upon themselves as a duty to exhort the people to obey the law. Always, the clergy have shown themselves worthy of their high position and it truly is a matter for regret that we should have in this House members who never allow an occasion to pass when they can throw insults in the face of the clergy of the province of Quebec, in particular, of the Catholic clergy as a whole. Let us remember that at this moment thousands of French priests and monks are shedding their blood on the soil of France for the cause of liberty and civilization.

Such attacks are unjustifiable and I do not see how I, the representative of a county both French Canadian and Catholic, could let them pass without a reply.

To my mind, the question of the Quebec riot has been debated with such forcible arguments that I have no intention of recurring to all the points discussed; but, Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain: if this riot in the city of Quebec has taken place, it is because the people of Quebec were provoked and, Mr. Speaker, it is not solely in the application of the Conscription Act that we meet this provocation.

I represent the county of Rimouski, and in the parish of Mont Joli, barely a few weeks ago, a trainload of soldiers, coming from Ontario or from the western provinces —I do not know which—stopped at Mont Joli. The soldiers left the train, and proceeded to storm the drug-store, breaking down the doors in order to procure whisky; then they went to the restaurants and insulted the young waitresses there; in a word, they aroused the entire population of Mont Joli who are peaceful folk but who, as our expression has, will not allow their feet to be trod upon.

It is just such deeds that bring on riots. What happened at Quebec, therefore, is not a matter for surprise.

There is no doubt that the same gang who operated at Montreal was behind the Quebec affair, and perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice will be obliged, before long, to hand over another $10,000 bail in order to get one of these individuals out from behind the bars.

The application of this Act was put into the hands of irresponsible people, most of the time, ne'er-do-wells, individuals totally devoid of discretion, and of judgment, who hie themselves to street corners and there insult peaceful folks, men whose very aspect is a certificate of exemption. For instance, you might have noticed in the papers that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) was arrested at Quebec. He was asked to produce his exemption certificate; was it not ridiculous to make such a demand upon a man whose hair is sufficient witness to his age? In a way, of course, it was flattering for him, but on the other hand, it was pretty insulting to have some nondescript of a policeman lay hands upon him, without cause or justification.

Mr. Speaker, feeling in the province of Quebec is against conscription; there can be no doubt on that score. For my part, I was elected in Rimouski county as an anti-conscriptionist; I was opposed to conscription before it was voted; I was opposed to it during the elections and I am against it still. I have not changed my conviction, because I believe that this conscription law is inopportune, that it is opposed to the best interests of our country and that it is not a help to the British Empire.

I was saying a moment ago that there had been provocation; well, if there was provocation, there was more than that. Certain high-falutin' personages in the Government of this country came, one day, to give advice to the voters of the province of Quebec, during that notorious election in Dorchester, when Mr. Blondin, the musical-comedy colonel, came to Dorchester to assist Mr. Sévigny in the contest, and that your humble servant had the advantage of

meeting with him at Ste. Rose de Dorchester.

Mr. Blondin, while I was telling the voters that conscription was on the way, spoke in this vein: "You people here in Ste. Rose; if conscription were to become law in Canada, you are near the American frontier; all you have to do is to escape."

When a man of Mr. Blondin's position comes to the people of St. Rose and says: "If conscription comes to Canada you can escape to the United States," how can you expect the people of the province to submit to this law; to submit, after that sort of advice coming from such an important figure in Canadian politics?

I say that the Government was ill-advised when it passed this conscription law. It seems to me that it would be better under the circumstances to withdraw the law so that peace of mind may reign once more in all Canadian homes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to engage the attention of this House too long, but I wanted to express my opinion before this debate had ended. I received from the voters of the county which did me the honour of sending me to this House a very definite mandate: I was elected as an anti-conscriptionist; I am to-day, and I will remain an anti-conscriptionist.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, as this is my first utterance in the House I crave the indulgence of hon. members. I have been very much impressed with what has been said upon this subject during the course of the debate. What impressed me the most was the position taken by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). The very moment he rose to his feet he reached deep into the well of his feelings and hurled his anathemas at the province of Quebec. I regretted his words very much, and especially those in which he launched an attack upon the Catholic clergy of that province. I regretted it on his own account as much as for myself. The province of Quebec is accused always in the same old way. All through the campaign the province was subjected to attack, and I was accused of upholding a doctrine antagonistic to the interests of the Empire. I hope I shall have an opportunity of stating the position which I took during that campaign and I am not ashamed to state it here. I did not preach cowardice, but on the contrary I maintained that we should do our duty to France which gives us our intellectual life and that we should also do our duty to the British Government which has preserved the liberty that we have thus far enjoyed here on this Canadian soil. I took that position, Sir, and I am doing business at the old stand still. I regret that hon. members on the other side of the House who have been elected as Unionists should feel called upon to cast reflections on the province of Quebec because we differ in opinion with them on certain questions. I took the stand that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took and the stand that Mr. Lloyd George himself, the Prime Minister of England, has taken. He has said that what we want is ships, ships, and more ships, to carry the last bag of wheat to feed the Allies. I trust that I may say without any discourtesy to the hon. member for Frontenac that the word of Mr. Lloyd George is as good as that of the hon. member for Frontenac. I heard the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) speak about the ambition, the passion and the philosophy of nations. I confess that I want none of his philosophy of nations or his ambitions. I am a Canadian enjoying the liberty here that the British Government has established and I wish to continue to enjoy it. He said that it was independence that we were searching for; at least that is what I understood him to say although I could not understand him very well. He also mentioned annexation. I have lived under the Stars and Stripes and I say, I hope without reproach, that I want to enjoy British liberty. We appear now to be a financial dependency of the United States. In connection with every measure that is adopted the United States is mentioned. What I said a moment ago I will always maintain. I repeat that I want to enjoy British liberty. My hon friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Artnurs) said that his opponent had stated during the campaign that if my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition came into power all the soldiers would be liberated. I could not quite catch all of his remarks but I think he said something of that kind. Probably that would take place in the trenches because that is where the promise was given. All through the campaign I did not go farther than my right hon. leader. I took a stand against conscription because I believe that in this country where we want production, you cannot have both soldiers and production and if you drain the country of man power production will be very much diminished. Of course, we must be careful not to compromise the action of the Allies and that is why I took the stand I did. If you want production you must allow the

farmer to remain a farmer. You cannot make him a soldier and a farmer at the same time. It was stated at the beginning of the war by the greatest economists of the world that in this conflict famine might perhaps have the last word. I believe we are all verging on famine and that Canada will pass through a great financial crisis. I believe that this country has great resources but we must husband them and we must conduct our affairs in accordance with the principles of economy or else the future will be compromised. We must be careful that we do not allow the tendency towards militarism in this country to compromise our future or interfere with the success of the Allies.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this debate. I had sent word to the Speaker earlier in the evening that although I intended to say a few words I would refrain from doing so out of regard to the lateness of the hour and the number of speakers. But I just wish to say one word. Whether one is moved by emotion or passion I do not know and whether it be a crime I am not prepared to say. I want to congratulate the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) who has just taken his seat. He has moved me by the strong British sentiments which he has expresesd to rise to my feet and tell him, an hon. member of French origin from the province of Quebec, the pleasure it gave me to note the splendid, sterling, British ring of the utterances with which he has favoured the House.

I liked his speech so much that that is my excuse for saying a word or two in this debate; it was in marked contrast to the speech of the hon. member from, I think, Montmagny—

Mr. VIEN: Lotbinière.

Mr. MORPHY: —to whom I listened to-night with feelings of great regret. I acknowledge the hon. gentleman's earnestness, his ability, and his out-spokenness, and I was rather pleased in one way to hear him address the House as he did, although I totally disagree with the sentiments which he uttered. I have been told, Mr. Speaker, and it has been commonly said, that the ideals of the province of Quebec, as a part of the Canadian confederation, were based largely upon thoughts such as were expressed by the hon. member for Lotbinière in his observations to-night. What were they? Without going into details I hope the hon. gentleman will pardon me when I state in an abstract way what I gathered from his remarks, viz.—that his ideal of life and liberty was limited to Canada entirely. He had not, like the hon. member for Bellechasse, who has just spoken, the same high ideal of the liberties we enjoy, and have enjoyed under the aegis of the British Empire. He seemed to forget, Mr. Speaker, that these liberties have been preserved to us by the great British Empire. I am sorry to say it, but in this, the greatest stress of the world's life, in this the greatest crisis in the history of the world, in this day when the British Empire—and what ought to be his beloved France but which apparently is not—when these two great empires are struggling against the power and might of the vandal Hun, it is a travesty upon the life of any part of the civilized world that in the Parliament of Canada a member could be so recreant to his duty as to stand up and condemn those of us who think differently from him, because we say that we have a duty to perform to the man-power that is gone to fight the battles of liberty, not only from the provinces outside of Quebec, but from that province itself.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say this: I may not have proven to him what I intended to prove through lack of fluency in his language, but what I intended to say is this: That we believe in maintaining in this country British institutions, but we claim that the best way to help the Empire is not merely by sending men. We can help the Empire otherwise and at the same time foresee the after conditions of the war for Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not wish to get into a discussion particularly about it, nor do I desire exactly to accept the statement the hon. gentleman now makes, or to withdraw anything which I have said. I am endeavouring to give to this House the full effect and meaning of the words that the hon. gentleman uttered in as good English as any man who has spoken in this debate. The hon. gentleman, beyond peradventure, gave the House to understand that he was prepared to-day to stop the sending of any more men overseas from this country, and he gave as the reason that the United States should send men, that Canada had done enough.

Mr. VIEN: Absolutely.

Mr. MORPHY: Am I wrong, Mr. Speaker, when I so construe the hon. gentleman's remarks? If the hon. gentleman said that, and he did so, and I do not think he will deny saying so, I maintain that such an

utterance was the most pusillanimous utterance that was ever made on the floor of this House during the six or seven years that I have had the honour of being a member of it. I have been told, but did not believe, that the ideals that the hon. gentleman has set forth here to-night were the ideals of the province of Quebec. It has remained for him to prove that there is one county at least represented by a member who cherishes those ideals. We from Ontario sit still under the accusations of lacking friendship to Quebec, of wanting to domineer over Quebec, of wanting to impress the power of Ontario upon Quebec. These gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, who deal in that kind of recrimination, who set up those men of straw for the purpose of knocking them down, do not know the people of Ontario. I have stood here to-night and listened to all the unpleasant things that could be said about the Orangemen of Ontario. I happen to be a member of the Orange order, and I am very proud of it, because, I want to tell the hon. gentleman, in the Dominion of Canada, nay, in the world, there is no Order that has gone to the front as loyally and patriotically as the members of the Orange Order in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. VIEN: Is the hon. gentleman referring to my speech?

Mr. MORPHY: No.

Mr. VIEN: Because I do not think that I said anything against the Orange Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for North Perth has the floor, and it is only with his permission that any other hon. gentleman may make interruptions.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not know the names of the hon. gentlemen who made the remarks to which I refer, because the House is more or less new to me; but it is within the knowledge of all of us that such language was used by several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The Orange Order in Canada needs no apology. Its motto is a splendid one: Fear God, love the Brotherhood and honour the King. They are not the fanatics they are painted; the constitution of the Orange Order assures the same liberty to hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec as they claim for themselves. I wish the hon. gentlemen to understand that we are not the "Orangiste fanatiques" that we hear so much about; we are merely men of flesh and blood and kindly instincts. That sort of remark thrown across the floor of the House is done, to my mind, for a purpose, and what good purpose can be served by it is very difficult to say; but it ill behooves men sitting upon the other side of the House, who preach against fanaticism in such a way as to antagonize, while at the same time praying for a consensus of opinion and for union, to throw these taunts across the floor.

There have been something like 75,000 Orangemen who have gone to this war, not a mean number. Are they to be condemned because they are fighting for our liberties and yours? What is there about the Order that it should be made the butt of and subjected to such attacks? It would be better for hon. gentlemen to look at home for the reasons for the trouble.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Can the hon. gentleman state what attack was made on the Orangemen by hon. members on this side?

Mr. MORPHY: I did not take note of it, as it was not a matter that I had intended to speak about. But hon. gentlemen heard it to-night. The attack upon the Sentinel.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: That is not the Order.

Mr. MORPHY: I will quote it to the hon. gentleman from Hansard when it is printed. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen should look closer at home for the cause of the trouble. We are discussing the cause of the riots in Quebec. I won't deal with the mixture that I have heard from the statements of hon. members opposite, but in the abstract I have noticed, while sitting here, one hon. member on the other side state that the trouble did not come from people in the city of Quebec, but that it was caused by outsiders. A little later the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) said that it did come from the people of Quebec, but he did not know them, that they came from the parish of St. Roch's. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) said that the trouble did come from the people of Quebec city, and he gave five reasons why they engaged in riotous conduct.

Mr. CANNON: May I ask the hon. gentleman in what part of my speech did I say that these troubles were caused by these people? I remember my speech perfectly, and I did not say that.

Mr. MORPHY: It was the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) I referred to. But it was the hon. member for Dorchester who gave five reasons why the people rioted.

Mr. CANNON: I could have given many others.

Mr. MORPHY: Which further emphasizes and clinches my point. Outsiders would not go to Quebec for grievances held by the people of Quebec. The people there resented for five different reasons the action of Col. Blondin, the action of the Government, the action of the Dominion police, and so on. The resentment was not against outsiders, it was the people who were annoyed, and so we have this contradiction of speeches discussing the matter from all points of the compass, crisscrossing each other, and defeating the arguments advanced in turn. Let us see what was the cause. I am more convinced than ever that the cause was mentioned by the hon. member from Lotbinière (Mr. Vien). From the nature of his remarks, the hon. gentleman shows how he has been educated. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to my mind, is more to blame for the views held in the province of Quebec than any other man. He has always been a man who was against the Empire and in favour of the provincial idea.

An hon. MEMBER: The Canadian idea.

Mr. MORPHY: Not even the Canadian idea. And the proper Canadian idea is British, and British to the core, and ready to help France as well.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: And France is helping England, too, in this war.

Mr. MORPHY: And Quebec did not help France.

Mr. VIEN: Did the hon. gentleman grasp that what we meant was simply a difference of views in the methods of helping the Empire?

Mr. CURRIE: Do not start to apologize now.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman's question is a subterfuge, Mr. Speaker. To say that every man in the province of Quebec is a farmer is too absurd to be considered for a moment. There are thousands of young men there who are seeking to evade military service. The hon. gentleman will not deny that. There are thousands going to the bowling alleys and billiard rooms.

Mr. CAHILL: I represent a Quebec constituency, and I would like the hon. gentleman to make good his remarks, and the Government of the day to make good their remarks, that there are thousands of eligible young men in Quebec who wish to evade the Military Service Act. It is either a reflection on the Government, or the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his statements.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not mistaken at all. The press and the figures show clearly that there are thousands in Montreal alone—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Where did the hon. gentleman get those figures?

Mr. MORPHY: They come from the daily press, the Montreal press.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is the daily press the source of your official information?

Mr. MORPHY: It is quite sufficient for my purpose to-night. The hon. gentleman can use any kind of figures he chooses, but we know that is the fact in this country, and we know that was part of the trouble in the province of Quebec. I was going to say that hon. gentlemen should look closer home to the leader they have. I made the statement that the right hon. leader of the Opposition had been more provincial than Imperialist. Why did I say that? All his history shows that he backed away from any great movement of Empire. At the time of the Boer war, his attitude was: Not a man, not a dollar. Public opinion became so strong that he was forced to allow men to go, but he let the English Government pay them. At the time of the Riel Rebellion, he was going to shoulder his musket to fight in favour of insurrection and rebellion.

An hon. MEMBER: And for the navy.

Mr. MORPHY: There are lots of things to talk about. In his Boston speech, Canada was ultimately to fall from the Empire as the ripe fruit drops from the parent tree. He preferred the Yankee dollar to a British shilling. Any one would prefer a dollar to a shilling but the sting is in the placing of the Yankee against the British. These things have sunk into the minds of the people of Quebec. Armand Lavergne gives twenty-two reasons why he is a Nationalist all taken from the speeches of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. He is the godfather of Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne. They have adopted his doctrines. Armand Lavergne has been quoted in the press as saying: "I am right; Sir Wilfrid has left me; he has gone back on the doctrine he taught me." There we have the situation, and it is to be deplored, and is most deplorable, and yet logical, that when a serious outbreak did come it came in the constituency of the right hon. gentleman.

Who better than his constituents knew what he would like? Disruption against authorized law and constitutional authority. Did he appeal to them after the outbreak? No. And you ask me what is the cause of the riots in Quebec. The trouble was brewing there; did the leader of the Opposition go to Quebec and say to his people: take counsel with me? No, he contents himself in the House with saying that before anything happened he had told the House that his people would obey the law. The point is that he has failed to intervene and to make any attempt to pour oil on the troubled waters and prevent riot and insurrection. It is quite logical, I say, that an outbreak of that kind should, under the circumstances, occur in his constituency. How deplorable it is that innocent wayfarers, passers-by, should be the mark for the guns of the militiamen. The blood of these innocent people has been shed because of an insurrection in the constituency of the leader of the Opposition, while men higher up have escaped. There are men in this House who will some day have to take the responsibility for the wanton attacks made in this House to-day against established law and order. In my constituency dozens of men have been improperly apprehended; is that a cause for rebellion or riot? No, thank God; there are no agitators amongst them to set them on, and to encourage them. When I heard a member to-day say that he saw the mob going upstairs to destroy the records of the Government and virtually admit that he stood there and let them pursue their nefarious work without taking sufficient interest in it to find out their names or to call a policeman and intercept them, I thought what a travesty it was on public life that members of Parliament could stand by and see a crime of that kind committed without taking any action. It is a hollow sham, Mr. Speaker; clever men of that kind would know who did it, and it does not do to pretend to an intelligent House that they do not know, because they could easily have found out.

A while ago we had in this neighbourhood an agitation about language. The "Orangeistes" of Ontario, the "Bosches" of Ontario, were depriving the people of French origin in Ontario of certain rights which they claimed to possess. This Parliament building was surrounded by hundreds of school children, a resolution was introduced in the House, which admittedly had no jurisdiction over matters affecting education in the provinces. The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) in one of the ablest speeches I ever heard him or any one else deliver, presented his case fairly. His address was of a very high standard. But the matter should not have been thrown into Parliament; the discussion tended to intensify and aggravate a situation then pressing very heavily on the Ontario Government, and had the effect of injuring the school population in many parts of Ontario. But during all this agitation, which was the main source whence this trouble in Quebec sprang, the leader of the Opposition stood by and lent a hand to the member for Kamouraska; never once went out with an appeal to his people to stop their agitation. Subsequently the language question which was the subject of the resolution at that time was considered by the Privy Council and a decision given absolutely against the claims of our French compatriots in Ontario. They did not themselves raise the agitation; it was raised by the people who came from the other side of the Ottawa river. To my mind, Sir, that was the proximate cause of the trouble in Quebec. It was the proximate cause that resulted in young and middle-aged men tearing down recruiting stands and signs on the streets of Montreal and assaulting men who were endeavouring honestly, openly and publicly to interest the bright youth of French and other extraction in the cause of the Allies. The mob came down, so the paper reports say —I do not know the facts, because I was not there—many students of Laval University were among them, and when the police came they took refuge in the sanctity of a church. We are asked to consider the causes of these disturbances. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that because an officer made a mistake, all this trouble ensued. Nobody in Canada will believe that. There was a deeper cause, and it is based on the same principle on which is based the attitude of the people of the south of Ireland—a cause that makes for disunion and for the weakening of bonds of empire, for the lessening of the power of the Allies. Let us divide the forces, these people say, for paltry political effect, so that Laurier will carry a solid Quebec. This feeling is what helped to cause the riots in Quebec. Well, I thank God, Mr. Speaker, that as a Canadian—and I am proud to be a Canadian, within the Empire—I cannot be charged with being a party to any cause that would tend to weaken the arm of the Empire at this time. When I look at the difference between the north and the south of Ireland; when I see the Ulster Presbyterians by the thousands going to the front —and many of them did go from the south

of Ireland—when I see these Ulster Presbyterians, ninety-five per cent of them Orangemen, walking into the trenches and giving their lives for their country and for the Empire, it makes me feel that hon. gentlemen opposite should be chary indeed about reviling anybody because he happens to be of that particular faith, denomination or order. It is not worth while; you cannot get liberty and union in any such way. Did our friends from Quebec feel that politics were more important than the cause of Empire? It is for them to say, in their hearts and souls. It looks to me as if that was their main object. Was it a worthy object? I submit not. The time was too critical; politics is one thing, and war another. Have hon. members opposite helped to create the right atmosphere? The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has, to his credit be it said. He has a son who loyally went forward; and he himself has done more in the way of recruiting than most people I know. Why can we not all do these things? What is the matter with us? Is this Parliament so narrow that we cannot get down to a common basis? As the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) pleaded to-night, let us forget animosity. I am willing to forget the nasty things said over there; you be willing to forget the nasty things said over here.

There is this difference that I see, and I have seen it coming for many years, and have been sorry to see it. When we people of English extraction sing "God Save the King" we are answered by "O Canada" from the other side. There is the line of demarcation, the line of cleavage. Does any man on the other side of the House think he is a better Canadian than I am because I am of English extraction. Let French-Canadians remember that there are other Canadians, and that English-speaking Canadians, while we do not boast of our superiority, do not relish any attack upon us as being inferior beings. That is another line that is worth while wiping out and putting a carpet over.

Another thing that differentiates us and ought to be considered is this: Up where I live and all over the West, everywhere in Canada, in fact, except Quebec, the country is ringing with loyal and patriotic war songs. "We will never let the Old Flag Fall" has resounded from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Do they know the song in Quebec? Has it been sung in their fields, has it been shouted from their house-tops? One gentleman has spoken of patriotism to-night. To my mind there is a great difference between loyalty and patriotism. Loyalty is love of country, a sentiment purely. Patriotism is more than loyalty. It extends beyond it, enfolds it, brings it into itself, covers it over. Patriotism is much more and much greater than loyalty, because it means loyalty plus something else—action, something must be done. A man can sing "We will never let the Old Flag Fall" for a thousand years, but if he does not do something to keep the old flag flying, he may be loyal, but he is not patriotic. Action—something to be done, that is what is wanted. Quebec can do a great deal if its men with right instincts will stand up and take their place. I make this appeal at this early hour in the morning to the few who are here, and I would urge in all candour, and with reasonable hope, that we get together and that soon we will coalesce, and there will be more co-operation and less party politics and less bitterness.

May I digress for a moment to say that there has been more party politics, more bitterness in this debate, than during all the sessions since the war started. Why is it? Is that the spirit in which men have come from their constituencies? I hope not, but that is the situation.

I am sorry I have talked so long, but I feel very, very keenly about this matter, not for Britain alone, but for Canada as well. We have sent 400,000 boys over there, and when they pledged themselves not to let the old flag fall, we pledged ourselves to "keep the home fires burning." That is a song that has swept over Canada, but do they sing it in Quebec? Answer me, somebody. Apparently not. Instead of keeping the home fires burning, we have had a small incipient blaze of the red fire of revolution and anarchy—a shame and disgrace to any civilized people in the world who pretend to enjoy the liberties the Empire gives us. But what, oh what, of noble France, whose chivalry shines brighter to-day than ever in the past? French Canadians may say, "I want the language of France," then I say "Do you love France, and will you fight for her? If you do not fight for France you cannot love her, and you are not worthy to enjoy her language." France lies bleeding to-day, the wonder and the admiration of the world, and as an English-speaking Canadian, I express my pride in the most glorious country on the battlefield to-day, for the honours she has won and the shining armour she has put on, of truth and nobility that is the envy and pride of the civilized world. Let us English-speaking people plead with our fellow-members from Quebec to enjoy the privilege

of going to their counties and getting the men to help France; put new blood into her veins and help her win this fight. This is a fight in which your liberty and mine is in jeopardy, and the man or the province or the colony or the Dominion that does not take its place to-day in this the greatest Armageddon of the world will hang his head in shame for all time to come. I hope and pray that this Parliament may through mutual co-operation, careful judgment, and unity of thought so propel the measures before it that all individual likes and dislikes and political bickerings may be forgotten, that we may join together in one common purpose, that this country as a part of the Empire and as a part of the Allies, with France, may as the poet said:

> Strike till the last armed foe expires,
> Strike for our altars and our fires,
> Strike for the green graves of our sires,
> God and our native land!

And may Canada as a result be prosperous and happy, ready for the period of reconstruction after the war, where all shall be one, and that one for the Empire and the Allies.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): I have the honour to-night to represent a whole province. There has been a good deal of talk about Quebec, and it would appear, listening to hon. gentlemen opposite, that Quebec was the only delinquent in this matter of supporting the so-called Union Government; I will give it its proper name and call it a mongrel Government. I see two hon. gentlemen over there from my province, and they are here by reason of the soldiers' vote. I happen to be in the fortunate position of representing a whole province on this side of the House, because the only other Liberal member who has been declared elected has not arrived yet. I want particularly to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and especially of the gentlemen who belong to the same cult as the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Morphy) to the fact that our province has already learnt the lesson that will unite Canada eventually, and which if it had been learnt by the great province of Ontario would have prevented all this trouble and all this debate. I would advise the people of Ontario to learn the lesson as soon as possible, and I say this with all earnestness and sincerity of purpose. I am an old man, and have no politics to bother about. I do not ever expect to run in an election again, and if I should I do not care if I am elected or defeated, anyway.

[Mr. Morphy.]

I tell the people of Ontario to get non-sectarian schools, and I would advise the people of Quebec to do the same as soon as they can. They would then be in the same position as Prince Edward Island, which is the provincial leader in all the political advantages and all the political advancement which has been made in the last century. We have led the Dominion of Canada in temperance legislation. We were the only British community, up to a few weeks ago, that had adopted prohibition, in the whole of the British Empire. Away back in 1852 we were the first British people, I think perhaps the very first people, to adopt the free school system—that is to say, to pay for the schools out of the public treasury, and not impose upon the people taxes for school purposes. We made the schools absolutely free, and later on we made them non-sectarian. The result is that we have done away with bigotry and intolerance, that accursed viper that is gnawing at the vitals of Canada to-day. Bigotry and intolerance are the cause of the riots in Quebec. My hon. friend talks about Orange lodges. We have Orange lodges in our province. The best and most manly supporters I had were sound educated Orangemen, not those narrow people who subscribe to the Orange Sentinel. It is true they sent a lot of Sentinels down there to try to debauch our people, but they said: "This is only a Tory organ, and a reactionary organ at that." The biggest joke of the whole campaign in my county occurred when they sent a big bundle of them up to be distributed in a certain Orange constituency, and by some mistake, which perhaps was not a mistake, the driver, instead of taking them over to the Orange constituency, took them to the Roman Catholic constituency, and they did some good down there. What do we find in Prince Edward Island? With a majority of Protestants, they have a good Roman Catholic premier, and a Tory at that. That is how broad they are. I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that if the people of Canada are going to get together, they must eliminate this foolish division and this foolish irritation between these two big provinces. My province has been sacrificed for 40 years, and for what? To help these two big provinces to get together, keep together and abstain from fighting one another. Prince Edward Island is the cradle of Confederation. Are hon. gentlemen aware that the first conference that was held to confederate the provinces of Canada was held in the city of Charlottetown in 1864?

The intention was simply to unify the three maritime provinces into a maritime union. Quebec and Ontario at that time, as at present, were at one another's throats, like the Kilkenny cats. Hon. gentlemen know that they tied together the tails of the Kilkenny cats, and threw them over a clothesline, and they fought until they killed one another. That was the condition of affairs in Ontario and Quebec. When they found we were going to form a maritime union, the big men of the two big provinces, men like Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the one side and Sir Sam Hughes on the other, got together and asked if they could be represented at the convention. Our people said, "Come along boys, and if we can do anything to help you out we will be pleased." So they came down there and formed the conference, and while our people did not go into Confederation at that time, for a very good reason, because of our smallness, and because the people felt that in place of being—

An hon. MEMBER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. READ: I am speaking to the point. I want to show the cause of the Quebec riots. There is no use diagnosing a case unless you can indicate the medicine. I will not go into the story of Confederation; it would take too long. I desire to say a word about annexation. Some hon. gentlemen expressed the fear that Canada might be annexed to the United States. Let me assure hon. members of the House that Canada will never be annexed to the United States. No politician or no party could ever annex Canada to the United States. I am a believer in natural law, and natural law itself would prevent unification of Canada with the United States. Drive out nature with a fork she comes running back. Canada runs along east and west lines, and there has never been a country on the face of the earth that ran along north and south lines involving climatic changes. Every nation must be homogeneous in order to be a stable nation, and you could not make Canada part of the United States if all the Lauriers and Bordens and the rest of them were to try for centuries. The United States would not take Canada to-morrow. The better-thinking people of the United States know very well that if Canada were added to the States it would break up the balance of power. The very thing that produced the Civil War in the United States in 1860 was the fact that they were adding Kansas, as a slave state, or a free state, to one or other of the two halves, which would break up the influence of the other half. Why does the United States not take Mexico? Simply because it would break up the balance of power. They do not want Mexico, so put that foolish idea out of your heads. The Military Service Act has been placed on the statute-book, and must be obeyed, as long as it is the law, and I am satisfied it will be obeyed in Quebec as in the other provinces. At the same time, while it is the law on the statute-books it was the enactment of that law primarily that caused the riots in Quebec. When I started my campaign down in the little province one of the open statements I made over my own signature was that, in my judgment, the Conscription Bill in its conception—not conscription itself, but the conception of the Conscription Bill—at that time was a paramount crime and, secondly, a political crime— in every way. Why do I say that? Not because I am not in favour of conscription. One hon. gentleman whom I interrupted indicated that conscription was an autocratic institution. Conscription is a democratic institution. We have on the statute books of Canada already a conscription bill—the Militia Act. That is perfectly and absolutely democratic. What is the principle of true democracy? It is that we work together for the common good of all hands. The state undertakes to guarantee the safety, liberty and protection of her citizens and as a quid pro quo the citizen is in duty bound to render national service to the state. Consequently, universal military service for every man and universal national service for every woman are absolutely democratic institutions. But, the Conscription Bill in its conception was a political bill intended not to win the war but to win an election. Many perhaps did not know enough to see the dragon's tail. They might have seen a mermaid's head but they could not see the dragon's tail. The right hon. leader of the Government to-day when he brought that Order in Council down, stated that voluntary enlistments in July and August amounted to some 3,000. The wonder is that there were any at all. How was it in May when they came down to this House and announced that they were going to inaugurate the principle of conscription? For that month and ten months previous the average was 6,500 per month. That was the average rate of recruiting by voluntary effort alone. Volunteers were coming in at this rate against the wish of some of the members of the Government, if we are to believe the evidence of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes).

The Conscription Bill was unnecessary because there was a better Act on the statute books. It was unnecessary because it synchronized with the mobilization of the great American army the transportation of which will take all the ships that can be produced for the next three years by all the Allies, by all the confiscations they are making of other nations' ships, and by chartering of Japanese ships. It will take all the ships that can be produced for the next two or three years to carry the American army across the ocean without ours at all. There will be an army of 6,000,000 men. If we stood them up in single file north and south along the meridian of longitude the line would reach from here to the Equator and 400 miles farther. It is an immense body of men. The hon. gentleman who sat down just now twitted some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House by saying that they wanted to let the Americans do the fighting for us. We do not want to do anything of the sort but we want them to do their share. They have a better right to do their share in so far as the number of men is concerned and in every other respect than we have. They are in the war as a sovereign state, they are in it in a constitutional manner, they are in it because they have to be in it. They could not exist as a nation and have their honour degraded in the way it was being degraded by the Germans. They are in it and we are only making fools of ourselves by taking on a burden that does not belong to us. At the same time, every ounce Canada has got whether in man or material power must be, and will be—and I know it will be willingly, including Quebec—dedicated to the most sacred cause that has ever presented itself to the people at any period in the history of the world.

Our civilization is based upon democracy. We would never have had this democracy before the discovery of America. For a thousand years the world had been in a worse position than the German Empire is in to-day. This applied to the whole of Europe including the Mother country, old England, Spain and Italy. Why? Simply because the country was over populated. Simply because the whole population was pressed against the limit of subsistence and because the human mind was cramped by the pressure of want. On the top of that great mass, of that dead sea of men, were the emperors, the kings, the dukes, the barons and the unfortunate clergy who had to do the bidding of the bigbugs about them. They held the whole European proletariat in a state of serfdom. Ignorance was bliss; it was folly to be wise. That was taught even by the clergy. There are some bigoted Protestants who throw out that slur to the Roman Catholic church. The Roman Catholic church, it is true, at that time, taught that ignorance was bliss and that it was folly to be wise, but the Protestant church would have done the same thing if it had been put in the same position. I have been all over the world, I have travelled over every country in Europe and America, and I want to say on behalf of the Roman Catholic peoples that they are the most tolerant and the least bigoted amongst the nations of the world. Look at Brazil, that great democracy. Did they have a riot—a Quebec riot—when they wanted to get clear of their autocracy? No Sir; they just simply took old Dom Pedro, gave him a free passage to Portugal and a little annuity and said: You go home and take care of your children and we will run this country as a republic. This is the only country in the world that became a great democracy without the shedding of one drop of blood, not even as much blood as was shed at the Quebec riots, and what do we find down there? You can go right through the city of Rio de Janeiro—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I have been trying to be very tolerant to the hon. member, and a great deal of latitude has been given during the debate to-day, but I really must rule that the remarks which are now being made have no bearing at all upon the cause or the cure of the Quebec riots.

Mr. READ: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling, but I want to make this statement, and I make it without fear of successful contradiction, and because I know that the people of Canada can get together: this country to-day is in a state almost of disruption, and it is because of that disruption that we have had these riots in the province of Quebec. I know that the conflicting elements of the population can get together because I know what other countries have done in that regard. I know that people can live together in harmony, each worshipping under his own vine and fig-tree. I know that people can be educated so that they will not take any more notice of a man's religious opinion than they do of the colour of his hair, because he is just as much responsible for the one as he is for the other.

I entirely agree with the mover of this resolution in one statement which he made, and that is that we should have to-day in khaki, not forty thousand, but two hundred thousand men. The hon. member for

Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) also was right when he stood up in his place in this House over a year ago and advised the Prime Minister to put the Militia Act into force. That Act could have been enforced in such a way that we could have raised two hundred thousand men without injuring the industries of the country, and without interfering with the farmers of this country. The men could have been called out in classes and sub-classes, and they need not necessarily have been sent across to fight in the fields of Flanders; they could be ready for any emergency. The time when we will want men most is when the terms of peace is being negotiated. We shall want a persuader then. How did Disraeli and Salisbury do in 1878 when they were going to negotiate a treaty with the Germans and the Russians at Berlin? They sent to India for twenty thousand Sepoys, Sikhs and Ghurkas, and placed them on the Island of Malta. Great Britain was not at war with anybody, but her statesmen mobilized the fleet and placed a military force as stated. Then they went over and negotiated the celebrated Berlin Treaty, that Billy the Bold called a scrap of paper and tore up the other day. Why did they put the troops there? In order to have a persuader. The British ministers at that time negotiated a remarkable set of treaties, and on returning from Berlin the first thing that Disraeli said as he stepped from his ship, was, "I have brought back peace with honour". One of the things which this Government ought to do is to get as many men as possible into khaki, not necessarily to send to the front, but to be available in case we want them. We never know what is going to happen. We do not want to lose the fruits of victory if we win, and we do not want to make a humiliating peace as poor Russia did if we lose.

Mr. CURRIE: My object, which was to secure a full and open discussion, having been obtained, I now beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

WAR GRANT $500,000,000.

On motion of the Hon. J. D. Reid the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1919, for:—

(a) The defence and security of Canada;

(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada;

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;

(d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and

(e) Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and eighteen, in excess of the amounts authorized by The Appropriation Act, 1917.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these Rosolutions.

3. That the principal raised by way of loan under this Act and the interest thereon shall be chargeable on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.—Sir Robert Borden.

Hon. J. D. REID: I may say that an understanding was arrived at between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition to the effect that the statement which is necessary to be made in connection with this resolution should be made on the second reading of the Bill. It was decided between them that this resolution should be allowed to go through and a Bill founded upon it introduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is my understanding.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask if on the second reading we shall get all the information that we could have obtained had we been able to put questions in Committee?

Hon. J. D. REID: That is the understanding.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): There was an unfortunate misunderstanding a few days ago in regard to a certain Bill which was apparently put through under a somewhat similar arrangement as that just announced, and which arrangement debarred members from exercising the same freedom which they would otherwise have enjoyed. I hope the understanding in this case is quite clear, and that no question will arise on the second reading as to our freedom to question the Ministry and obtain all the information that we deem necessary.

Hon. J. D. REID: The Prime Minister wrote a note to the leader of the Opposition, and the understanding between them has been reduced to writing.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to know what the understanding is.

Hon. J. D. REID: The understanding is that on second reading, or in Committee, all necessary information will be given.

Mr. CAHILL: The same as if it were on the first reading?

Mr. REID: Yes

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Hon. J. D. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 38, for granting to His Majesty aid for Military and Naval Defence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 4.40 a.m. (Saturday).

Monday, April 8, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Carvell, Bill No. 40, To Amend the Public Works Act, was introduced and read the first time.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT.

Hon. F. B. Carvell (Minister of Public Works) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 41, to amend Navigable Waters Protection Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. CARVELL: It was found in the operation of the Navigable Waters Protection Act that sometimes questions arose as to the rights of people to erect wharves, etc., in navigable streams. The object of this Bill is to prevent this happening, except with the consent of the Public Works Department. The Bill defines the public works more generally than they are defined at present, and also provides that, except in certain very small matters, if people persist in obstructing navigable streams, the Public Works Department, with the consent of the Governor in Council, may take whatever steps may be necessary to remove the obstruction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, to amend the Yukon Act.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain, please.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill provides for ratification of the steps already taken to reduce the organization of the Yukon Government, in so far as the administration under the Interior Department is concerned. It also provides for relieving the Auditor General of the necessity of sending one of his staff to the Yukon annually. It provides that he shall be sent only as the Auditor General deems it in the public interest. It further provides the Governor in Council shall have power to abolish the Yukon Council, and substitute in its place another council appointed by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 33, respecting Brazeau Collieries, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 36, respecting Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 37, respecting The Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

QUESTIONS.

Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.

ENLISTMENT UNDER MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. How many conscripted men were enlisted under and by virtue of the Military Service Act of 1917: (a) during the month of December, 1917; (b) during the month of January, 1918; and (c) during the month of February, 1918?
2. What was the cost of the said enlistments for each of these months?
3. How many volunteers enlisted during (a) the month of December, 1916?; and (b) during the months of January and February respectively, in 1917?
4. What was the cost of the said enlistments for each of these months?

Major General MEWBURN: 1. (a) The total enlistments during the month of December, 1917, were 3,909. No men were ordered to report under the Military Service Act until January 3, 1918; (b) the total enlistments during the month of January,

1918, were 14,971, of which 11,539 were conscripted men enlisted under the Military Service Act; (c) the total enlistments during the month of February, 1918, were 10,030, of which 5,889 were conscripted men, enlisted under the Military Service Act.

2. As the accounts for voluntary recruiting, as well as for men recruited under the Military Service Act have never been separated, it will entail numerous researches and will take some time to obtain this information.

3. (a) 5,796; (b) January, 1917, 9,194; (c) February, 1917, 6,809.

4. Answered by No. 2.

QUEBEC PROPERTIES LEASED.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Militia Department or the Military Hospital Commission leased any properties in the City of Quebec since the first of January, 1917?

2. If so, from whom were these properties leased, at what rental, and on whose recommendation?

Major-General MEWBURN: 1. (a) Recruiting office in Quebec Railway Building, owned by Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company. (b) Upper floor, J. B. O'Brien, auto garage; (c) Cummings Building.

2. (a) Owned by Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company at $20 per month; (b) J. B. O'Brien Auto Company, $50 per month; (c) Mrs. Margaret M. Cummings, at $115 per month. All recommended by the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5.

FARM MACHINERY REPAIR PARTS.

Mr. J. F. REID:

What were the total receipts from the customs tariff during the fiscal period ending March, 1917, on threshing separators, threshing outfits, traction engines, self-binding reapers, ploughs, other farm machinery and repair parts, respectively?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

Threshing machine separators, $353,432.22; threshing machine separators, parts of, including wind stackers, baggers, weighers, and self feeders therefor, and finished parts thereof, for repairs, when imported separately, $124,463.62; portable engines with boilers in combination, and traction engines, for farm purposes, $896,356.05; harvesters, self-binding, $89,257.28; ploughs, and parts thereof, $373,504.03. Other farm machinery and parts thereof, viz:—Binding attachments, cultivators, weeders, drills, rollers, harrows, hay loaders, tedders, horse rakes, manure spreaders, mowers, potato diggers, reapers, fanning mills, grain crushers, hay presses, fodder or feed cutters, horse powers for farm purposes, and parts of agricultural implements, n.o.p. $280,255.03.

AMMUNITION INSPECTION.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who is in charge of inspection, for the Government, of ammunition manufacture?

2. Who has charge of the inspection of the Canadian Explosives Company at Beloeil?

3. How many times since the 1st January, 1917, has the said company's establishment been inspected, and what are the dates of said inspections?

4. Is the Government aware that fires recently broke out in the said establishment and were extinguished only a few feet from storage containing T.N.T.?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition at Quebec.

2. No official of the Department of Militia and Defence is charged with the inspection of the Canadian Explosives' premises at Beloeil.

An examiner (under the jurisdiction of the Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition) is stationed at Beloeil for the purpose of inspecting such supplies of ammunition and explosives as may be ordered by this department from time to time.

3. The Government has no information.

4. No.

It may be added that the inspection of ammunition and explosives for the Imperial Government is carried out by representatives of the Imperial Ministry of Munitions of England, who are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Militia and Defence.

LAPRAIRIE—ST. LAMBERT DYKE.

*Mr. Du TREMBLAY:

Is it the intention of the Government to complete this season, the work already commenced of a dike along the St. Lawrence, Laprairie to St. Lambert?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

*Mr. Du TREMBLAY:

1. Can the Prime Minister give the House and the country any reassuring information regarding the question of improving the rate of exchange on money as between the United States and Canada?

2. Was his recent mission to Washington in connection with this matter, and was it successful?

3. Have any steps been taken to obtain from the British Government, concessions to Canada which will help the Canadian Government to improve the exchange situation as between Canada and the United States?

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The subject is, and has been, under the consideration of the Government. There is no special announcement to be made at the moment. Any necessary announcement will be made in due course.

STAFF OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What are the number of officials and employees on the staff of the Privy Council who have been appointed since December, 1917?
2. What salary is paid to each, and what are their respective duties?
3. Have they passed the Civil Service Examination?
4. Are any of military age?
5. What are the travelling and living expenses of each one since coming to Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1 and 2. Assistant private secretary, $1,750; stenographer and typist, $800; typist, $700; messenger, $600.

3. Yes, or have complied with the law.

4. One, assistant private secretary. Was lieutenant in the C.E.F.; wounded at the battle of Zillebeke and discharged from the army as unfit for further military service.

5. None.

LEGAL ADVISER TO FOOD BOARD.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

1. Is there a legal adviser to the Canada Food Board?
2. If so, what is his name, address and salary?
3. What is the total amount paid him to date?
4. Has he any assistants? If so, who are they, and what are their salaries?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes.

2. Francis Henry Keefer, K.C.; at present, Ottawa, formerly, Port Arthur; no salary.

3. Nothing.

4. No.

SOLDIERS CONVALESCENT HOME, PORT ARTHUR.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Government or any department thereof leased a residence or other building in Port Arthur, Ontario, for a Returned Soldiers' Convalescent Home, or for some like purpose?
2. If so, what is the name and occupation of the lessor, and what rental is paid for the building in question?
3. Is there a matron employed, or in charge of the said building so leased? If so, what is her name and salary?
4. How much has been paid to date to the lessor and to the matron?

Mr. McCURDY:

1. The Military Hospitals Commission was granted the free use of a private house at Port Arthur, Ontario, as a convalescent home for returned soldiers.

2. The name of the donor is Frank H. Keefer, Esq., K.C., of Thorold, Ontario, no rental is paid for the building in question nor for the furniture which has also been loaned by the lessor.

3. The matron employed is Mrs. Hugh Keefer. Her services were rendered gratuitously for some two years until 1st May, 1917. She is now drawing a salary of $75 per month.

4. Nothing has been paid to the lessor. The amount paid to the matron to the 31st March, 1918, is $825.

STEAMERS MONTCALM AND LADY GREY.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. Are the Government steamers Montcalm and Lady Grey at present engaged in breaking ice on the River St. Lawrence?
2. If so, at what point, according to latest information, are said steamers so engaged?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. 3 p.m., Thursday, April 4th, 1918. Steamers Montcalm and Lady Grey reported working 500 feet below "Red Gas Buoy 66 Q" Batture Simon—approximately one mile below Grondines (North Shore) or 32 miles below Three Rivers, and 46 miles above Quebec.

April 6th, 1918, 6 p.m. Steamers Montcalm and Lady Grey reported working above Black Can buoy 73-Q, approximately half a mile below Cap Charles (South Shore) about 29 miles below Three Rivers. Ice conditions better.

POST OFFICE BERTHIERVILLE.

Mr. GERVAIS:

What was the total cost of repairs to the post office building at Berthierville, since 1912?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: $650.06.

249th BATTALION.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has an investigation been made into the financial affairs of the 249th Battalion?
2. If so, what has been the result?
3. Has there been any misappropriation of the funds?
4. If so, what officers are implicated?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Audit inspection not yet completed.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

APPEAL REPRESENTATIVE AT ST. HYACINTHE.

*Mr. MARCILE:

Who has been the representative of the Department of Militia, before the Court of

Appeal, under the Military Service Act, presided over by Honourable Judge Martineau at St. Hyacinthe since December, 1917, up to the present date?

Major-General MEWBURN: The appeal representative acting before Judge Martineau at St. Hyacinthe up to the 4th February, was A. O. Rondeau. This department has no knowledge of who has acted since that date, as the conducting of appeals was taken over on that date by the registrars.

FARM TRACTORS; REPAIR PARTS.

Mr. EULER:

In view of the fact that the Government has removed the duty on farm tractors and has retained the duties on certain necessary imported component parts which enter into the manufacture of tractors in Canada, is it the purpose of the Government to remove at an early date, the discrimination thus existing against the Canadian manufacturer by removing the duties upon the raw materials which enter into the Canadian product?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON: There is no discrimination against the Canadian manufacturer in this case. Provision was made by Order in Council of March 26, 1918, for drawback of duty on materials entering into the manufacture of tractors costing not more than $1,400.

BERTHIER PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. GERVAIS:

What is the cost of the wharves and ice-breakers constructed by the Government on the Chicot River at St. Cuthbert, in the County of Berthier?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: $1,068.35.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. What is the total cost of the wharf the Government constructed at Berthierville?
2. What has been the cost of repairs of said wharf since its construction?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. $20,736.16.
2. $707.25.

MR. W. V. WEBSTER.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Is there an employee, named W. V. Webster in the Department of the Interior?
2. Is there an employee, in the Department of Militia and Defence, named Gertrude Webster?
3. If so, are they husband and wife, and is this not a violation of the spirit and letter of the Civil Service Act?
4. If the Government is not aware as to the above, will it make inquiries to ascertain the facts?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No information.
4. Yes.

REWARD FOR ARREST OF DESERTERS.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Does the Government pay a bonus in the case of a person of military age who is apprehended for not having complied with the provisions of the Military Service Act?
2. If so, to which local officer or agency is said bonus paid?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the said bonus system?
4. Is the Government aware that said bonus system is detrimental to the successful carrying out of those provisions of the Military Service Act relating to the drafting of recruits, and that it hinders the effectiveness of the work which is expected from the Federal officers?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. Under Order in Council of the 24th December, 1917, (P.C. 3452), a reward of ten dollars may be paid to any civil, police or peace officer for the apprehension and delivery into military custody of a deserter or absentee without leave from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or from the active militia of Canada on active service, or of a man who is absent without leave from the military forces of Canada, on account of his failure to comply with the terms of a Proclamation or Order under the Military Service Act, 1917.

3. So far as the Department of Militia and Defence is aware, there is no intention to discontinue the payment of this reward.

4. The Department of Militia and Defence is not aware that the payment of such rewards is detrimental to the successful operation of the Military Service Act.

INCOME TAX.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Act relating to Income Tax?
2. If so, does the Government propose to fix a scale of rates in the proposed amendments, having regard to the number of persons and dependents who may compose one's family?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to amend said Act with a view to establishing a system, now existing in very many countries, whereby a proportional deduction of income taxation is made, according to the number of persons and dependents composing one family?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Amendments of this character are not usually announced in advance.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What sum of money has been spent for repairs to the wharf at Graham, since 1911?
2. Who has superintended the works, and what are the names of the parties who have been employed thereat?

3. What amount has been paid to each of them, and at what rate per diem?

4. What are the names of the parties supplying materials, and what amount has been paid to each of them?

Mr. COPP:

1. From what person or persons, firm or firms was the stone used in the rebuilding of the new Parliament building purchased?

2. From what stone quarry or quarries was the stone taken?

3. Where are the said quarry or quarries situated?

4. Were public tenders called for the supply-the said stone taken?

5. If so, from whom, and at what prices were offers received, and were said offers F.O.B. at place of shipment or F.O.B. Ottawa?

6. If said stone was supplied from different quarries what quantities were supplied from each quarry respectively?

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. What sums have been paid in the last twenty years by the Government of Canada for the prosecution of scientific research?

2. For the prosecution of research in pure science?

3. In applied science?

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. How many persons belonging to class one were liable to be called under the Military Service Act, 1917, in each of the provinces and the Yukon Territory, respectively?

2. How many in each province have reported themselves for service?

3. How many in each province have asked to be exempted from military service?

4. How many in each province have been exempted by local tribunals?

5. How many decisions rendered in each province by local tribunals have been appealed from by: (a) recruits; (b) representatives or military authorities?

6. In how many appeal cases have decisions been rendered in each province, how many appeals have been allowed, and how many rejected in each province?

7. How many cases are still pending before the Central Appeal Judge?

8. Is it the intention of the military authorities or public representatives to appeal in some other cases, either before the appeal tribunal or before the Central Appeal Judge?

9. If so, how many in each province?

Mr. KAY:

1. What quantity of bran, shorts, or mill feed have been exported to the United States (a) by license; (b) without license, between August 1, 1917, and February 28, 1918?

2. To what firms in Canada have licenses to export this feed been granted, and for what quantity in each case?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. McMASTER:

For a copy of a certain memorandum sent to the Minister of Public Works by the Senior Member for Ottawa relating to the abolition of patronage, and of all papers, letters and other documents which passed between him and the Minister of Public Works in relation thereto since the 17th December, 1917.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the amount of land purchased by the Government at Camp Borden, the price paid, with a list of the names of those from whom the land was purchased?

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a return showing the number of Agricultural Representatives appointed to represent the Minister of Agriculture at the Military Tribunals, by whom they were appointed, at what cost to the country, the expenses of each representative, the number of telegrams each representative sent out between December 1 and December 17, 1917, and the name of the representative appointed for Glengarry-Stormont.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a copy of all correspondence respecting Orders in Council creating a paper commission, and subsequent Orders in Council respecting the same, which have passed between newspaper publishers in Canada, more particularly those publishers in Toronto, and the Government.

Mr. DEVLIN:

For a copy of the Order in Council creating a paper commission, and also a copy of the subsequent Orders in Council in regard to the work of this commission.

Mr. COPP:

For a copy of all correspondence, certificates, recommendations and other documents in reference to the granting of a total disability pension to Colonel R. H. Labatt.

Mr. COPP:

For a copy of Orders in Council in reference to the appointment of Colonel Langton as Paymaster General in the Militia Department.

HEREDITARY TITLES IN CANADA.

MOTION BY MR. NICKLE FOR ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY NOT TO CONFER THEM.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, an Address should be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King in the following words:—

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty,

Most Gracious Sovereign,—

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any hereditary titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, or any title or honour that will be held or can be used by, or which will confer any title or honour upon any person other than the person in recognition of whose services the honour or title has been conferred.

All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into Your favourable and gracious consideration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising, to support the resolution which stands in my name, it is only fit and proper that I should advise the House that I am making this motion instead of the hon. member from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), whose privilege it was to introduce the subject to the House in 1914, because of his having informed me that he did not care this year to give the matter consideration. In speaking to me in reference to the matter, he told me that he thought war conditions at the present time were so pressing, and that the responsibilities of the Government were so great, that it would not be right, fit, or proper that they should be worried with other anxieties at this time. While I appreciate the sincerity of the hon. gentleman's motives, I must say that I do not see eye to eye with him. It occurs to me that if there ever was a time when a subject such as this should be brought before the House, it is a time when the nation is at war, because if war teaches us anything it teaches us this: that when the country is at war and when the war is over, you are likely to have the greatest crop, if I might use that term, of decorations and recognitions that are from time to time seen.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: And, Sir, I think there is another reason why this matter should be brought before the House at this particular time, and it is that we have in Canada a Union Government, a Government that is supposed to have within its ranks representatives of the two great political parties in Canada, as well as representatives of Labour. And, I know from the address that was delivered to this House in 1914, that the Right hon. leader of the Opposition is not unsympathetic with the resolution that I present to the House to-day for consideration, and I hope favourable decision. For these reasons I think the House should bear with me in presenting to it reasons why I think, first, that hereditary titles should not continue to exist in Canada, and secondly, why women should not bask, if I might use the expression, in the reflected glory of their husband's distinctions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: I might say, Sir, if I were to go as far as my inclination takes me, my resolution would strike at the very root of the iniquity, because I have no sympathy at all with titular distinctions given to men in civil life. I am quite prepared to admit the correctness of men in military life being given rank and distinction, because if the system is to prevail there must be distinctions by which those with higher rank have recognition and priority over those of lower rank; but when it comes to granting distinctions to men in civil life for the services they have rendered their state, for great munificence, or for outstanding ability in their profession or business, it is a procedure with which I have no sympathy. But, Sir, while in theory I might go farther than my resolution goes, yet I trust I am not altogether blind to practical considerations. They say that when a man begins to remember the days of long ago, it is an evidence that age is creeping on him, and when I was endeavouring to secure some comparison as to how I might bring to the House my reason for not going as far in this matter as my desire would take me, I cast my mind back to my student days at Queen's University, when Sir George Kirkpatrick, at one time Speaker of this House, in addressing the students of my day, said: "If you want to roost high you have got to fly high, but be careful you do not fly over the roost." And that is what influenced me in restricting my resolution: I wanted to fly high, I wanted to roost high, but I did not want to frame my resolution so that a dozen or so men in this House would escape from their sense of obligation, and vote against it because the resolution was broader than their sympathies. For that reason I have restricted the resolution to hereditary titles and what I may call the reflected titles of women.

Now, Sir, it has been said that in Canada we should have titles because they have titles in England; that England has developed an official aristocracy which is a very essential part of the Government, and if it is good for England it is equally good for Canada. I think we should examine the analogy, I think we should examine the source from which titles in England come, and I feel satisfied that from an examination of the source and of the development of the institution it will be apparent that conditions in England and conditions in Canada are totally different. Titles to-day in England are really only the picturesque effect of the days of feudalism. They are distinctions without the responsibilities of service. In the old feudal days in England and on the continent the granting of a title was a recognition, but it carried a duty. It was the giving of a privilege, but it carried an obligation, and, as a rule, titles were granted in respect of territorial possessions.

Many of the members of this House have, like myself, been in England. I do not know whether I am a deeper dyed democrat than they are, but there was one thing that always grated upon me, and that was when a man rose to address an assemblage of Englishmen, an assemblage of Britishers, he began his address by, "My lords and gentlemen."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: My lords and gentlemen may be all right for England, or Britain, but from my point of view it is not all right for Canada. Britain has an aristocracy which is deeply rooted in her constitution, but no man can have talked with the common people in England, no man can have considered the conditions of the common people there without standing aghast and being shocked at the class, almost the caste, distinctions that there prevail.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: Not two years ago I drove one evening in a motor car in Scotland and talked to as bright a young man as one would want to hear, and he told me that he regretted that he had stayed in the Old Country because the class and caste distinction was so great that he occupied exactly the same position in society to-day that his forefathers had occupied in earlier days, and that there was no opportunity of bettering or improving his condition.

As I said, Sir, in the early days, titles indicated service, but they are now largely meaningless, and perhaps the House will bear with me a moment or two while I refer to what just a few of the titles of Britain mean.

We will take for instance the title of Duke; it meant the leader of an Army, or a military governor. It is a title that did not come into England until the time of Edward III. Its delay in coming to England arose from the fact that the title of William the Conqueror in Continental Europe was only that of a duke. and he did not care to create in Great Britain a title that was equal to his own. But when Edward III was king, the kings had become so well established that they did then appoint dukes, and the title became hereditary. In the early days it was granted to a man if he had an income of £800 a year from the land—and, Sir, I trust the House will see as the debate progresses, that from the beginning it was those who were or are in affluent circumstances that had the advantage of the King's prerogative.

[Mr. Nickle.]

Now, taking the title of Marquis; he was governor of a province that bordered on or "marched with" another state, and it was his duty to guard his province. The title was first granted for life; it became hereditary for the first time in the German Empire about 940. In England the title was first used in Richard II.'s reign, and he created all sorts of discord and annoyance by interposing this title of Marquis between the title of Duke and that of Earl, which was the first Anglo-Saxon title after that of Prince. Before the Norman conquest there was no other titles than those of Prince and Earl, except such merely officiary ones as Sheriff and Alderman. The Earl was an "honourable man," a warrior, and in return for his recognition by the King made payment in men, horses and spears. That was his service. The value of an Earldom was £400 a year. He had power of administration in his own district or county.

Then there was the title of Viscount, the official left in charge by a Count. First the title was officiary and afterwards it became hereditary. Sometimes the Viscount was created by the King instead of the Count, or as his vassal direct. In jurisdiction the rank was perhaps equivalent to Saxon Alderman or Sheriff. But this title of Viscount was not used in England until after the reign of Henry VI.

Then we have the title of Baron. The baron was lord of the territory from which he took his name, with some judicial powers, but beneath the dignitaries hitherto spoken of. There were three classes of barons; first, King's Barons, holding their land direct from the crown, secondly, Barons of subjects, under Earls, and holding their baronies from them. Both these classes were Parliamentary barons, and had revenue amounting to "13 knights fees and the third part." Thirdly, there were Lords of Manors, with smaller revenues and not summoned to Parliament.

I would like to draw attention to this point, for this reason. We have sometimes heard it said that these titles only arose from the prerogative of the Crown. In the main they did, but those of a certain station had the right of creating titles for their inferiors. There were the King's barons, those created by the King; and then there were the barons of pledges, created by earls in the higher order, and then we have the lords of the manor, and so on. Then we come to the title of baronet. Baronet is rather an interesting title in these days.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: It has been the creation of baronetcies in this country which has aroused some little interest in this subject. It is interesting to know how these arose. I wonder if you will be surprised to learn that James I, with an ingenuity born of a financial stringency, created the title of baronet to secure a class that would look after the colonization of Ulster, and he sold the privilege for a thousand pounds. And if you are going to get a thousand pounds for a title, you have to make it worth while for the recipient to pay the money. So he made the title hereditary, giving the baronet precedence over all the knights, and he said in the patents: "You are entitled to be called Sir, and your wife may be called Lady, Madame or Dame.

The knight was a landed proprietor, with a very small holding, and by virtue of his gentle condition he had the privilege of fighting on horseback instead of on foot, holding his land on the express condition of readiness to assist the king in arms.

In 1205 a writ of King John directed that every nine knights should provide a tenth, well equipped with horse and arms, for the defence of the kingdom, and should contribute 2s. per diem for his keep. The penalty was forfeiture of their land and a fine. But in the time of Henry III., in 1224, the king, in order to obtain money for his wars, ordered all laymen, who were of military age and who held a knight fee, to get themselves knighted, and a similar order was issued in 1234. In 1254 all who held land of the annual value of £10 were ordered to receive the dignity, though exemption might be purchased by payment of a fine. In those days men were anxious to avoid knighthood on account of the responsibilities it entailed, and the fines appear to have been considerable. Edward I. imposed the obligation afresh, and in 1292 ordered that all who held land to the value of £40 a year were to be distrained.

Coming to later days, James I., in the early part of his reign, revived the practice, and called on all who received forty pounds a year to receive knighthood or to pay a composition, and he made many hundreds of knights in the first year of his reign. The Long Parliament abolished compulsory knighthood on the ground that they objected to the king raising money in that way without their consent. In other words the conferring of knighthood meant that the knight had to pay something for his privilege. And I was rather amused to be told by a knight, in these democratic days, that distraint of knighthood has somewhat changed its method of extracting money, that even to-day under democratic conditions, people were demanding their toll. He told me that a short time ago he asked for a service and he was asked a somewhat large sum in payment, and he said to the man: "You are charging me much more than this is worth," to which he had the reply: "Why, are you not a knight?—you have to pay for your privilege." Democracy is taking advantages of these privileges. As I said a moment ago, privilege and obligation, rights and duties, went hand in hand in the early days. In titles, it is the same as it is in many other things: You grant a privilege and you expect a realization of duty, and those to whom the privilege is granted soon forget that they hold the privilege for which they owe a duty, and believe they hold the privilege as a vested interest. It was not long, as we count the life of nations, before the privileges in the old land were taken as a right, and the duties forgotten. As a historical example of this, I would ask you to consider the position of the Highlands of Scotland. In the Peninsular War the Highlanders fought by the hundreds, but the large land-owners found sheep raising more profitable than keeping their tenantry on the soil, and used their land for grazing. And so, in the Crimean War, the Highlands were so stripped of men that they were almost unable to furnish soldiers. To-day, in some of the north lands of Britain, the shooting rights are of more value to the owner of the land than the rights of the tenantry. That is one reason why we are being called upon to-day to cultivate to a greater extent than should be necessary to send food to the old land. I am not saying anything on my own initiative. There are probably few men in this House who have not read Goldsmith's "Deserted Village." The simplicity of the theme and the gentle touch of the writer are remarked to-day, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to a few lines taken from that work, in which the author says, speaking of a condition similar to that to which I have just now attracted the attention of this House:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade:
A breath can make them, as a breath has made:
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed can never be supplied.
A time there was, ere England's griefs began,
When every rood of ground maintained its man;
For him light labour spread her wholesome store,
Just gave what life required, but gave no more:
His best companions innocence and health,
And his best riches ignorance of wealth.

I therefore say, Sir, that if anything is demonstrated, it is that hereditary titles

have not done for Britain what their founders expected they would do.

Now, let me for a moment or two draw the attention of the House to conditions in Canada. Some Canadians may glory in their ancestry, but I think the majority of us look facts fairly in the face, and realize that the majority of the men who came to this country, the fathers and grandfathers of the present generation, came to this country because it offered to them better opportunity for making their way in the world. To try to claim anything else is to try to set up snobbishness instead of the true standard. I want to say that, in speaking from my place in this House this afternoon, I speak as the son of a man who came here because he realized that the Old Country did not offer him the opportunity for him to advance that he thought this country would, and anything I have in this world I owe to his industry and thrift and courage in facing Canada when it was a wilderness. Now, Sir, as I said at the beginning, I am a democrat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: I have always been deeply impressed by the beginning of the second paragraph of the American Constitution, in which Jefferson, influenced by the philosophy of Locke, laid this down as a principle: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Now, Sir, I want the House to remember that, in preparing that Declaration of Independence, Jefferson was preparing a political document. It was a political, not a moral, declaration. And when Jefferson said that all men were created equal, he did not mean that all men were created equal intellectually or morally. What he meant was this: that all men before the law had equal rights and equal privileges, and that no one was entitled to priority. I subscribe to that as the sound declaration for a democratic country, and I sincerely trust that before I am through this afternoon the Prime Minister will say that he realizes that the democracy of Canada is equal to that of the country which lies to the south of the line.

I think that the simplicity of our forefathers is something of which we may all be proud. You may say that Canadian statesmen were the makers of Canada, but the men also who made Canada were those who came to this country and amid the trials of the wilderness laid the foundation

of the rights and privileges we enjoy to-day. They were the true makers of Canada. But, Sir, no man who has lived in this country within the last ten years can think of Canada's development prior to the war without being shocked by realizing how far we were getting away from the simplicity of our ancestors. We have had in Canada tremendous national and industrial expansion. People grew rich; if a man wanted to make money it was almost impossible for him not to grow rich, if he made money his ideal. A new standard was developing prior to 1914 in the matter of how a man was to be measured. We were beginning to value a man by what he was worth—the size of his house, the number of his motor-cars, and the elegance of their equipment, and the extent of his wife's dinner parties, and the number of gowns she had was beginning to determine what a man's family station was. This war has brought tremendous agonies; it has brought sorrow and anguish into Canadian life, but, thank God, it has brought one other thing; it has changed the standard of value of the citizens of Canada. We no longer value men by what they have; we value them by what they are. Some people call me a Socialist. I should like to define my Socialism. Socialism is a very general term; you may regard it as synonymous with anarchy, or you may define it as the recognition of the right that every man is entitled to a fair chance. I am a Socialist, if by that term you mean that there should be a reasonable equality of opportunity; if you lay down as a fundamental principle that every man should get a due amount of this world's goods for the services that he renders; that no group, no class, no individual should be crippled just because of lack of money to get a fair start in life. I have run, not one, but five or six elections, parliamentary and municipal, in the city from which I come, and if there is one thing that has wrung my heart it has been to find, among the households of people whom I call my constituents, especially bright boys or girls who were obliged to leave school because the factory age had come and the family could not afford to keep the child at school because of the necessity of their earning to assist the other members of the family. I am a Socialist, to the extent of my belief that that child is entitled to a chance. It has been strongly borne in upon me that "slow rises worth by poverty oppressed." My views are to this extent socialistic: that unbearable burdens of this kind should be lifted from the masses of the people.

As I say, the war came. Men went to the war from a sense of duty. We learned that in the humblest clay a hero might be hidden; that there was no monoply in virtue. Occasion showed who were brave and who were cowards; who were saints and who were sinners. Numerous examples might be given to the House of wonderful nobleness of spirit, but two that come from the people have deeply impressed me. One is of that of a boy John—I do not remember his surname; I remember him only as John. He stood on a certain battleship until he was killed, when every member of the gun crew was gone, because it was his duty to stay there. He did his duty, and did it unto the end. The other magnificent example of nobleness of spirit was that of a simple seaman who stood on board a man-of-war as she was sinking, having previously drawn the lot entitling him to go into the lifeboat. He turned to a good friend whom he knew had parents to support, and said: you take my slip; you get into the boat—and then he calmly faced the future knowing that death was inevitable. You cannot get finer examples of nobility of spirit than this, and if we are going to have titles, this is the class of people which should have recognition, not those who by vast munificence, have to a certain extent, brought themselves public recognition.

As I said in the beginning, the reason why I am speaking this afternoon is that I fear that out of this war is going to come a great shower of titles. Why do I think that? Because on the 18th day of March of this year, the following despatch came from England:

Canada Asks Title Delay.

London, March 17.—The list of honours of the new Order of the British Empire appears to-night for Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the Crown colonies, accompanied by the intimation that "at the desire of the Canadian Government submission to His Majesty of the list for the Dominion of Canada has been postponed."

That means, if the despatch is correct, that a list had been prepared and that the Canadian Government had asked that the list be held up. I think that we as members of this Parliament, representing the people, have the right to know who prepared the list, and if it was not prepared on the word of the Prime Minister, or of this Government, we have the right—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend has gathered an entirely erroneous impression from the despatch. It merely meant that the Canadian Government had up to that time prepared no list.

Mr. NICKLE: Then, as I always gladly do, I accept the word of the Prime Minister. But in rising it seems to me that the Prime Minister lays down this as a principle; and as the Government of this country has not prepared a list, no list should be submitted to His Majesty for approval without the consent of the Prime Minister. I say that that is sound and proper. What I intended to ask the Prime Minister was this: was that list prepared by him, or was it prepared with his approval, or was it prepared by somebody else? He tells me that no list was prepared; therefore the despatch was incorrect and I shall not follow the matter further.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may tell my hon. friend that the Prime Minister was asked to prepare a list, but that he found other urgent engagements which made it impossible for him to give consideration to the subject.

Mr. NICKLE: I am very glad indeed that the Prime Minister found other considerations requiring his attention. If we read into the lines of his remarks the meaning that is obvious, it is apparent that if other considerations had not had his attention, before this fresh hereditary titles might have been bestowed upon Canadians.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The British Empire Order is not hereditary.

Mr. NICKLE: Well, others are. The reason why I speak of the matter from this angle is this: I have a great regard for the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I think he is one of the finest examples of the fine Tory politician, mellowed by ripe experience into an Imperial statesman. But in the debate of 1914, page 480 of Hansard, he said this in reply to the resolution of the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham):

I have not very much to say upon this question except that I think the bestowment of honours comes from the source of all honours, that is, the King; and that we must allow the King to have unrestricted scope as to the selection of persons upon whom to bestow these titles of honour.

I do not know that this Parliament, not having the power of originating or controlling; not being the supreme source of power so far as the bestowment of honours is concerned, has anything particular to say about it, or should pass legislation with reference to it. That is my first objection to the passage of a Bill of this kind in this Parliament.

Now, Sir, there I want to differ from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have

got a long way beyond the divine right of kings. I think the prerogative of the Crown must be exercised constitutionally, and I am not prepared for one moment to admit the doctrine that an overseas dominion has no voice in the recognition by His Majesty of the citizens of that overseas Dominion. I want to show you, Sir, that I am not the only one who thinks this. Last year, we had in England a conference at which the Premiers of the overseas dominions were present. I am now reading from a little volume called "War-time Speeches of Lieutenant General, the Right Hon. J. C. Smuts." It is published by Hodder and Stoughton, of London, Toronto and New York. Among those speeches, I find the following resolution moved by the Prime Minister of this Government:

The Imperial War Conference are of opinion that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.

They deem it their duty, however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth, and of India as an important portion of the same, should recognize the right of the Dominions and India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations, and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action, founded on consultation, as the several governments may determine.

Surely that lays down the principle that an overseas dominion within the sphere of the Imperial authority in so far as it affects an overseas dominion, has a right to be heard and to be recognized. General Smuts took also the same view, and I am reading these remarks, to illustrate the sense in which I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce was wrong in the principle which he enunciated in this House in 1914. General Smuts, in speaking to the resolution of the Prime Minister of this Government, said:

The subject matter of this resolution, as Sir Robert Borden has stated, has been carefully considered, and although quite properly, a definite decision on the main problem is to be postponed for future action by a more important conference than this, yet certain principles are affirmed here in this resolution which are very important and far reaching. The resolution refers, in the first place, to the question of the status of the self-governing Dominions. That matter has already been referred to both by Sir Robert Borden and by Mr. Massey, and I wish to say a few words in reference to the point. The resolution says that any future settlement that is come to must "be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth." The whole question of the future status of the Dominions is therefore raised in this resolution. So far the British Empire has developed along natural lines. The Dominions started as colonies and settlements of the mother country and of the British Isles. They started as Crown colonies; they developed into self-governing colonies, and now they have become the present Dominions. Other parts of the world have been added to the Empire, until to-day we have really a congress of nations. These old colonies and the present Dominions have in course of time increased in importance, increased in population and in economic influence, and are to-day already playing a part in the world which seems to my mind to make it very necessary that their status should be very seriously considered, and should be improved. Too much, if I may say so, of the old ideas still cling to the new organism which is growing. I think that although in practice there is great freedom, yet in theory the status of the dominions is of a subject character. Whatever we may say, and whatever we may think, we are subject provinces of Great Britain. That is the legal theory of the constitution, and in many ways which I need not specify to-day, that theory still permeates practice.

In the light of those speeches and in the light of the resolution, I think the principle as enunciated by the Prime Minister and by General Smuts is the correct principle and one that should govern in Canada, and the position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not such as a self-respecting overseas dominion can acquiesce in.

Going a step further and coming to the philosophy of titles, if I may so term it, why do people want titles at all? As far as I can find out, and as far as I can think it out, I suppose we must admit that there is vanity in most people. Human beings desire recognition, and the people at large are pleased when such recognition is justly given. Besides, there is in the world a certain class of people who will do more if they are going to get something for it; in other words, if you recognize them. They like it to be known by the world in general and by people with whom they mix that other people recognize their abilities, and that they have a handle to their name as evidence of their virtue and of their character. If, in every day practice, you could reward where reward should be given, and if it were possible for the Prime Minister —because I still stick to my position that the Prime Minister in England, in the main, recommends to His Majesty those to whom titles shall be given, and it is a constitutional privilege that the Prime Ministers of the overseas dominions must exercise if this thing is to be kept in reasonable check— exactly and accurately to determine all

those to whom recognition should be given —there might be some merit in the continuance of the system. But those of us who have thought over the matter, know that this is altogether impossible. We know that, as a rule, titles go to those who have the big places and who catch the public eye, and that the men who, in restricted areas and within their own circles, do just as efficient, just as thorough, and just as praiseworthy work, get nothing but the go-by, with the result that a spirit of jealousy is engendered, and instead of your stimulating a nation to united effort as the result of the recognition of only those who are outstanding, the majority of the people are indifferent, and there is a tendency to think that nothing need be done because nothing will be heard of what has been done. You get away altogether from what I think is the right principle, namely, that virtue is its own reward. If Pitt and Gladstone were big enough to be Prime Ministers of England and to carry to their dying day their own surnames, I do not think we should be going too far if we should ask that men less great should do the same.

I have heard a good deal as to the position I have taken in regard to a woman not being given a title owing to the fact that her husband has been granted a title. To catch my point of view, you have to go back a little and consider the legal and constitutional position of women in relation to the community. In the old civilization woman was really, so to speak, a chattel, the chattel, first of her father, and then of her husband. A relic of the old days exists in the fact that on her marriage day a woman is given away by her father. In the old days, the woman belonged to the parent until the father transferred the title, so to speak, to her husband. But the position that woman occupies in society to-day is quite different. First, we had the right gradually recognized that her property could not be taken from her without her consent. There was no longer unity of property. Then we had a further recognition, at least in the province from which I come, by which she was given absolute control of her property, and only

4 p.m.

a few day ago the leader of the Government introduced into this House a Bill by which woman is given equal status with man in this country so far as the franchise goes. It is inevitable—it has not reached here yet; it may take a few years—it follows, as night does the day, that you must give her in the near future the right to sit in these halls and in the legislatures of the provincial parliament. If she has brains enough to vote—and we all admit that she has—with a little training she will have the ability to sit and debate in these legislative halls. The whole status of a woman has been changed. She is now an independent entity. She has her own position in the community, and, having that position in the community, I think the time has come when she should have her recognition by virtue of her individual accomplishments, and not shine, as I said in the early part of my remarks, in the reflected glory of her husband. I want to go further—and in this I may offend certain women in this country —I believe it is the social aspirations of the women that lead them to desire titles in this country. A cynic in this country once said that a man measured his worth by his intellectual capacity and the money he could make, and a woman by her social status, and I have been shocked at the social superiority that some women attempted to assume, simply because their husbands had been singularly successful in making money, and had shown great tact in the method they had adopted in giving donations to certain objects. I think a woman's status entitles her to recognition as of her own right, and I believe if there were no reflective titles, you would have less seeking after them, and you would have greater equality in society, and for these reasons, briefly put, I think there should be no such thing as a woman being given the title of a "lady," by virtue of the fact that her husband is called "Sir."

I want to go a step further. I am speaking again of hereditary titles. I have no sympathy with other titles, but my resolution is directed against hereditary titles. When I ask myself the question, why should a title be hereditary? I cannot answer it, and one of the greatest difficulties I had in preparing an argument on such a question as this, is that I could not consistently put up a mental man of straw that I could later on knock down. I could not conceive why there should be such a thing as hereditary titles. Lloyd George once used what I might call a brutal simile. I do not know that I would like to adopt it, but he was the great democrat twenty years ago, and is yet. In talking of the hereditary titles in England, he said: "I never could see"—these are not his words but the gist of his argument—"how we get to the position that all the quality is in the oldest pup in the litter." It is a rough simile, but I cannot see why the oldest son has all the qualities,

and yet if he has not all the qualities, why should he have all the recognition? To go back to the earliest titles, they were not hereditary. In feudal lands, freehold was vested by the monarch in the father for his own life. But as time went on, the father having rendered efficient service, the son knew what was to be done, and on the death of the father the fee went from him to the son, and in that way the hereditary title came. It followed the land, and it followed the service. If the father rendered the service, and received recognition the son got the land and had to undertake the service, and therefore, got the title, but to-day there is no fee. There is no territorial holding in Canada. We are a long way off from the territorial holding as entitling a man to recognition. But we have this: we have the money fee. To use the terms of the hon. gentleman from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), we have got the centralization of wealth, and in a moment or two I intend to direct my attention to that, but I believe with hereditary titles coming to this country, we are going to see the wealth of the father coming to the oldest son instead of being equally divided amongst them all, and later in the debate you will see why that is repugnant to a man of my temperament. A hereditary title rests on this principle: You admit that the oldest son of a noble should be noble, but your experience has proved the fallacy of the argument. If you want to go further and look among the peers of England you will find examples that will shock you, but I do not intend to use the name of any man. Those who are anxious to look into the matter may learn for themselves. Why should we have hereditary titles? What we want to build up is wholesome democracy. and I would commend to the House, and to the Prime Minister of this country, this gentle but firm reply, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts gave certain English nobility in 1640, when they offered to come and settle in Massachusetts, provided that state would create them as an hereditary house. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts made a reply which I think stands out as a beautiful piece of literature, a firm declaration of a democratic group of what they considered the principles that should influence a democracy in the giving of recognition to those that were thought to be great. The declaration was that no man is great because he is the son of a great man, but only those are great who have within them a personal and individual greatness of their own. This is what the Commonwealth of Massachusetts said:

> When God blesseth any branch of any noble or generous family with a spirit and gifts fit for Government, it would be a taking of God's name in vain to put such a talent under a bushel, and a sin against the honour of magistracy to neglect such in our public elections. But if God should not delight to furnish some of their posterity with gifts fit for magistracy, we should expose them rather to reproach and prejudice, and the Commonwealth with them, than exalt them to honour, if we should call them forth when God doth not, to public authority.

That was a clear-cut enunciation of those who understood the principle of democracy, that if a man had worth, the people would recognize it, but if God had not given a man ability, then no hereditary right should be exercised to give him a place in the community he had no right to occupy. If we are going to have hereditary titles, let us be consistent. Why not make our Distinguished Service Orders hereditary? Why not make our university titles hereditary, and our V.C.'s hereditary? And if the Government of this country to-day are prepared to stand by hereditary titles, I see nothing for it, but that they must appoint a committee on eugenics to see that the proper men are given titles. I had hoped, Sir, for the moment that the House would take this matter seriously. Now, Sir, if hereditary titles rest on anything, they rest on the belief that a noble sire will transmit to the coming generation the characteristics that are outstanding in him, and if we are going to come to the conclusion as to whether a noble sire does this, what would you do? You would look back and see the stock from which a man came, and study his atavism, and his prepotency. And if Canadians are to be appointed, I suggest we should appoint the hon. Minister of Justice, whose calm deliberation would enable him to judge of the intellectual qualities of the recipient, and then I would suggest the appointment of the Minister of Agriculture, with his knowledge of stock raising, and then, Sir, as mental and physical qualities are not the only things, by which a man is to be judged, we must consider the spiritual characteristics, and who could be better qualified to act in that respect than the hon. President of the Council on such a committee? I said a moment ago that I thought if we had hereditary titles in this country it would lead to the inevitable conclusion that, a system of primogeniture would be practised; that is the recognition that the eldest son must be given the money, to enable him to main-

tain the dignity of the family name. I am opposed to the concentration of wealth, and opposed to estates—being entail—being followed in this country. I believe a man should be valued by what he is, and not by his father's worth.

Sir, a man does not have to be very old before his personal ambitions are merged in his ambitions for his children. Little as the distance may be which I have gone, I would a thousand times rather that my children looked back on my virtues, if I have any, than that they should look back on the fact that I gave them a title to carry through life.

This question of hereditary titles is not a new subject in Canada. We have had it up in reference to this country three or four times. I want to go back a little bit into Canadian history. James I, as you know, was a gentleman who knew how to replenish his coffers by the sale of baronetcies and knighthoods. There was a Scotchman by the name of Sir William Alexander, and if there is anything to be got where there is money at the end of it you will generally find that a Scotchman, in dealing with the English in reference to these matters, will be looking after the main chance. Sir William Alexander saw that baronetcies were to be created because James was very anxious to build up Ulster, and to replenish his exchequer. He, therefore, approached the monarch and said: "Across the Atlantic there is New England and New France, let us create a Nova Scotia. If you transfer to me a large tract of land and give me the right to create baronetcies and baronets, I will attempt to populate the country for you." Therefore, in 1621 James the First granted Sir William Alexander a huge tract which practically included all the country now known as the Maritime Provinces. Under the power conferred, Sir William offered a baronetcy and a tract of land three miles long upon the coast, and ten miles up the country—

"To all such principal knights and esquires as will be generously pleased to be undertakers of the said plantation and who will promise to set forth six sufficient men, artificers or labourers, sufficiently armed, apparelled and victualled for two years".

Each baronet paying Sir William "ane thousand markis Scottis money." The proclamation constituting the Order of Baronets of Nova Scotia was issued on November 31, 1624, and ten days before the death of his father Charles I wrote to the Privy Council recommending the scheme. The number of baronets was fixed at one hundred and fifty; one hundred and seven were created. In what is now New Brunswick, thirty-four; Nova Scotia, fifteen; Cape Breton, twenty-four, and Anticosti, thirty-four. The scheme came to nought, as Charles I. handed the country back to the French. His plan was to establish in Acadia a state of society similar to that of mediaeval Europe, with the soil in possession of lords paramount, under whom the colonists should hold their lands as tenants. Sometimes, in studying history from that standpoint, I am not sorry that Charles handed the country back to the French, because in that way he saved us from a great deal of trouble in Canada and especially in the Maritime Provinces to this day.

There is a nearer example and an example that is pregnant with thought for me. I want to view this subject seriously. While at times there may have been jocular things in my remarks this afternoon, I have never approached anything in my life more seriously than I have this subject. I think that it strikes at the very foundation of Canadian society, and we have got to stop it. In 1789, after the rebellion south of the line, the Colonial office prepared a document. This document is not in print, but I had the privilege of seeing a copy through the courtesy of Mr. J. S. Ewart, of this city. It shows that it appeared to the Colonial Office at that time that the rebellion of the thirteen colonies was caused by the fact that there was not, as a bulwark between the Crown, the monarchy and the democracy, a hereditary house that would stimulate the ambition of men to desire recognition and which would have so operated that it would have won from the democracy and to the monarchy the great men who took the part of the democracy or who took the part of the thirteen colonies against the Mother Country. It was suggested in all seriousness that there should be established in Canada a hereditary house. We see the result of that document in the Constitutional Act. The Constitutional Act came into effect in 1791, and the fifth and sixth provisions of that Act read as follows:

V. And be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That every member of each of the said Legislative Councils shall hold his seat therein for the term of his Life, but subject nevertheless to the provisions herein-after contained.

VI. And be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That whenever His Majesty, His Heirs or Successors, shall think proper to confer upon any subject of the Crown of Great Britain, by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of either of the said Provinces, any hereditary Title of Honour, Rank or Dignity of such Province, descendable according to any

Courts of Descent limited in such Letters Patent, it shall and may be lawful for His Majesty, His Heirs or Successors, to annex thereto, by the said Letters Patent, if His Majesty, His Heirs or Successors, shall so think fit, an hereditary right of being summoned to the Legislative Council of such Province, descendable according to the Courts of Descent so limited with respect to such Title, Rank or Dignity; and that every person on whom such right shall severally so descend, shall thereupon be entitled to demand from the Governor, Lieutenant Governor or Person adminstering the Government of such Province, His Writ of Summons to such Legislative Council, at any time after he shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, subject nevertheless to the Provisions hereinafter contained.

Therefore, we see that this sixth section of the Constitutional Act made provision for establishing in Canada a hereditary legislative council. One of the reasons why that was not carried out in practice probably was that Lord Simcoe and Lord Dorchester, both firm old Tories, Lord Dorchester the greatest Tory of them all, advised against the creation of hereditary titles. Lord Dorchester said:

The fluctuating state of property in these provinces would expose all hereditary honors to fall into disregard and disrespect.

He saw that if you were going to have a hereditary aristocracy for the support of the monarchy, you had to make provision for money for the decent support of those who enjoyed the titles.

I now want to read to you another extract, because I am afraid that perhaps some one will say: This man is setting up a new doctrine; but what does he know about it after all? He is expressing his own ideas, and they are not entitled to much weight. They are only the expression of one man's idea. You know how you can laugh a case out of Court, and I have known many good cases to be laughed out of Parliament. I want to read a quotation from Professor Shortt's life of Lord Sydenham, which is as follows:

The legislative council was supposed to be the counterpart of the House of Lords. A great part of the Constitutional Act was taken up with provisions for securing in the colony a body of landed aristocracy which, when furnished with suitable titles of honour, would provide the requisite nobility from which to recruit the legislative council, or Canadian House of Lords. The proximity of the exalted rank and dignity of those Canadian nobles would incidentally sharpen the tooth of remorse which was assumed to be gnawing the consciences of those fallen republicans in the lower regions to the south.

The provision for an aristocracy contributed the Family Compact, with the necessary accompaniments of land-grabbing intrigues, for an impecunious aristocracy would inspire little awe and less envy.

As the members of the legislative council held their offices for life, they were free from the corrupting influences which press upon those who have to keep in touch with the vulgar multitude. They could, therefore, if so inclined, freely devote to public questions an enlightened mind and unbiased judgment; or, if differently minded, they could devote themselves with equal effect to the pursuit of private interests and class privileges, with a calm disregard of public opinion.

If you have no respect for the opinion of Professor Shortt who wrote the life of Lord Sydenham, let me refer you to what Fox said when the Constitutional Act was under debate in the House of Lords. He said this:

As to the points of hereditary powers and hereditary honours, to say that they were good or that they were not good, as a general proposition, was not easily maintained; but he saw nothing so good in hereditary powers and honour, as to incline us to introduce them into a country where they were unknown, and by such means distinguish Canada from all the colonies in the West Indies. In countries where they made a part of the constitution, he did not think it wise to destroy them; but to give birth and life to such principles in countries where they did not exist, appeared to him to be exceedingly unwise. He could not account for it, unless it was that Canada having been formerly a French colony, there might be an opportunity of reviving those titles of honour, the extinction of which some gentlemen so much deplored, and to revive in the West that spirit of chivalry which had fallen into disgrace in a neighbouring country. He asked, if those red and blue ribbands, which had lost their lustre in the old world, were to shine forth again in the new? It seemed to him peculiarly absurd to introduce hereditary honours in America, where those artificial distinctions stunk in the nostrils of the natives. He thought these powers and honours wholly unnecessary, and tending rather to make a new constitution worse than better.

He goes on to say:

The legislative councils ought to be totally free, and repeatedly chosen, in a manner as much independent of the governor as the nature of a colony would admit. Those, he conceived, would be the best; but if not, they should have their seats for life, be appointed by the King, consist of a limited number, and possess no hereditary honours. Those honours might be very proper, and of great utility, in countries where they had existed by long custom; but, in his opinion, they were not fit to be introduced where they had no original existence; where there was no particular reason for introducing them, arising from the nature of the country, its extent, its state of improvement, or its peculiar customs; where, instead of attracting respect, they might excite envy; and as but few could enjoy them, those who did not, might be induced to form an unfavourable comparison between their own situation and that of their neighbours, among whom no such distinctions were known.

Now, Sir, I said at the beginning the reason I brought this motion up to-day was that I thought the war would be used as a

reason for the creation of honours. I want to direct your attention to the fact that in 1791 the war was used as a reason for the attempted creation of a hereditary class that should intervene between the democracy and the Sovereign. The war may be the reason to-day why hereditary titles may be introduced into this country.

I would like to read another instance before I leave the subject. Lord Bryce is a man for whom we have much respect, and I would like to read to this House, and through Hansard send out to the country what Lord Bryce thinks of hereditary titles. I will now read extracts from his American Commonwealth:

> It may seem a paradox to observe that a millionaire has a better and easier social career open to him in England than in America. Nevertheless there is a sense in which this is true. In America, if his private character be bad, if he be mean, or openly immoral, or personally vulgar, or dishonest, the best society may keep its doors closed against him. In England great wealth, skillfully employed, will more readily force these doors to open. For in England great wealth can, by using the appropriate methods, practically buy rank from those who bestow it; or by obliging persons whose position enables them to command fashionable society, can induce them to stand sponsors for the upstart, and force him into society, a thing which no person in America has the power of doing. To effect such a stroke in England the rich man must of course have stopped short of positive frauds, that is, of such frauds as could be proved in court. But he may be still distrusted and disliked by the elite of the commercial world, he may be vulgar and ill-educated, and indeed have nothing to recommend him except his wealth and his willingness to spend it in providing amusement for fashionable people. All this will not prevent him from becoming a baronet, or possibly a peer, and thereby acquiring a position of assured dignity which he can transmit to his offspring. The existence of a system of artificial rank enables a stamp to be given to base metal in Europe which cannot be given in a thoroughly republican country.
>
> Europeans have been known to ask whether the United States do not suffer from the absence of a hereditary nobility. As may be supposed, such a question excites mirth in America; it is as if you were to offer a Court and an Established Church. They remark, with truth, that since Pitt in England and the Napoleons in France prostituted hereditary titles, these have ceased to be either respectable or useful. "They do not," say the Americans, "suggest antiquity, for the English families that enjoy them are mostly new; they are not associated, like the ancient titles, with the history of your nation; they are merely a prize offered to wealth, the expression of a desire for gilding that plutocracy which has replaced the ancient aristocracy of your country. Seeing how little service hereditary nobility renders in maintaining the standard either of manner, or morals, or honour, or public duty, few sensible men would create it in any European country where it did not exist; much less then should we dream of creating it in America, which possesses none of the materials or conditions which could make it tolerable. If a peerage is purchasable even in England, where the dignity of the older nobility might have suggested some care in bestowal, purchasable not so openly in Portugal, or a German principality, but practically purchasable by party services and by large subscriptions to public purposes, much more would it be purchasable here, where there are no traditions to break down, where wealth accumulates rapidly, and the wealthy seek every avenue for display. Titles in this country would be simply an additional prize offered to wealth and ambition. They could not be respected. They would make us as snobbish as you are." A European observer will not quarrel with this judgment. There is a growing disposition in America, as everywhere else, to relish and make the most of such professional or official titles as can be had, it is a harmless way of trying to relieve the monotony of the world. If there be, as no doubt there is, less disposition than in England to run after and pay court to the great or the fashionable, this is perhaps due not to any superior virtue, but to the absence of those opportunities and temptations which their hereditary titles and other social institutions set before the English.

Lord Bryce declares, further, and I want the House to pay attention to what he says:

> It would be the very wantonness of folly to create in the new country what most thinking people would gladly be rid of in the old one.

I fear I am wearying the House but I would like to direct attention to another side of the question—and it is a most serious side—the corruption that is being brought to view in the granting of titles in England.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: I am not going to use my own language because I do not know, as a matter of fact, of my own knowledge that which is spoken of, but I will read from the Debates that took place in the House of Lords in England, in 1914, and twice afterwards in 1917, and I think that before I finish, this House will be convinced that titles are, as Lord Bryce said, purchasable for money, and that they are no indication of the worth of their recipient, or of him to whom they are given. James I of Scotland created a Viscount and Lord Treasurer for which he secured £20,000, Pitt in the period from 1784 to 1801 created 140 peerages, granted to men whose buroughs he wished to buy that he might strengthen himself in Parliament and make his Government secure. What I intend to draw the attention of the House and the country to this afternoon is that the prerogative that was at one time exercised by the Crown for the enrichment of the Sovereign is to-day recognized and used by political parties in England for the maintenance of party funds.

Now, Sir, let me first turn your attention to what was said in the debate of 1914, and

I will quote from the proceedings as found at page 274, Lord Ribblesdale was speaking to a resolution which was before the House. The Earl of Selborne had moved:

> That a contribution to Party Funds should not be a consideration to a Minister when he recommends any name for an honour to His Majesty; that effectual measures should be taken in order to assure the nation that Governments, from whatever Political Party they are drawn, will act according to this rule; and that this House requests the concurrence of the House of Commons in the foregoing Resolution.

In other words Lord Selborne asked that an assurance be given that party funds were not to be got by the sale of titles. Practically no member of the House of Lords denied the existence of the practice. Men like Lord Ribblesdale, of a cynical temperament, admitted that it existed, but said it was not of much importance. Hear what he said as printed on page 274 of Hansard:

> I am afraid I belong to the class of people which the noble Lord behind me (Lord Charnwood) very pleasantly alluded to as people who seem to think that these things must be, that they do not very much matter, that they have always gone on and are likely to go on, and that if they do not go on in one form will go on in another. That is precisely my opinion.

He admits the existence of the fact, and says that, as far as his opinion goes, it must go on. Let me read you what the mover of the resolution says:

> There is a prevalent belief—I do not think that I should be guilty of exaggeration if I said a very widely prevalent belief—that persons are often recommended for these honours whom no one would have thought of so recommending if they had not contributed largely to Party funds. That prevalent belief takes three forms, as I know, not only from the Press, but from a voluminous correspondence on this subject. It is believed that persons who have social ambition, or whose wives have social ambition, and who have really no claim at all to receive an honour, can purchase it if they go to the right place. Again, the belief takes this form, that there have been cases where social ambition has never entered into the soul of the innocent rich man, but where he has been tempted and where an honour has been actually hawked to him on condition that he would make this contribution. The third case is rather of a different kind, but still, I maintain, a great evil. It is the case of men who have really done public service, whom public opinion would be very content to see honoured, and who have had pressure— I would almost say brutal pressure—put upon them to make a contribution to Party funds which they did not wish, and in some cases could not afford to make. If it were necessary, I could quote sheaves of cuttings from the public Press to prove the prevalence of this belief, and from newspapers covering the whole field of political opinion, from the Labour Leader to the Morning Post, and from the Nation to the Saturday Review, and last, but not least, we have the new publication, the Candid Witness, in which Mr. Gibson Bowles has dealt very fully with this question. And further, every playgoer knows that this matter of the sale of honours is now openly scoffed at in the theatre; and it has also even been thrown across the floor of the House of Commons as a taunt from one member to another.

And, then, Sir, it did not stop there. A resolution along similar lines to that moved in 1914 was again moved by Lord Selborne. In the course of the debate Lord Beresford, one of the outspoken men who says what he thinks, is reported at page 184 of Hansard to the following effect:

> My Lords, I should like to support the views of my noble friend Lord Selborne. There is no doubt that the feeling in the country is that most of the Party funds are raised in a manner which is discreditable to public life; that enormous sums of money are paid for Peerages, Baronetcies, and Knighthoods, and they believe further that sums of money have been paid for Privy Councillorships.

Then he goes on and says:

> This war will be celebrated in history for the large numbers of honours, rewards, promotions, and even offices given to people who have disastrously failed. Nobody can deny that. Many of these people who have received honours have no earthly right to them except that they were lucky enough to be plutocrats. Why should not the Patent for a Peerage be made out on exactly the same lines as the Patent for the V. C.

He meant by that that the patent should set out the reason for granting it. Then I would refer to pages 204-5 of the Debates of the same year, in which Lord Salisbury waxes warm in regard to the matter. The Marquess of Salisbury says this:

> Does anybody doubt, even after hearing my noble friend's speech, that there is corruption in the administration of honours in this country? Nobody doubts it. My noble friend said that he knew nothing about it, and had never heard of it. O sancta simplicitas: Does my noble friend really expect us to believe that the leading public men of this country do not know of the corruption which exists in the administration of honours.

Earl Curzon of Keddleston replied:

> I said that I was perfectly well aware of the rumour. I said—and I repeat it—that I know of no established case; and I ask for one.

The reason I read this reference is this: When I come to the October, 1917, debate in the House of Lords, it was established beyond peradventure by cases given in that debate that titles are sold in Britain. Not in the same way that you may buy butter and cheese over the counter, but grants to party funds to secure men peerages, baronetcies and knighthoods. And the Marquess of Salisbury hopes nobody doubts the existence of this evil.

Now I come to the debate of 1917. That is the debate par excellence. That is the debate in which the facts of the whole issue came out. And I am going to read from it at considerable length. I fear I am going to weary the House, but I want the House and the people of this country to know that if the system of honour is going to be continued in Canada, it is going to result in the establishment of a system in the days to come which is going to have a very pernicious effect in this country, because if both parties in England will dispose of honours, it is not going to be long before the principles which I have been speaking of this afternoon—and I do not see how anything else can be admitted—must be adopted in Canada; that is, if the Prime Minister of this country is responsible for the recognition given to Canadians, it will not be long before Prime Ministers in this country may find themselves unwillingly, and perhaps unknowingly, being parties to just such a system as exists in England. I want to be absolutely honest and frank, and my reading of the debate leads me to this conclusion, that the Prime Ministers are not actually aware that they are improperly giving recognition to certain men by granting titles, that it is done through the party whips, and as we are often blind to what the sources of the party expenses are, so the party whip is blind in the matter of recommending titles. The resolution moved by Earl Loreburn reads as follows:

That this House, convinced that Ministers have in recent times advised His Majesty to confer honours and dignities on persons who have given or promised money to Party funds as a consideration therefor, considers that His Majesty's Government ought forthwith to give effect to the following provisions: (1.) That when any honour or dignity is conferred upon a British subject, other than a member of the Royal Family or the members of the Naval, Military, or permanent Civil Service under the Crown, a definite public statement of the reasons for which it has been recommended to the Crown shall accompany the notification of the grant. (2.) That a declaration to the Sovereign be made by the Prime Minister in recommending any person to His Majesty's favour for any such honour or dignity, that he has satisfied himself that no payment or expectation of payment to any Party fund is directly or indirectly associated with the grant or promise of such honour or dignity.

Sir, as I said a moment ago, I want to be perfectly fair. That was the resolution proposed, but the resolution as passed was varied to this extent. The preamble of the resolution as proposed read as follows:

That this House, convinced that Ministers have in recent times advised His Majesty to confer honours and dignities on persons who have given or promised money to Party Funds as a consideration therefor.

That was in the resolution. But during the debate it became manifest that, if this clause were left in, the country at large would read it as meaning that the Prime Ministers were aware of the fact that money had been paid, and that it would have involved the honor of the Prime Minister and might involve the good faith of the Sovereign, and when the resolution was finally passed, these words were deleted, and the second part of the motion was also varied by being made to read as follows:

That the Prime Minister, before recommending any person for any such honour or dignity, should satisfy himself that no payment or expectation of payment to any party or political fund is directly or indirectly associated with the grant or promise of such honour or dignity.

In other words, the House of Lords declared that the bestowal of titles had reached such a stage in Britain that hereditary titles had lost the position that entitled them to respect, and that they were degenerating into a by-word, and a hissing. Let me read to you a few extracts from the speeches made at that time.

The noble and learned Earl said: My Lords, the subject that I am bringing before your lordships is no new one. In February, 1914, before the war, Lord Selborne moved:

"That in the opinion of this House a contribution to party funds should not be a consideration to a Minister when he recommends any name for an honour to His Majesty; that it is desirable that effectual measures should be taken in order to assure the nation that Governments, from whatever political party they are drawn, will act according to this rule; and that this House requests the concurrence of the House of Commons on the foregoing resolution."

That resolution was passed without a division, with unanimity, in this House; but unfortunately, as I think, the House of Commons has taken no notice of that communication. It has been stated here that during this year a number of Peers aud Privy Councillors, of whom I was one, endeavoured by private ways to advance this same object. In August last Lord Selborne raised the same question in this House, but some of us, also including myself, did not think that the answer which was then given, or the way in which the question was met, was satisfactory. I should myself have much preferred if Lord Selborne, who, greatly to his honour, was the first to bring up this matter, had consented to bring forward this evening the motion which stands in my name. He has, however, thought otherwise; therefore I move it myself.

I have thought it right to state plainly on the Notice Paper the ground of this notion, so that there should be no question as to be attitude which is taken up. It is this—"that Ministers have in recent times advised His Majesty to confer honours and dignities on persons who have given or promised money to party funds as a consideration therefor." I believe that to be the truth; and it lies at the root of this

resolution. In the course of former debates my noble friend Lord Crewe has given two assurances to the House. One of them was that contributions to party funds had not been a consideration to any Prime Minister in recommending the bestowal of an honour. Of course, I accept the statement of my noble friend. It is explained by his second assurance —namely that the Prime Ministers had not been aware, in recommending any name, of anything that could be said to be a payment made in respect of honours and dignities. I accept that statement also. It comes really to this, that Ministers have not been told, regarding any recipient of honours, that he has made any such payment, and therefore can say truthfully, of course, that no such payment has been a consideration to them. That is precisely what I have heard from very good authority. What I want to secure is the Minister shall be told, before he makes any recommendation that an honour should be bestowed upon any person; for I believe that, although the Minister has not been apprised, payment, or a promise of payment has in fact been in some cases made—of course, I cannot say in how many cases. I mean that there has been a promise of payment in substance and in fact, whatever may have been the circumlocution or the different communications by which the transaction may have been concealed.

In debates of 1914 no instances were given, but in the debate of 1917 instances were given. I quote further from the report:

My Lords, I have not sought any confidences upon this subject in any quarter, but since Lord Selborne's motion in 1914 various perfectly reliable people have told me of purchases and sales of which they knew, or of offers which had been made and been refused, giving the sums of money proposed and also the names. Let me give two illustrations, one from each side—one from the buyers's side, and one from what I may call the seller's side. A personal friend of mine told me that within a period which I will call five or six years, he was three times approached with proposals that he should pay £25,000 for a baronetcy or £15,000 for a knighthood. He, in fact, did not want and had never wished for a title, and he refused; and then a short time afterwards he was told—I am quoting his own words, because he wrote this as well as told me—that "there was a chance of pulling it off if he would go to £10,000 for a knighthood." and that if he wanted a baronetcy later. "a full valuation for the first honour is allowed, and such candidate as a prior claim.

I wish to go further and read another instance:

Then Lord Knutsford told the House, in the last debate on this subject, that a gentleman, almost unknown, had asked him, when the King was going down to a certain hospital, whether if he gave £25,000 to the hospital he would be as likely to get a title as if he gave the money to the party funds. Lord Knutsford told him the truth. He said he would be more likely to get the baronetcy if he gave the money to the party funds; and, added Lord Knutsford "within a short time he came out as a baronet and the hospital suffered in consequence."

Now, my Lords, when we put all these things together; when we have heard in private numbers of statements of a similiar kind; when we hear of great party funds and do not know where they come from; when we see honours given, followed in a short time by fresh honours to gentlemen of great wealth who have never done any public service whatever; when we know that the belief is universal that this is a matter occasionally of bargain and sale; and when we have never heard it denied by anybody, either in this House or anywhere else—then one naturally looks to the Government of the day and expects them either to deny the practice or to provide a remedy.

During the course of the entire debate nobody denied that these things were being practised and were regularly going on in Britain. I now come to the speech of the Earl of Selborne—and I must hurry because time is flying.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Take your time.

Mr. NICKLE: An hon. gentleman near me says: "finish it up properly;" I am glad he thinks that I am making progress in that direction.

The Earl of Selborne said:

My Lords, I rise to second the motion of the noble and learned Earl. When I asked a question on this subject at the beginning of August, my noble friend who leads the Opposition made a most skilful and ingenuous speech in reply. But the foundation of that speech was the erection of a case which he proceeded to demolish, but which we had not named. We have never said that a person otherwise worthy to be honoured by the Crown should be debarred from that honour because he is a good party man and has contributed to party funds, and we have never suggested that great public munificence is not a reasonable subject of award. I wish quite clearly to repeat that we have never occupied that position. I was very plain in my statements to that effect when I first brought this matter before the House in February, 1914, and I did not think it necessary to weary your Lordships last August by repeating those arguments. But as my noble friend assumed that that was our position, I take the first opportunity of again contradicting it.

I have read that because I do not want it said that I have set up the case that great munificence should be debarred from recognition if recognition is given. Great munificence in itself, or the expenditure of great amounts in itself, should not be a ground for recognition. If recognition is given it should be the recognition of the spirit that prompts the donation, not of the amount of the donation itself. (Reading):

The whole attitude of my noble friend opposite (Earl Curzon) and of my noble friend Lord Crewe in dealing with the subject on more than one occasion has been a scepticism as to the extent of the evil. My Lords, we have always understood the extent of this evil. From the information that has come to my knowledge, the evil has greatly increased in recent years and has been increasing up to a quite recent date.

Then he goes on to give the instances. I am going to read them, because I think they should go on Hansard. The foundation of my argument is that these evils exist in England and that I am afraid they will be introduced into this country, and I want the House and the country to understand how publicly and how grossly the thing has been practised overseas. (Reading):

When I spoke on this subject before, I told you that I had been the recipient of many confidences, but that they were confidences, and that I was not in a position to give facts or names. But standing at this place in August I made an appeal, and I asked whether some of those who had personal cognisance of this matter would not allow me to mention here in the House facts on their authority. I am glad to tell you, my Lords, that my appeal was not in vain, and that I am in a position to-night to state the facts of a certain number of cases.

Dr. Millard, the medical officer of health for Leicester, authorises me to say that he had a friend who had done public service in many ways, and unknown to that friend, he approached the local political association of the party to which that friend belonged and asked whether an honour could be obtained for him in reward for his public services. The answer from the leader of the local political association came pat, and these were his words: "Certainly we will consider your suggestion. But we must be quite frank with you. We know it is very objectionable, but we have got to do it. What is your friend prepared to pay?" The reply was that the suggestion had been made quite unknown to his friend and that he knew his friend would in no circumstances pay anything; and then the matter dropped.

The next case is more remarkable. There is a gentleman in Lewes, in Sussex, called Mr. George Holman, who has been seven times mayor of Lewes. He has done public work of a great many kinds, but he has never asked for an honour. In 1912, at the end of his seventh mayoralty, some of his friends in Lewes went to him and said, "We should like to get an honour for you. You have done so much public work that we think you ought to have a reward." He said, "I should like an honour very much. I am greatly obliged to you." One of his friends went straight to headquarters to the Whip, and the Whip said, "Yes, this is a clear case for an honour, What is he prepared to give to my party fund?" The friend returned to Mr. Holman and told him what had been said. Mr. Holman then remarked, "In no circumstances will I give a penny to party funds." The friend then went back once more to the Whip, and the Whip said on each occasion, "This is a very good case for an honour, but an honour he shall not have unless he contributes to my party fund."

My last case has been furnished to me by an ex-member of Parliament, Sir George Kekewich. Sir George, your Lordships will remember, was the Permanent Secretary of the Education Office, and, after that, member for Exeter. He authorizes me to tell this story.

When he was in Parliament at the time the Licensing Bill of the Liberal Government was before the House, a friend of his, not unconnected with the trade, came to him and said that he wanted a knighthood. He was introduced to the Whip, and he was informed that there was no great difficulty about his request. He was a Liberal, and had been a benefactor of his borough and Mayor of it. But he was told, "There are two conditions you have to fulfil. The first is that you should abandon opposition to the Licensing Bill; the second is that you should subscribe £5,000 to the party funds." He said, "All right, I will do both." His name appeared in the next list of honours.

There are other cases, but I shall not weary the House with them. I should like to read to the House something that Lord Bryce has said, because I have a great respect for that gentleman. I believe, if ever there was a man who did public service to his country, who was imbued with a desire to give service because he felt that great men should render public service, it was Lord Bryce. I have endeavoured to make it perfectly clear that I am not casting any imputation on this or that party in Great Britain. It is generally admitted through the debates that in the practices that have grown up, one party is just as black as the other; but if public respect for the peerage is to be maintained, Britain has to grip this reptilian thing by the neck until it dies. This is what Lord Bryce says:

My Lords, I have only a few words to say upon this question and I propose to direct them to a branch of the topic which has not been touched upon by either of the noble Earls who have addressed your Lordships. But before I advert to that particular topic I may perhaps be allowed, though I cannot give any of those sensational incidents to which my noble friend has just treated the House, to say as an old member of the House of Commons—what I think any member who sat in the House of Commons from 1880 to 1908 would say—that there was no doubt at all, even then, in the House of Commons, of the existence of these evils. When we saw hon. members—sometimes others, but chiefly members of the House of Commons, for it was of them that we knew most—when we saw men of great wealth who did not appear to us in their daily converse of the House of Commons and its lobbies to take anything but a purely perfunctory interest in politics, suddenly rise to the peerage or receive other marks of titular distinction, men whose merits no eye less penetrating than that of a party Whip had been able to discern, we were driven to only one conclusion. What was it that entitled them to receive these honours? To that question there was only one answer.

I happen to know some things which I have been told in confidence and therefore cannot use; but although I cannot say anything to your Lordship's to confirm the evidence which my two noble friends have given, I do not think any member of the House of Commons who sat in that assembly during those years, when the evil, according to what my noble friends have said, was less gross than it appears subsequently to have become, doubted the existence of those facts. They doubted them no less than people in the days of Sir Robert Walpole doubted the infinitely and incomparably greater evils which prevailed in those days.

And those of us who know anything of British history know how great were the evils that existed in Walpole's day. I might go on and read the remarks of other members of the House of Lords. Lord Sumner says:

Some noble Lords in speaking, have minimized the evil. Some treated it with an almost paternal indulgence. Some have said that it is not so bad as it was. Some have, in terms, admitted its existence. Nobody has said he does not believe that it exists. I have the greatest difficulty in believing that any noble Lord will speak on behalf of the Government to-night and say that he, for his part, disputes its existence. If he did, I am inclined to think that your Lordships will be disposed to ask in what clostral solitude he has passed his meritorious life.

The Marquess of Lansdowne says, in regard to the question of the granting of honours:

I believe there have been what it is perhaps not too much to call scandals in connection with it, scandals for which the Prime Minister of the day has been in no way responsible, but which have been due to indiscretion or overzeal on the part of his subordinates. Therefore, when my noble friend Lord Selborne suggests that some of us were sceptical about the extent of this evil, I say at once that although he probably considers that it exists on a larger and a more flagrant scale than I do,—

And this is what an ex-Governor General of this country says:

—I am entirely at one with him in believing that there is an evil and it requires to be redressed.

He says further, speaking of qualifications:

I venture to suggest that the real test is this —that no amount which has been contributed in his way by a possible recipient of honours should be recognized as a qualification for him, unless he is abundantly qualified for wholly different reasons un-connected with contributions to party funds.

I would like to direct attention to the fact that Lord Curzon's reply for the Government does not deny that these things exist. He admitted they existed, but in stating the case for the Government insisted the Prime Minister was not aware of it, and the very fact of Lord Curzon speaking for the Government practically meant that they accepted the resolution of the noble Earl Loreburn as truly stating facts. It goes to show, that so far as the Lords were concerned, they were satisfied that these evils did exist. If any gentleman is interested in going further into this matter, it is for him to read. But before I sit down—and I am now reaching, what probably all hon. members will be glad to know, the end of my remarks,—I am going to read one or two extracts from the

Canadian Press, because I think the Canadian Press, to a very great extent, mirrors public opinion. While I do not believe that this House should ever be stampeded by public opinion, merely because it is public opinion, yet when from the

5 p.m.

Atlantic to the Pacific you hear but one voice raised by the public press, and that is that hereditary titles have no place in public life, I think we should listen to what is said. Before, however, I read those extracts, I should like to read a remark made in the legislature of the province of Ontario by the present President of the Privy Council when he was the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in that House. The president of the Privy Council says:

I venture to think that in the free democracy of Canada we are not improving conditions by importing hereditary titles passing from father to son. I hope it may be the last. I think that when we are fighting the battle of democracy the world over the tendency will be in the old country to bring themselves into harmony with the spirit of democracy rather than for us transplanting part of the old feudal system into Canada.

If the hon. gentleman does not agree with the remarks I have read—I know he does—it is his privilege to rise in his place and contradict me as quoting him incorrectly. The Ottawa Journal-Press says:

We may have had doubts as to the wisdom of introducing life titles into this new country, but we have no doubt at all as to the unwisdom of establishing hereditary titles here. This can be said without any reflection upon recent recipients of such honours.

The idea that any man should be set apart, should be given a handle to his name, and any precedence or advantages attaching thereto, simply because of something done by his ancestors, is foreign to the make-up of the people of this country.

Our principle is and should be that every man must stand on his own feet, and that this position among his fellows must be gained by merit. The acquisition of wealth sometimes upsets that principle, but hereditary titles violate it to an extent that calls for protest at the very outset.

The Hamilton Herald says:

Once more the Herald enters its protest against the bestowal of a peerage or any other hereditary title upon a Canadian resident in Canada and intending to remain in this country. If encouragement is given to this new departure in the way of Imperial honours in Canada, it may not be long before we shall wake up to find ourselves with an aristocratic caste fastened upon our social system. In Britain these hereditary honours stand for something real.

I do not think the writer knew of the debates of 1917.

They are links with Britain's historic part, survivals of the forms of feudalism though dissociated from the powers and privileges which accompanied them in the old feudal days. They

are, therefore, interesting historically, and, to a people who reverence their past, they have real symbolic value. In Canada they are exotics, and, to be frank, seem somewhat absurd. There is no historical background for them in this country. They are as in incongruous and out of place here as would be a Gobelin tapestry in a log cabin or a suit of medieval armour in the cottage of a day-labourer. And will mere baronies satisfy the craving of the new aristocracy? If barons, why not Canadian viscounts and earls and dukes? The reason for engrafting the lesser hereditary honour upon the Canadian social system may prove equally good when claims are made for the higher honours. No man who wants to be a baron, no woman who wants to be "Lady", will be content with these distinctions when there is any prospect of the baron becoming an earl and the lady a countess. It is to be regretted that a beginning was ever made in this bad business but we hope there will be so general and pointed a protest against it that it will be discontinued.

This is an essentially democratic country, and we are sure that so far from there being any general desire here for the establishment of a hereditary titled aristocracy, such a movement if attempted would be regarded generally with resentment and disgust.

And the Journal of Edmonton, Alberta, says:

There are reasonable differences of opinion on the subject of titles in general but there is practical unanimity in this country with regard to those which pass from father to son. They are out of keeping entirely with Canadian life. It is no time to introduce them here when feeling against them grows stronger all the time even in the Old Land. There is much to confirm the view that those by no means young will live to see the day when the only hereditary honour in Britain will be the kingship. It stands on quite a different plane of usefulness from that of the various ranks of peers.

The Westminster Gazette of England contended that:

Honours do create and intensify class divisions; they encourage snobbism, and stamp inequality, but we cannot do without them because without these things you could not finance political parties nor could you reward political service.

They do create snobbery and flunkeyism. I am not going to use the name which appears on the head of this paper, but is there any decent, fair-minded man who does not resent this sort of thing? You cannot pick up the Sketch of Britain without seeing a picture on its pages underneath which may be printed.

The Hon. X. Y. Z. walked down Pall Mall with her dog Ponto yesterday. The Hon. X. Y. Z. takes a great interest in munition workers.

Why should she not? Here is an item which reads:

Princess X. helps the workers and takes a great interest in the soldiers.

Why should not the Princess X take an interest in the workers of the munition factories and the soldiers? Some of us feel we are giving a great deal to try and help democracy in this country, to maintain constitutional monarchy, and to maintain the present dynasty on the throne of England. We are proud of our monarch. We sing "God Save the King" with reverence and feeling, but I say it is snobbery and flunkeyism where that sort of thing is presented in the country as a reason why we should look up to the Princess or to others to whom I have referred.

I have tried to make a case without feeling. I have tried to show why women should not have a reflective title. I have tried to show this House that reflective titles have no justification in history, that the title should carry with it service as well as recognition. I have tried to show you how it corrupted the Kings of England, and how it was used to obtain money. I have tried to show you how the prerogative of the Crown became a constitutional prerogative, and how the responsibility to a very great extent of such a recognition is vested, in so far as Great Britain is concerned, in the Prime Minister of those three isles, and that, so far as Canada and the overseas Dominions are concerned, it is vested in the Prime Minister of the respective Dominion. I have shown, not from my own mouth, but from speeches delivered in the House of Lords that the rankest corruption exists in England and stinks in the nostrils of the people, and if something is not done in Canada, it will stink in the nostrils of the Canadian people. I have tried to show there is no justification for hereditary titles in Canada. If there is some justification in the minds of some gentlemen, there is none in mine; but I say to this House and to this country that we have sacrificed much for the maintenance of democratic principle, and if out of this war should arise a crop of titles which would make the people of this country feel that their sacrifices have been in vain—and there is no greater sacrifice in this war than that of the wife who has given her husband, and the mother who has given her son, and the young man who has given his future—and if there should arise from this war a feeling that worth did not obtain recognition—and that feeling will grow if titles are without justification given—then the inevitable conclusion will be reached—that while princes and lords are but the breath of kings, an honest man is not the noblest work of God, and people will realize, to use the words of Mr. Asquith, that we are establishing a class in this country who

are sincere "in the tranquil consciousness of effortless superiority." I do not want that class in this country.

Speaking from this side of the House today I want to extend my thanks to the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster) who allowed me to move this resolution because I said to him: "Let it come from the ranks of the Unionist party rather than from the ranks of yours. Let it not come from your side, but from mine, so that the people will know there is no politics in it, that we approach it on a broad basis, because we think it is pregnant with possibilities of irretrievable injury to this country, and will militate against the establishment of a wholesome democracy for which we crave and pray.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): My first words must be those of thanks to the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) who has associated me with him in the resolution before the House this afternoon. It is true that eleven months ago, almost to a day, in accepting the nomination in the county which I have the honour to represent, I told the delegates that if I were fortunate enough to be elected to this House I would place upon the Order Paper a resolution saying that it is undesirable that hereditary titles should be bestowed upon Canadians living in Canada. Perhaps a word of explanation is due to the House and to my constituents why I have associated myself with the motion of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) rather than that I should promote my own motion. The reason is that his motion was a better one than mine. It goes further in the first place, and it is better planned from the point of procedure. He is an older parliamentarian than I, and his motion was couched in more practical terms, and called for action, which my motion did not. Then there is the advantage to which the hon. member for Kingston alluded, when he said that if the motion came from the Government side it would be presented in a non-party sense. Party feeling is an extraordinary thing and there are no doubt some Conservatives, if such exist now in the country, who, if as a Liberal I had moved it might have looked askance at the motion. There may be perhaps those on my side of the House who might have thought that the motion had something bad in it, if it came from the other side. So that we are both godparents to this interesting child. As Hercules in his cradle throttled the snake, I hope this child will throttle this snake of hereditary titles in the Dominion of Canada. I am proud to associate myself in this matter with the mover of this resolution.

There are three sorts of Liberal-Conservative. There is the Conservative who calls himself Liberal-Conservative because he likes a hyphenated name, and because the word "Liberal" looks good to him, but, apart from that there is no liberality or liberalism in his makeup. Then there is the Liberal-Conservative who has been defined by a great English statesman as one who sometimes talks Liberal but always votes Conservative, and then there is the Liberal-Conservative to which class my hon. friend belongs, the impression of whose words and thoughts and actions on the public is to make us realize how right the French political philosopher was when he said there was a great deal of artificiality in the political divisions into which mankind is divided.

The first point I wish to make is this: that hereditary titles are unpopular in Canada. If proof of that were required, I would suggest that by a short Bill—I think we have had almost enough Orders in Council this session—that genial authority which you, Mr. Speaker, so well exercise, and to which we all cordially and respectfully bow, should be extended sufficiently to enable you to make a progress through this country—beginning with your old historic province, you might place yourself at the corner of some popular street in the county metropolis and ask every man who passed whether he was in favour of hereditary titles or not. I do not believe that, if you questioned a hundred men, you would find one that was in favour of that principle. If you went to the metropolis of Canada, the city of Montreal, and placed yourself on St. James street, unless by chance you found some financial magnate who had already received a hereditary title, I feel satisfied the result would be the same. In Toronto I am inclined to believe that not two people out of a hundred would be in favour of hereditary titles. As you went westward, I believe it would be well for you to be accompanied by the Serjeant-at-Arms and the Mace, because, if you asked that question of the stalwart democrats of the West, I am afraid you might be in danger of personal violence; they would not tolerate being even asked such a question.

Edmund Burke has said that the strength, the spirit, the essence of the House of Commons is that it is the express image of the nation. If we are true to that concep-

tion of the House of Commons, we must see to it that the desire for the elimination of hereditary titles, or at least the feeling against the perpetuation of hereditary titles, has its necessary legislative action in this House.

Are the people right in their desire? I say they are. I say that hereditary titles are, first of all, undesirable socially; that they are undesirable politically, and that their perpetuation or increase in this country is a breach of faith with the men at the front. Why are they undesirable from the social standpoint? It is difficult for me to say anything new on this subject, because it has been treated in such an exhaustive and masterly way by the hon. member (Mr. Nickle), but let me say that hereditary titles lead to the caste system. I shall give an illustration. A friend of mine was once speaking about a very prominent banker in Montreal, the son of a baker who had gone into a bank in Scotland. He told me that if that boy had been born in England he never would have got into a bank, because the son of a baker in England, through the caste system, could not have been received in a bank. In Scotland, due very largely to the influence of the democratic Presbyterian Church, there is a more democratic feeling and the boy was admitted to a bank. He rose to the highest position in the Canadian banking world.

The caste system leads to snobbishness, and snobbishness leads to the caste system. Snobbishness is not one of the lesser evils; it is one of the greater evils. A young lady takes a trip to another land and she comes back after having acquired an accent that she forgets in a few years. This may be a matter of small moment, but it is more serious than that. Snobbishness often means extravagance. Snobbishness means contempt for and disrepect of parents. It means very often delay in marriage until the young folks can start where the old folks left off, and delay in marriage produces all sorts of social evils. But, I need not labour the point.

Is it not politically undesirable? I do not think we want to strengthen the House of Lords in England. I believe the people in England are not very fond of an hereditary House of Lords. They have been talking for years themselves of mending or ending the House of Lords. The members of that august body themselves have had plans under consideration for their own reform. We do not want to increase that power or to transfer power to the House of Lords and that is a sound idea on the part of the Canadian people. Why? The members of the British aristocracy have done valiant service in this war. They have been as brave as the Scottish shepherds, as brave as the Dundee trawlers, as brave as the boys from the plains of Saskatchewan, as brave as our own lads from the counting houses and banks, but no braver, and we have the right to look at the question whether the House of Lords has been an influence making for progress in the Old Land or whether it has been against progress.

In 1906 the Liberal party in England, after having been in opposition for some years, came back into power and started a great era of reform—old age pensions, the Licensing Act, the Education Act, and reforms of that sort? What was the history of those measures? When those Acts, to give better living conditions to the poor people of Great Britain, came into the House of Lords they were defeated. When it was desired that a better education should be given to the children of British workingmen, the Education Act was defeated in the House of Lords. When the people wished to control the liquor traffic in the Old Land, when they wished to have local option, did you not hear the honourable gentleman who addressed this House before me state that a man was to receive a title on condition that he withdrew his support from the Licensing Bill? The Licensing Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords.

In order to effect great social reforms and to provide ships of war, Lloyd George brought in his great Budget of 1909, and that Budget came up in the House of Lords. It was thrown out by the House of Lords. They dared to oppose the constitution of Great Britain which had said for hundreds of years that the House of Lords must not reject a Bill dealing with money. They had a great election in January, 1910, at which time the British people reaffirmed their determination to deal with financial matters through the House of Commons alone. What I wish to impress upon the House this afternoon is that the House of Lords, in thus dealing with the Budget in 1909, and in dealing with these other reforms that I have just mentioned, was running true to form.

In spite of notable exceptions to the general rule, in spite of the individuals who have given great talents and great wealth to the furtherance of social progress, I make the declaration that every step in the direction of progress taken during the

nineteenth century by the British people was met with the stern, the unrelenting and the bitter opposition of the House of Lords. Take Catholic emancipation. Before 1829 Roman Catholics did not have the right to vote for members of Parliament. The Duke of Wellington and the Tory party of his day refused to pass the Bill for Catholic emancipation until they had brought the country to the verge of revolution.

In 1832, three years afterwards, the great Reform Bill was brought forward by Lord Grey, which tried to effect some equality between those who did the electing and those who were elected. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, how before that time a few houses in one place, or a small village in another place would elect a member to Parliament, while great industrial cities with hundreds of thousands of inhabitants had no representation at all. You would have thought that a reform to do away with that inequality would not be resisted. But, it was resisted by the House of Lords, and for several days Great Britain was on the brink of a revolution.

I ask you to think of the repeal of the Corn Laws. I ask you to think of how Richard Cobden and John Bright went through the length and breadth of Great Britain preaching that the poor man's food should not be taxed. Where did the great opposition come from? The great opposition came from the landed interests of Great Britain, and that landed interest was entrenched most firmly in the House of Lords. Do you remember the condition of the working people at that time? Surely it was enough to wring the heart of any man with feelings of humanity in his bosom. Do you remember that famous Corn Law rhyme:

> "Bread taxed weaver dost thou see,
> "What this tax hath done for thee,
> "See thy children vilely led,
> "Singing hymns for shameful bread,
> "While the stones of every street
> "Know their little naked feet."

That was the call of the British people for bread, for untaxed food. And what was the reply from the aristocracy of Great Britain, the landed interest of that day? The Duke of Richmond suggested the advisability of the working class staying the pangs of hunger by mixing a little curry-powder in water and drinking that between meals.

I need not rehearse the story of the different steps taken towards democracy in Great Britain: how when the franchise under the influence of John Bright was extended to work people in 1868, the upper classes, the House of Lords set their faces against it, until John Bright had to protest against the Botany Bay view of their fellow-countrymen taken by these men, and Gladstone had to recall to the foes of the measure that the poor people were their own flesh and blood. By whom was the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland resisted? By all the highest aristocracy in the House of Lords. I could go on and rehearse the whole history of the 19th century in English reform but it would serve no purpose because I am talking to those who are already converted.

I need not dwell, Mr. Speaker, upon the corrupting influence of hereditary titles. That has been most ably dealt with by the speaker who preceded me. We have tried —and I think it is just to us to admit we have succeeded—to conduct the discussion of this resolution upon the level of principle, and not upon the level of personality. There are those who have received hereditary titles in Canada, who perhaps deserve them as well as any one else, if hereditary titles are to be given. There are others whose meteoric careers have filled us, their fellow citizens, with astonishment and wonder, if not with admiration. We can think of one of them sitting down in Great Britain on some quiet Sabbath afternoon in the old land, and thinking of the old Scottish paraphrase as he writes to another in Canada:

> High is the rank we now possess,
> But higher shall we rise,
> But where we shall at length attain
> Is hid from mortal eyes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: That is the sort of thing that has been going on. That is the sort of thing we would like stopped.

This country has been warring for democracy, we have been fighting for liberty, for equality and for justice. Is it right that in the old land and in this land, when the boys are fighting for democracy, that we should establish, or that we should allow to be established, a hereditary aristocracy in Canada? I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the voice of Canada will be unheard when this resolution goes before the Throne in Britain, and I want it to go there. I want this resolution either to be accepted by the Government of the day, or for them to allow this matter to go to a vote, so that by an overwhelming majority the mind and heart of the Canadian people on this subject may be known to the people across the ocean. Why should we encourage and now compel men to fight for democracy and perpetuate an aristocracy, or,

rather, a plutocracy, among ourselves. I want to say, in conclusion, that I am at one with the mover of this resolution in his feeling that titles of all sorts should be done away with if possible, but seeing that our forebears came from Scotland, and that prudence is a Scottish virtue as well as economy, we have started in at the most vulnerable point in the armour of the so-called aristocrats. The weak joint in their armour is that these hereditary titles are opposed to common sense, and opposed to the spirit and the heart and the mind of the Canadian people. I trust that the Government of the day will accept cordially and emphatically this resolution, and that if they cannot see their way to endorse it that they will allow us to vote upon the resolution so that our views may be given expression to.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of the mover and seconder of the resolution, and that it will be willing to extend to them congratulations upon many eloquent passages to which we listened in the course of their remarks. It might be said that, perhaps, in both instances there were certain observations which were not very closely relevant to the particular subject which is embodied in the resolution, but in the main they were relevant. I would like to observe to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) that it by no means follows, either in this or in any other country, that the abolition of hereditary titles, or all titles, will do away with the plutocracy to which he has alluded. It does not seem to me that the two are very closely associated, and if my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) will permit me to say so, I venture to think that a man in the United Kingdom, whether he be peer or commoner, is held in public estimation at his true worth just as thoroughly as in any country in the world. That is my belief from pretty careful observation covering a period of some years. It is perfectly true that there are these class distinctions in Britain. It is perfectly true that people have precedence at social and other functions in consequence of them. I am not speaking of that; I am speaking of a man's worth as measured by the estimation in which he is held among his fellow countrymen as a whole, and I repeat that the worth of no man in Great Britain is measured because of the mere fact that he happens to be a member of the House of Lords, or that he does not happen to be a member of that august body.

Now, my hon. friend from Kingston—and I will allude to only a few of his observations, because in the main they will be covered by the discussion which I shall take up later on along somewhat broader lines—seems to be of the opinion that there has been a very great grasping for titular distinctions in this country. After an experience of some six and a half years as First Minister of this country, I am not disposed to concur in that observation. I think, on the other hand, that there is a much less general desire for such distinctions in Canada than there is in the United Kingdom, and from first to last I have never heard of the anxiety for titles on the part of ladies to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, nor do I believe that any such supposed anxiety exercises any influence upon the granting of such distinctions in Canada. The hon. gentleman also alluded to his disregard for ancestry. No one in this country, I imagine, would very much desire to have his worth reckoned by what his ancestors were, rather than by what he is himself, and yet, on the other hand, there is, I hope, in the heart of all of us the feeling that we are descended from those of whom we have no need to be ashamed; that we come of good stock; that we hope by our conduct to be worthy of the record which our forefathers have made. All that is perfectly desirable and perfectly honourable. We should also concur fully in what the hon. gentleman has so eloquently expressed as to the desirability in this country, and in every democracy that there should be equality of opportunity to all the people, so far as human conditions permit. In this connection I may say that if my hon. friend is under the impression that the inheritance of considerable wealth is of any great advantage to a young man in this country, I for one, am not disposed to agree with him. If you look around Canada today and see those who are foremost in all the important spheres of national activity, I venture to say that you will find, in ninety-nine cases, out of a hundred, that they are men who did not inherit any wealth at all but who have made their mark in the world by their own ability and effort.

My hon. friend also referred to the observations of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1914 when this subject was under discussion. I do not think that the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce at that time were intended to bear

the meaning which my hon. friend attributes to them. He was speaking of the prerogative of he Crown in its relation to the Government and to Parliament in all the Dominions of the Empire, and he was not dealing especially with Canada.

My hon. friend attacked the principle of primogeniture, and he seemed to be under some apprehension that it might be established in Canada. I have not the slightest apprehension that that principle will ever again be established in Canada. It was abolished in the very early history of every province in this Dominion, and unquestionably it never will be re-established in this country. He referred also to the baronets of Nova Scotia. I believe that Order was established, as he says, by King James 1. We have never really heard very much about them in Nova Scotia, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that, so far as the material, moral and constitutional development of that province is concerned, it has never suffered in the slightest degree from the institution of that Order.

My hon. friend from Kingston went at considerable length into the question of alleged corruption in connection with the bestowal of titles in the United Kingdom. I shall not follow him in that. If there is presently prevailing in the United Kingdom any evil of that kind, I think we may safely entrust its removal to the people and the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and no great advantage will accrue to the public interest either here or in Great Britain by having such matters made the subject of discussion in this Parliament. So far as Canada is concerned I have never heard it suggested from first to last that under any Government in this country has there ever been any evil of that kind, and I do not believe that there is the slightest probability that any such evil ever will arise here.

It will be necessary for me to go into an examination of the question in a somewhat broader aspect than has hitherto been brought to the attention of this House this afternoon, and it might be advisable to call it six o'clock now so that I can take up the subject this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (resuming): Before coming to the more general aspect of the resolution presented by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I should like to say a few words with regard to that portion of it which relates to the use of titles by any person other than the person in recognition of whose services the honour or title has been conferred. As I understood from the hon. member, this portion of his resolution is designed to prevent the wives of knights, baronets or peers from being addressed by the title of "Lady" in this country. I am not of the opinion that that proposal really adds very much strength to the motion. Unless I am greatly mistaken, the appellation of "Lady" is applied to the wife of a knight only as a matter of courtesy; I think this is true also of the wife of a baronet, although I am not quite sure of that. The member for Kingston, to whom I spoke on the subject, is of the contrary opinion. I have had neither the time nor the desire to make elaborate study of that rather minor question, but in looking at a couple of standard dictionaries I find that the version I have given is the correct one: That is to say, the appellation of "Lady" as applied to the wife of a knight or baronet is entirely by courtesy. Would it not be rather absurd for this House to ask His Majesty to make a formal pronouncement in respect of a matter which is purely one of usage.

Some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House exhorted the member for Kingston to make "a thorough job" of this question. Well, if we are to make "a thorough job" of it, we must go much farther than my hon. friend has proposed. For example, as a title of respect, archbishops are addressed by courtesy in this country as "Your Grace"; bishops as "Your Lordship." More than that, members of the legal profession, to which both the mover and the seconder of the resolution belong, when seated on the Bench, are addressed as "Your Lordship." I know that they are so addressed in nearly all provinces of Canada—perhaps not in the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Formerly they were not so addressed in New Brunswick, but I believe that recently they have followed the custom even there. The member of the legal profession who happens to rise to judicial office is not thereby rendered a Lord, and there is no particular reason, I suppose, in logic or in law why he should be addressed as "My Lord;" yet he is so addressed. The member for Kingston must not go too far against the women

in this matter, or by and by, when he has flown high enough to "roost on the bench, —if I may use his own expression—some eloquent lady member of this House may propose a resolution asking His Majesty the King to debar my hon. friend from being addressed as "Your Lordship" or "My Lord."

As a matter of fact, these appellations vary from time to time and from century to century. Three or four hundred years ago every Master of Arts in Great Britain was addressed as "Sir," and because members of the clergy were usually of liberal education, the title "Sir" was applied to all clergymen in England. In the time of Shakespeare, as any one will recall who has read his plays, even a curate was addressed as "Sir" So-and-so. That practice has passed away.

Mr. BURNHAM: Sirloin steak.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that is so. Other similar usages prevail in this country. For example, certain members of provincial legislatures, that is to say legislative councillors, the Speakers of legislative assemblies and members of executive councils of the provinces, are enitled to the appellation of "Honourable" as a matter of law, under the King's direction, so long as they retain the position to which the title appertains. When they cease to hold these positions, then they cease to be entitled to the appellation of "Honourable;" but every one continues to term them "Honourable." It does no particular harm that I know of. We might as well ask His Majesty the King to fulminate against this usage as to ask him to make a pronouncement against the courtesy titles which certain ladies in this country receive as a matter of usage and which they do not enjoy as a matter of right.

However, there is a much broader aspect of the whole question: The motion proposed by the member for Kingston and seconded by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) does touch very closely the exercise of the prerogrative of the Crown. The functions of the Crown as distinguished from those of the Cabinet, and Parliament are very clearly set forth, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, in the monumental work of Mr. Todd, which was first published in 1866 and of which a second edition edited by his son, appeared in 1887. Following that came his work—still more useful to us in the Dominions—on parliamentary government in the British colonies, the first edition of which appeared in 1880 and the second, also edited by his son, in 1894. Todd himself died in 1884, all too early. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with these matters know that both these works are regarded as of the highest authority, not only in the United Kingdom, but in every dominion of the Empire. The exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in self-governing dominions was defined by Todd in his work on Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies as follows:

> Moreover, certain prerogatives of the Crown are suitably reserved in every colony to the direct and immediate expression of royal pleasure thereon. The powers so reserved differ according to the position and circumstances of the particular colony; but they invariably include the abstract right of dealing with all colonial legislation, and of disallowing such acts as may be deemed objectionable, or in direct opposition to Imperial policy. Sometimes, colonial laws which, for defect in form or substance, might otherwise need to be disallowed, are remitted to the colony wherein they were enacted, accompanied by a despatch from the secretary of state for the colonies suggesting their modification or repeal. The judicial prerogative of the Crown, or the right of determining in the last resort all controversies between subjects in every part of the Empire, has been universally reserved, as being one of the most stable safeguards, and most beneficial acts of sovereign power, The administration of the prerogatives of mercy and of honour is either reserved to the Crown or is made the subject of special and limited delegation. Finally, all questions which involve the relations of British dependencies, and consequently of the United Kingdom itself, with foreign States—the formation of treaties and alliances; the naturalization of aliens; the declaration of war or peace, and, by consequence, all regulations affecting the disposition or control of Imperial military forces—are, invariably and for obvious reasons, reserved for the direction and control of the parent state.

We have travelled far in constitutional development since these words were written by Mr. Todd. One of the most notable steps taken in Canada was that taken in 1876 by Edward Blake as Minister of Justice. The instructions to the Governor General authorized his independent exercise of the prerogative of mercy. Upon the very able report presented to the Privy Council by a subcommittee over which Mr. Blake presided, those instructions were changed in 1878, and the British Government, in their subsequent instructions, have fully recognised that the prerogative of mercy in all of the self-governing Dominions must be exercised upon the advice of ministers. In all these matters, the natural trend of constitutional development has been along the same line, that is, of ministerial responsibility for the exercise of the prerogative in any self-governing

Dominion. There are illustrations of this arising from time to time. I need not go over all the changes brought about since Mr. Todd's book was first published. The absolute control of many matters there alluded to as being within the function of the Imperial Government, is now exercised without question by the Governments of the Dominions. Since this war broke out, a question arose as far back as November, 1916, as to whether or not the prerogative of the Crown to requisition in time of war ships registered in Canada and owned by people domiciled in this country should be exercised by the Government of the United Kingdom or by the Government of Canada, and we had no hesitation whatever in maintaining—and our view was accepted—that the exercise of the prerogative in such cases ought to be upon the advice of the ministers of the Crown in Canada and not upon the advice of the ministers of the Crown in the United Kingdom.

In this respect, I might express the doctrine of the present day in the words of a notable author, a man evidently of varied gifts.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We are not, I believe, to understand that any claim was made by the British Government that we had the right to exercise the prerogatives which have been spoken of here?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter became a subject of discussion, and the Government of this country took the position to which I have alluded. I was referring to Mr. Arthur Berriedale Keith, who is a barrister of the Inner Temple, and who was for many years in the Colonial Office. In 1912 he published a very notable work in three volumes called "Responsible Government in the Dominions," and since the war broke out he published, in 1916, a work in one volume, which is very instructive and useful, called "Imperial Unity and the Dominions." When his first work was published in 1912, he was, as I have said, occupying a very important position in the Colonial Office, but between that date and 1916 he left the Colonial Office, and when the latter work was published in 1916, he had become Regius Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the University of Edinburgh. His summary of the present day position of the matter is as follows:

> It is now clear law that the Governor has a delegation of so much of the royal prerogative as is required for the conduct of the executive government of the Dominion or State of which he is Governor, and time and good sense have united to make it clear that this necessary delegation includes practically all the prerogatives of the Crown in the United Kingdom.

I would be content to accept that as a fair statement of the case. The prerogative of the Crown is, of course, a very important and, on many occasions, an exceedingly useful power. If I remember correctly, the great reform made about sixty years ago in Great Britain respecting the Civil Service, by which patronage was abolished and appointment after competitive examination was established, was effected by the exercise of the royal prerogative and not by statute.

With respect to the exercise of this particular prerogative, a debate, to which reference has been made this afternoon, took place in 1914. I was unable, through illness, to be present in the House on that occasion, and consequently I did not take any part in the debate. It was spoken to by several hon. members, amongst others, by my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). The practice in this country with regard to the preparation of lists of proposed honours to be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, probably has changed very little in the last twenty or twenty-five years. On occasion I have spoken to my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition as to the practice while he was Prime Minister, and it did not vary greatly from that which has been pursued since I have occupied the position I now fill. It is customary that the Governor General makes up his list twice a year, usually about two months in advance of the time at which honours are to be announced. He submits that list to the Prime Minister, and he is willing to receive suggestions. I cannot recall any occasion on which there was any pronounced difference of opinion, and I have always found that the Governor General very strongly inclined to uphold the voice of the Government of this country in such matters. During the past six and one-half years there are only two occasions that I can recall on which honours have been bestowed upon persons ordinarily domiciled in Canada as to which the Governor General and the Prime Minister have not been consulted. I know, on both those occasions, protest was made and explanations followed. As to the bestowal of honours, there has never been any difficulty that I can recall between the Governor General and the Prime Minister. Such matters, during the past six and a half

years at least, have never been brought before Council in a formal way. The Prime Minister, if he thought it desirable to do so, would consult a colleague here or a colleague there, but they were never brought formally into Council or dealt by Council in the way in which the ordinary business of the country is dealt with.

Now, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the prerogative of the Crown in the bestowal of honours is almost invariably exercised upon the advice of some minister. I say, almost invariably, because I think a few occasions arise now and then when some person has rendered a personal service to the Crown, either in attendance at the court, or in attendance upon some tour made by a member of the royal family, when it is considered desirable that the Crown may still exercise the prerogative of bestowing honours without invoking the responsibilty of any minister of the Crown. In the United Kingdom, the minister upon whose responsibility honours are bestowed is the Prime Minister, and in respect of nearly all honours—not all, but nearly all—bestowed upon persons domiciled in any of the dominions of the Empire, the bestowal is made on the recommendation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I am not sure how it is with regard to India, whether the Secretary of State for India has a direct voice or not. Undoubtedly he has a voice, but it may be he makes recommendations to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister makes recommendations to the Crown, so far as India is concerned.

Coming to some observations of my hon. friend from Kingston this afternoon, I may say that, apart from his criticism of certain conditions in the United Kingdom, upon which I do not think I am called upon to speak or to offer any criticism, and apart from the question of abolishing the usage by which the wives of certain persons are designated by courtesy titles, I very largely, if not altogether, concur in what my hon. friend from Kingston said. I particularly concur in this part of it, that I see no reason why the Government of this country, represented by its Prime Minister from time to time, should not have the same right and the same responsibility in respect of the bestowal of honours upon persons domiciled in Canada as that which is enjoyed by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in respect of the bestowal of honours upon persons domiciled in the British Islands.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Does my right hon. friend mean that, although the House should adopt this resolution, the Prime Minister of Canada would still be free to exercise that power?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think I shall make myself clearer to my hon. friend as I go on. I do not observe anything in the resolution which would conflict with the view I have just expressed. It is dealt with in that way in the United Kingdom as a matter of ministerial responsibility, but as a matter in which the Prime Minister speaks for his colleagues in the Government, and I do not think that it is there dealt with by Order in Council or in any formal way but as I have just now indicated. The question as to the procedure in such matters was taken up by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as far back as 1902, and I have obtained permission to bring down, and communicate to the House, the Order in Council then passed, as well as the reply then made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I have obtained the like permission to communicate to the House an Order in Council which was under consideration of the Government some weeks before this session began, which was submitted to His Excellency the Governor General on 9th March, and which has since received his approval, after he had the necessary communication with the Government of the United Kingdom on the subject. The Order in Council approved on the 19th February, 1902, is as follows,

On a report dated 15th February, 1902, from the Right Honourable the Prime Minister submitting that the exercise of the Royal Prerogative conferring honours and titular distinctions upon His Majesty's subjects in Canada is one which has not hitherto been brought into harmony with the principles of Parliamentary Government, of which it is an important part.

The Prime Minister further submits that the great development of Canada, and the high position which she has now obtained, render it advisable that upon this subject, as upon all others, the exercise of the Royal Prerogative shall conform to the well understood principles of Ministerial responsibility.

The Prime Minister observes that though Canada has had conceded to her the powers of self-government, and His Majesty the King, is here the fountain of honours and titular distinctions, yet, the exercise of this branch of the Royal Prerogative which may be as necessary to reward the servants of the Crown, within the sphere of Government in Canada, as it is in the United Kingdom, is, nevertheless, totally disassociated here from Parliamentary Government.

The Royal Prerogative of conferring honours and titular distinctions for important public services, is within the sphere of Ministerial authority, as necessary to good government in Canada as it is in the United Kingdom; so that those who are responsible for administra-

tive government in the Dominion would be greatly aided by the stimulus which such powers would give to those engaged in the service of the Crown for the time being, not less than such Prerogative strengthens the hands of the Executive in the United Kingdom.

The Prime Minister states that in practice, since the establishment of Confederation, the granting of honours and titular distinctions upon the subjects of the Crown in Canada, has been the result of correspondence between His Excellency the Governor General and the Colonial Office, and of recommendations made by the former, usually yet not invariably after consultation with the Prime Minister, but not in conformity with any settled principle and without constitutional responsibility.

The practice is not in harmony with the principles of our constitutional system. There are two classes of persons upon whom honours and titular distinctions may be conferred within the Empire, and outside the United Kingdom; the one class, honoured by His Majesty for services of an Imperial character, and in respect to which His Majesty is rightfully advised by His Ministers at Westminster, and the other is for services done by the subjects of the Crown associated with His Majesty's Government in the Colony, and on whom honours and distinctions should be conferred upon the advice of those Ministers only, who are there responsible to His Majesty and to the Colonial Parliament, for that part of the administration of His affairs. In this way, the constitutional advisers of His Majesty, within the United Kingdom, would avoid invading the sphere of His Majesty's advisers in the Colony, and would leave to those advisers both the advantage and the responsibility for everything which might contribute to the honour and efficiency of His Majesty's Government within the range of the constitutional duty assigned to them.

The Prime Minister submits that while His Majesty may take the initiative in respect to the bestowal of honours and titular distinctions, the Minister should be none the less responsible for what may be done. To the Ministers of His Majesty at Westminster responsibility attaches for every reward conferred for public service within their sphere of action.

In Canada a Government similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom has been established, and the advisers of His Majesty in Canada are the proper advisers of His Majesty for every kind of reward bestowed upon His Majesty's subjects for services performed within the legal and constitutional sphere of Canadian jurisdiction. His Majesty's Ministers in Canada are acquainted with the standing in the community of the persons upon whom it may be proposed to confer honours, and of the character of the services for which these honours are the reward, and to have those rewards bestowed by His Majesty on the advice of those who are but imperfectly informed as to the estimation in which the recipients are held, or of the character of the services for which the honours are bestowed, is practically an invasion of the right of local self-government.

The Committee of the Privy Council concurring in the report of the Prime Minister, recommend that the same be presented to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, and respectfully ask that the Royal Instructions be modified to the effect that the same rules which apply for the exercise of the Royal Prerogative in granting honours and titular distinctions to subjects of the King in the United Kingdom be made likewise to apply to all recommendations by the Governor General for the exercise of the Prerogative to the King's subjects in the Colonies, and that all such recommendations by the Governor General to the Sovereign in such matters be made upon the advice of his responsible Ministers.

To that Order in Council, which went forward in the form of a despatch, a reply was sent, dated the 23rd of April, 1902. It is as follows:

Downing Street,
23rd April, 1902.

Canada.

Confidential.

My Lord,—

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's Confidential despatch of the 4th March forwarding for consideration a Report of your Privy Council relative to the procedure they advise in respect to future recommendation for Honours to be submitted to His Majesty.

2. The Report in question has received my most careful consideration, and I have now to acquaint you with my views upon the subject.

3. I am of opinion that it is of primary importance not to lose sight of the fact that the Crown is the source of all honours, which may even be granted without the interposition of a responsible minister, although as a rule they are only given on his advice. As Your Lordship is aware, the usual method of rewarding conspicuous services rendered by those resident in the Colonies is by appointment to the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, an Imperial Order, for appointment to which, in all but very exceptional cases, the responsibility ultimately rests with His Majesty's Government. Service to Canada is recognized by conferring membership of this Order, because service to the Crown in any part of the Empire, is service to the Empire.

4. As regards the question of procedure in making recommendations, I consider that if the service is of a political or administrative character, rendered solely in the sphere for which the Ministers of the Crown in Canada are responsible, they are constitutionally the proper authorities for making recommendations, and that in transmitting the same, they should be accompanied by Your Lordship's observations thereon.

5. In regard, however, to persons whose purely Imperial, Provincial, or Municipal services, or public services of a charitable, literary or scientific character, are held to merit recognition, I consider that the proper course would be for you to transmit a list of such persons to your Prime Minister, inviting his observations on the same, and such list, with the remarks of the Prime Minister, should be submitted to me.

6. In dealing with this subject I have been desirous of meeting the views of your Ministers as far as possible, but as the responsibility for making recommendations to the Sovereign in regard to appointments to an Imperial Order, such as that of Saint Michael and Saint George, rests with the Secretary of State and not with your Ministers, it is his duty to obtain the best advice he can, and he must be the sole judge of what is the best advice.

7. I should be glad if Your Lordship would make known to Your Prime Minister the purport of this despatch, and I trust that the arrangement herein described will prove acceptable both to yourself and to your Ministers.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servant,

(Sgd.) J. CHAMBERLAIN.

It will be observed that the reply of the then Secretary of State for the Colonies does not at all conform to the views which were put forward in the Order in Council I read a moment ago. For example, in the fifth clause of this despatch, Mr. Chamberlain says that where purely Imperial, provincial, or municipal services, or public services of a charitable, literary, or scientific character are held to merit recognition, he is to be the judge and not the responsible ministers of the Dominion in which the persons alluded to are domiciled at the time and in which they have rendered such services. The matter does not seem to have been followed up. I can find no trace of any further correspondence on the subject. The Order in Council which I have just read and the reply of Mr. Chamberlain thereto have been carefully considered by myself and by my colleagues as well, and after giving a very great deal of thought and consideration to the subject, in the month of February last, I brought into Council, on the ninth day of March, a recommendation which was approved and submitted to His Excellency, who gave his approval thereto on the 25th of March last, after communication with the Imperial authorities. That Order in Council, which I shall now read, is as follows:

P.C. 668.

Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 25th day of March, 1918.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a report dated the 9th day of March, 1918, from the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, touching the procedure for conferring titles of honour upon subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

Submitting that the subject demands consideration and attention, the Prime Minister observes that the Royal Prerogative of conferring honours and titular distinctions for important public services is unquestioned, but that it is necessary to consider the conditions under which and the advice upon which it should be exercised within this Dominion. He submits that the bestowal of honours is a matter of concern to the whole community and has a direct relation to the orderly government of the State. Its purpose is to signify public recognition and approval of the recipient's conduct and services in cases where these have been commendable and notable.

Having regard to the firmly established principles of self government in Canada, the Prime Minister is of opinion that no title of honour or titular distinction should hereafter be conferred upon any subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except upon the direct advice and responsibility of His Majesty's Canadian Government. Such an assumption of control by the Government of Canada follows the natural course of constitutional development in this country as the tendency has invariably been in the direction of complete control of every function of government.

The constitutional aspect of this question suggests consideration of the analogy to other exercises of the prerogative. It has been said by a careful student of government in the Dominions that:—

"It is now clear law that the Governor has a delegation of so much of the Royal Prerogative as is required for the conduct of the executive government of the Dominion or State of which he is Governor, and time and good sense have united to make it clear that this necessary delegation includes practically all the prerogatives of the Crown in the United Kingdom." (Keith, Imperial Unity and the Dominions, p. 52.)

The Prime Minister is not aware of any other prerogative of the Crown which in its relation to Canada is not exercised on the advice of His Majesty's Canadian Ministers; and he is unable to agree that a different principle should be maintained in the exercise of the prerogative of conferring honours. He entirely assents to the view that in Canada the functions of the Sovereign in such exercise should be subject only to the same limitations as in the United Kingdom, except with regard to hereditary honours as hereinafter set forth.

The Prime Minister calls attention to a Minute of Council approved on the 19th day of February, 1902, copy of which is hereto appended, and he desires to associate himself with the views therein set forth insofar as they are in accord with the recommendations herein contained. Attention is also called to the confidential Despatch of 23rd April, 1902, from the then Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the then Governor General, copy of which is also appended. Without pausing to examine the development of constitutional relations at that time, the Prime Minister finds himself unable to accept as appropriate to present conditions the view set forth in that despatch as to the responsibility for recommendations to the Crown in respect of honours to be conferred upon persons ordinarily resident in Canada.

In expressing this view the Prime Minister realizes that the character and number of the honours to be conferred in any Dominion must necessarily be considered by the Government of the United Kingdom. This view seems entirely consistent with the principles which are herein affirmed.

With respect to the bestowal of hereditary titles of honour upon persons ordinarily resident in Canada, special considerations must be taken into account. In submitting these considerations the Prime Minister desires it clearly to be understood that they have no relation whatever to the status or functions of the House of Lords of the United Kingdom in its legislative or judicial capacity. He thoroughly realizes that any representations which might be construed to bear such a meaning would be uncalled for if not presumptuous; and the observations which follow apply only to conditions of national development in this country. The Prime Minister

equally disclaims any intention of casting the slightest reflection upon the status or service of any resident of Canada who has been honoured by the bestowal of hereditary distinction. The purpose of this recommendation is concerned with the question of general policy and with that alone.

The Prime Minister is firmly of opinion that the creation or continuance of hereditary titles in Canada is entirely incompatible with the ideals of democracy as they have developed in this country and that the time has arrived when their heritable quality or effect should be abolished in this Dominion. The hereditary peerage as an institution can find neither historic justification nor scope for usefulness in a state structure and social tradition such as that which now exists in Canada. Consequently the effect of such an institution in this country is merely, on the one hand, to confer and to perpetuate arbitrarily for some members of the community a titular distinction or status of honour, and on the other hand to imply a position of special though ill-defined privilege to which there is not and cannot be assigned any obligation or function in the activities of Canadian national life. Honours conferred directly upon deserving recipients, under appropriate conditions and by proper authority, will be respected by the community; but a decoration or titular distinction which is attached to the holder, not in recognition of his own services, but merely from the incidence of birth, and which is invested with no special or public duties or responsibilities, will inevitably arouse in this country a sense of utter incongruity and a feeling of keen impatience.

Such an attitude toward a state institution cannot but have unfortunate effects upon the respect and regard in which the authority of the State is held; and since the question concerns so intimately the honour, dignity and security of the Crown it becomes the duty of His Majesty's Canadian Ministers to take immediate and serious notice of it and to advise an appropriate course to be followed.

The Prime Minister further observes that the procedure necessary to provide that titles of honour already held by Canadian residents shall no longer have hereditary effect in Canada will doubtless require careful consideration, and that the question involved is one which may appropriately be submitted for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown advising His Majesty's Government. In this connection it is desirable that a course should be followed under which any Canadian citizens who now hold hereditary titles would not be subjected to undue inconvenience or disadvantage. For that purpose appropriate provision for a reasonable time limit may be desirable within which the operation of the proposed enactment or other necessary proceeding would be postponed.

The Prime Minister therefore recommends that this Report, if approved, be forwarded to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies with the respectful request that the necessary formal action may be taken to render effective the proposals herein set forth, which are recapitulated as follows:—

1. No honour or titular distinction (saving those granted in recognition of military service during the present war or ordinarily bestowed by the Sovereign proprio motu) shall be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

2. The Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.

3. No hereditary title of honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

4. Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

The Order in Council goes somewhat further than the resolution which my hon. friend from Kingston has proposed in respect of the continuance of hereditary titles in this country. That question deserves some serious consideration for this reason: although we may provide, and the Crown may assent to our proposal, that hereditary honours shall no longer be granted to any person ordinarily resident in Canada, it is quite possible that persons holding hereditary honours may come to reside in this country and may become domiciled therein, and titles may be perpetuated in that way. According to the judgment of the advisers of the Crown in this country, this would not be a desirable consummation——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:—and therefore we reached the conclusion that some method should be devised by which, after a certain period, no title of honour held by any person resident in Canada, should continue to have the heritable quality. I must admit, at the same time, that the difficulties which present themselves in bringing about such a result are somewhat serious. With respect to the Order in Council I have just read, I have had communication with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and I am authorized to state this: First, the British Government offer no objection to its publication, provided it is made clear that it is published before they have had time to consider it, and that the whole matter is reserved for personal discussion after my arrival in England some time this summer. Second, that in the meantime no honours will be conferred except in accordance with the proposals recapitulated at the end of the Order in Council. They give their assent in that way for the time being, and as a matter of fact, I do not apprehend that there will be any serious difficulty in obtaining the concurrence of the Crown to the first three proposals. The only difficulty that is likely to occur is with regard to the last of the four proposals. And third—they have not asked me to say this specifically, but I

think it is a fair deduction from what has been said—there are grave difficulties as to the fourth proposal and it raises serious questions affecting the United Kingdom. It does certainly raise a serious question, because after an honour has once been conferred carrying with it the heritable quality, it would require legislation, I should think legislation of the Parliament of the United Kingdom itself, to deprive that honour of its heritable quality. Without special legislation it is impossible that any person shall sit as a peer of the United Kingdom in the House of Lords, holding simply a life tenure. Members of my own profession will recall that, in 1856, Sir James Parke was appointed a life peer with the title of Baron Wensleydale. The House of Lords appointed a committee, and decided eventually that life peers could not be created. It was alleged that there had been a prerogative exercisable and exercised in former days by which life peers could be appointed; but it also appeared that the exercise of that prerogative had been discontinued for at least four hundred years, and there was grave doubt as to whether any such prerogative had ever existed at all. Accordingly Sir James Parke was appointed a peer in the ordinary way, took his seat in the House of Lords, and afterwards Acts were passed by which, first four, and then six, Lords of Appeal in ordinary were appointed as barons, and for life only, as members of the House of Lords. There is an interesting note in an English constitutional writer which sums up the whole matter very well, and which I might as well give to the House. Sir William Anson says:

> The rule of law seems clear. The Crown can confer such dignities and with such limitations as it may please, but a Lord of Parliament must be an hereditary peer, except in the special cases of the Bishops and the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary; when once an hereditary peer is summoned the right to a summons descends to his heirs, except in the special case of the representative peers of Ireland.

Then, of course, there are the special provisions with regard to the representatives of the Irish and Scottish peers in the House of Lords, as to which I need not trouble the House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that if hereditary peers of Britain are debarred from living in Canada, because I understand they have to give up their hereditary title here, how would French, Italian and peers of other nations be affected?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Their titles would have effect in this country only as a matter of courtesy.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The others would only have effect by courtesy, too.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No; the others are quite different. Any person who comes from another country, enjoying a title of honour from that country, has a different status here from that of a peer of the United Kingdom, whose right extends over the Empire so far as the heritable quality to which I have alluded is concerned.

Now, it is only proper for me to say that no reflection is intended by the Order in Council which I have just read upon those domiciled in this country who have been honoured by the bestowal of the peerage or other hereditary honour, or upon the character or extent of their service in any case. We are simply laying down a general line of policy which we think ought to be followed, and which, I believe, will be followed in this country in the future.

My hon. friend from Kingston made a very forcible and eloquent speech, pointing out the incongruity of hereditary honours in this country. It is well to bear in mind that the most important privilege of a peer is to sit and vote in Parliament as a hereditary legislator. That is a duty which cannot ordinarily be discharged by persons domiciled in this country, and no duty or responsibility in relation to this country is attached to any such position. The Order in Council which I have cited sets forth in concise form the considerations which influenced the Government in reaching its conclusion. I might add, as a summary by the constitutional writer whom I have already quoted, a citation which is to be found on page 62 of Mr. Keith's work on "Imperial Unity and the Dominions." He says:

> If as early as the end of the 18th century, it was felt that the proposal to create a hereditary aristocracy, which was contemplated as possible by the Quebec Act of 1791, was out of the question, the creation of a mere social arstocracy must be deemed still less in harmony with the ideals of the Dominions in the twentieth century. The grant of membership of the various Orders, of knighthoods, of the highest distinction of Privy Councillorships terminate with life, and are earned by service: there is no essential objection on democratic grounds to such distinctions which meet a need of human nature, but there is the gravest objection to the grant of honours which descend to those who have no claim to them except by the accident of birth.

Mr. EDWARDS: Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? If an English peer should take up his permanent resi-

dence in Canada, would he have the right to run for a constituency in this country, and have the right to sit in this House?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. I remember looking into that question as a matter of interest many years ago, and I came to the conclusion then that there was no reason why he could not be elected.

Mr. EDWARDS: He could not sit in the House of Commons in Great Britain?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not there, but here he could. I do not think that has ever been a subject of a judicial decision. Apart from all this, the hon. member for Kingston has raised the question as to how far the bestowal of honours not of a hereditary character should proceed in this country. I entirely agree that that is a question which may well concern Parliament and the country. On the other hand, I am bound to say that there have been a great many cases in which I think such recognition has been very highly regarded from one end of the country to the other. Leaving out of the question those actively concerned in public life, let us take the case of Sir Frederick Fraser in the province of Nova Scotia, a man who, through an accident, lost his sight when he was eighteen or twenty years of age, and whose life has been devoted to the upbuilding of the finest institution for the blind which exists in the Dominion of Canada. A recognition of that character, granted to a man of that type, is, in my opinion, very happily bestowed. The same might be said of Sir William Gage of Toronto; of men who are at the head of great universities; of men whose duty and pleasure has been found in service to their country and doing good to their fellow beings.

Reference has been made to the British Empire Order, which was instituted last year. We heard something of it when we were in London, but we were too much engaged with other matters to give very much consideration to what was proposed. I think that the constitution and the by-laws and all that is necessary in these matters were being prepared at that time. I was asked at the end of last summer and again in the autumn, as well as at the beginning of the year and later in January, to take into consideration the preparation of a list. The Order itself embraces, I think, no less than six classes. The number of persons who might be honoured under it in Canada was very large indeed; I think it ran into some hundreds, including all the minor classes of the Order. I should like hon. gentlemen to realize that the institution of this Order

was prompted by the very best of motives. The idea and desire was to give some suitable recognition in the various dominions of the Empire to those who by service, by devotion, by self-sacrifice, had sought to do their full duty to their country in time of war. When the matter was presented for my consideration, I felt that it was one which gave rise to the greatest difficulties. In the first place, I was not at all clear as to the wisdom of the proposal. But, assuming that it was wise, I should like hon. gentlemen to consider the very great responsibility and the burden that would be placed on a Prime Minister who undertook a task like that. Even if it were possible for him to have a perfect knowledge of the service that had been rendered by every one of the eight million inhabitants of Canada, it would be a difficult task for him to determine which service was most worthy of recognition. Of course, it is not humanly possible for a Prime Minister or for any one else to have that perfect and absolute knowledge; therefore it seemed to me that if the task had to be fulfilled at some time or other, it should at least receive more considartion than I had been able to give it since my return to this country on May 15 last.

Another order has recently been instituted, known as "Companions of Honour." We were not consulted with regard to its institution; nor were we with regard to the institution of the Order of the British Empire, otherwise than as I have indicated. It is true that honours under the British Empire Order have been awarded in New Zealand, Australia and South Africa, but I thought that I might very well, under the circumstances, defer the consideration of any list for Canada, and action has been postponed for the present. It is a subject that may be taken into consideration and discussed when the Canadian ministers visit Great Britain next year.

I have placed the whole matter with the greatest possible frankness before the House and the country exactly as it rests at the moment. The proposals which are set forth in this Order in Council represent absolutely the opinion of the Government. I desire, however, that the House and the country should understand that the fourth proposal, although it does embody our absolute conviction, cannot be worked out without great difficulty; indeed to work it out in the way we have suggested may prove to be altogether impracticable. I am not at all confident how the House of Lords, for example, might receive a legislative proposal which would cut down an hereditary honour to merely a life honour;

nor am I confident that the Government of the United Kingdom would be prepared to propose such legislation to the Imperial Parliament. However, we have recorded our opinion, and I leave it at that. Under the circumstances, and as the British Government has as yet had no opportunity of considering fully the proposals which we have put forward to them, possibly the mover and the seconder of the resolution may consider it desirable to let the motion stand, upon the assurance of the Government that no action inconsistent with its purport will be taken before we meet in another Parliament.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has certainly reason to congratulate himself upon the result which he has already obtained in the declaration of the Prime Minister. For my part, I should have been more pleased if the Prime Minister had not marred the effect of his remarks by suggesting that the member for Kingston and the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) should not press their motion to a conclusion. I infer from the remarks of the Prime Minister that the Government are in sympathy with the motion, and if that is the case it is obvious that when the Prime Minister takes the subject up with the authorities in Great Britain his hand will be very much strengthened if he has in support of it the declaration of the Parliament of Canada. With all due respect, therefore, I suggest that the member for Kingston persevere in his present intention, inasmuch as the idea embodied in his resolution has been accepted by the Government.

If the member for Kingston will permit me, I think I can say that every member of the House has been impressed by the exhaustive manner in which he has presented his case.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I agree with every syllable that he uttered—not only every syllable that he uttered, but also the hint he threw out, if I understood him correctly, that if he had followed his own inclination he would have gone further than he did and asked for the suppression of all titles in Canada.

The reasons for the conclusions which my hon. friend has embodied in his resolution and which, aside from the terms of the resolution, he has presented to the House, seem to me to be based upon the forward movement which is now developing in Europe and all over the world. We are engaged in a great war the object of which is the triumph of democracy, and it is inconsistent with the objects for which we are fighting that we should do anything the effect of which would be to promote or to perpetuate that which is not in perfect accordance with the principles of democracy.

Democracy and aristocracy are not compatible institutions, and as democracy advances aristocracy must recede. For my part, and I say it with full sincerity, I bow with respect to the aristocracy of Great Britain to whom the world owes a great debt. If England has been preserved from the bane of autocratic Government, it is very largely owing to the efforts of the aristocracy of that country. It was the barons of the day who dragged from King John his reluctant consent to Magna Charta, which has been the charter of freedom not only in Great Britain but throughout the world, and from that day on to the revolution of 1688, the Lords of Great Britain were in accord with every movement that went on to curb the powers of the Crown. In the revolution of 1688, it was the Lords who took the lead in the revolution which finally forced the withdrawal of James II and brought about the advent of a new dynasty, the Bill of Rights and other great charters of the liberty of the people have been the consequence. Whilst up to the 19th century, the aristocracy of Great Britain has always been in the van of freedom, it has not, in my judgment, in the 19th century, been equal to its opportunities.

I am a Liberal of the old school of England. I would have been a Whig if I had been in England. I wish, for my part, that the British aristocracy had continued to do as they did in the past. But they do not understand the times in which we live. Whether the British aristocracy like it or not, or whether men generally like it or not, at the present time England is on the eve of a revolution. Such revolutions do not take place in England by force or violence; they go simply from step to step and from reform to reform. The days of aristocracy are over; a new force is now entering into the Government of Great Britain, that is to say, the great masses of the nation. Whether it be for woe or for weal the future will show. For my part, I think it is for weal; but I am sure of this, that in the new order of things, which will be the order in England, England will not be as picturesque as we have known it hitherto, but I believe

that undoubtedly the great masses of the nation will be more happy than they have ever been before.

The resolution of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) goes only to the suppression in this country of hereditary titles. Hereditary titles in Canada are of little consequence, I believe, and I think they were properly represented by the Prime Minister. The only benefit, if a benefit it be, at all events the only privilege, which is given to-day by the creation of a peer resident in Canada, will be the privilege of becoming a legislator in Great Britain; he would be in Canada a simple citizen of Canada. My right hon. friend says that he has at one time looked over the question whether or not a peer of Great Britain will be eligible to sit in this House, and he came to the conclusion, as I understood it, that he saw nothing to make him ineligible. I also studied the question, and I came to precisely the same conclusion, that a citizen of Canada who is a peer of Great Britain is eligible to sit in the House of Commons of Canada. This will not happen frequently, I am sure; it will be very infrequent that a man resident in Canada will be made a peer of Great Britain, but recent events have rather excited public opinion upon this point, and have contributed, I have no doubt, to induce my hon. friend from Kingston to introduce this resolution.

So far as I can see, I think we are unanimous in this House on this matter. I have not heard a word or seen a sign of dissent in any quarter against the resolution of my hon. friend. Everybody seems to agree that we should not have any peers created in this country. But we might go a step further. Is there any reason why there should be the bestowal of titles of any kind in Canada? Everybody will, I believe, agree that in Canada badges, titles, honours and trappings will never take any root. We are a democratic country; we have been made so by circumstances. I listened with great pleasure and interest to what my hon. friend said this afternoon. His ancestors left Scotland, and my ancestors left France, because they were not satisfied with the conditions of their native land. If there is anything that is dear to the heart of man it is the soil upon which he was born, and if any man deserts the soil upon which he was born in order to take up his abode in another country, he does so for very serious causes. We are all in the same condition in this country. No one in Canada, I believe, claims blue blood. We are all from the people, and, I believe, we shall ever be pleased to say that we are of the people, and we shall have no distinctions and no classes. I may be told: If you hold those views, how is it that you have accepted a title for yourself? Well, so it is. I have accepted a title. It was offered to me. Why I accepted it with the views I hold now, will be going into a matter of personal history which I do not care to bring forward. But at all events I may say this: I see here a little class of titled people, knights commanders of this order or that order. If they will make a bargain with me, I am quite prepared, if we can do it without any disrespect to the Crown of England, to bring our titles to the marketplace and make a bonfire of them. We are British subjects, and for my part I take very much pride in the fact that British institutions do not proceed by violence but grow up quietly and gradually to given ends. I have no doubt at all that, whether my suggestion is accepted or is not accepted, the time will come—and perhaps soon rather than late—when all titles will be held to be of no value in this country, and the only title which will be accepted will be that of a citizen of Canada and British subject.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council) Mr. Speaker, the question now before us is one in which I have taken, for some years, a very deep interest. I am sure we are all interested in the progress of democracy and in Canada as a free and democratic country. One who thoroughly believes in democracy and in the development of free and democratic institutions must, I think, realize that titles, and particularly hereditary titles, are not a normal growth of such institutions. They are rather the survival of a dying feudalism which continues to this day in some of its aspects, but which is rapidly passing away.

My hon. friend from Kingston was good enough to quote a brief extract from an address I delivered something over a year ago on this question, and he said if I was not accurately quoted I might have the privilege of so stating and repudiating the statement. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was accurately quoted. Those were my sentiments at the time they were uttered, they are my sentiments now, and they are embodied in the Order in Council which the Prime Minister has presented to the House. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) quoted a French philosopher, who said, "How artificial are the lines that divide us," and he applied that to the

discussion in the House this afternoon. I think we will all agree that it was an apt quotation as applied to the subject matter under discussion, and it was also a very apt quotation as applied to the manner in which the Union Government has dealt with this question. I frankly thought I entertained somewhat radical views on hereditary titles, but when we put aside these artificial party lines that divide us and look at this question from the standpoint of common Canadian citizenship, we find all the members of the Union Government, irrespective of party, holding exactly the same views on the question of hereditary titles. And perhaps one of the benefits which have come to us during the war is that, at times at least, we are prepared to forget these artificial party lines that divide us and to look squarely at the great issues from the standpoint of our common Canadian citizenship. The more frequently we do it the larger sense of unity we realize, because, we find there is a common consensus of opinion on the majority of the great issues which face the people of Canada at this time. My hon. friend from Kingston, I know, thought he was a radical, as I thought I was. He thought he was a radical in saying he was a Socialist on certain questions. I think that, having listened to the hon. member for Kingston we must regard him as a very moderate Socialist. The views he expressed with reference to the status of the average man in Canada in the days to come are views which might be accepted by every hon. member of this House. My hon. friend from Brome thought he was a great radical on this question, and we find that the Order in Council itself is more radical than the resolution submitted by my hon. friend from Kingston, and the hon. member for Brome. In view of the very full, admirable and convincing statement made by the Prime Minister on the constitutional aspect of this question, I shall not add anything except to observe that this Order in Council, when accepted by the Imperial authorities, as we confidently believe it will be, will mark a distinct advance in the constitutional status of Canada. It marks, perhaps, the relinquishment by the Crown of the last prerogative which it has claimed to exercise within the Dominion, apart from the advice of the responsible advisers of the Crown in the Dominion. I shall not take time to outline the development of self-government in Canada, and in the dominions of the Empire, but it is of interest to note the fact that by successive steps the dominions have developed from dependent colonies of the Crown, to free self-governing nations, part of the British Commonwealth; and I think I am correct in saying that in every momentous departure Canada has taken the lead, and all the other dominions have shared the benefit of her advance. In the Order in Council which the Prime Minister has presented to the House you have another of these constitutional developments which indicates that Canada is now reaching the full status of a nation, and the Government of the nation is exercising the full prerogatives of advisers of His Majesty in all matters relating to the government of Canada. Just in passing—although it is not germane perhaps, but yet as indicating the growth of Canada as a nation—the establishment of a Canadian mission at Washington where Canada is directly represented in dealing with the United States Government in important matters of trade and commerce, directly represented with full authority of His Majesty's Government, is another step in the development during the past few months of the policy of managing our own affairs in the Dominion of Canada. The net result of this growth is that Canada in a very real sense is to-day no longer a dependent colony of Great Britain, but is, as I have stated, one of the free nations that go to make up the British Commonwealth. The resolution passed at the Imperial Conference, which was read by the hon. member for Kingston, moved by the hon. Prime Minister of Canada, and seconded by General Smuts, I think, states the relation of the self-governing dominions to the Mother Country in a way that can be accepted by all those who believe in maintaining the full rights of self-government, and at the same time preserving the essential unity of the Empire. Passing away from the important constitutional aspect of this matter which is the assertion of the right of the Government of Canada to pass upon all these questions and to say that no title or honour should be conferred except upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada, speaking for the Government of Canada, I have one or two observations to make on the other question, that of conferring hereditary titles. The matter has been so well and so ably dealt with by the hon. member for Kingston, supplemented by the hon. member for Brome, and further discussed by the Prime Minister and by the leader of the Opposition, that I shall not dwell upon it, but I think a recent British

writer has expressed in very clear and admirable language the effect of such hereditary titles. He said: "The effect is to develop the twin evils of snobbery and flunkeyism," both incompatible with a free democracy. We do not wish to see those twin evils flourish in Canada by the enlargement or development of such a system. It has been suggested by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that we should go still further. This Order in Council goes further than any proposal made up to this time by any government in Canada. It is the most advanced declaration on the question of titles made by any government in Canada. My right hon. friend has said that the British Commonwealth has made progress not by revolution, but by orderly development, and it may be that what he has predicted in this case will be true in the future; but certainly up to this time we have gone even in advance of public opinion, as indicated by the resolution submitted to the House and now upon the Order Paper. Personally, I am a democrat, and I would not object to be present at the bonfire to which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition referred, but it may be we will not have the opportunity of witnessing that for a short time to come. The whole question is larger than the simple question of conferring certain titles and dignities. It is the whole question of a class or caste system. We all realize in the time of a war like this, when we are fighting the battle of democracy against autocracy and for the triumph of our free democratic institutions, the spirit of democracy will have a larger expression in English-speaking communities after the war than prior to it. The whole tendency will be towards a fuller expression of democracy in all the affairs of government.

When we recall the fact that more than sixty per cent of the men who have gone from Canada to fight our battles come under the class of labouring men we realize what a tremendous contribution the working men of Canada are making for the preservation of our homes, our liberties, our property, our free institutions. I venture to think that when these working men return to Canada, having defended our homes, preserved our lives and liberty, and saved for us our inheritance, they will expect and demand a larger share in that inheritance than they have received in the past. If that is true of Canada it is true also of Great Britain. The ferment of industrial and political revolution is at work. That man to-day is blind who does not look into the future and see the great and the grave possibilities that face us. It behooves us at this time, facing conditions as they exist, to recognize that the democratic tide is setting in, that it will go on to the flood, and to set our houses in order and give full recognition to the honest service, the honest toil of the honest man, so that, not only will every toiler have the rights which my honourable friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) mentioned, but he will live under conditions where he is able not only to earn sufficient to maintain himself in decency and comfort, but to provide a suitable home for himself and family, to feed and clothe those dependent on him, and to give them a suitable education so that every child born in Canada may be properly equipped for the service and the opportunities of life.

We are facing great industrial and social changes as well as changes in the political world. Because this whole system of hereditary titles is absolutely inconsistent with the spirit of democracy, and with the great cause for which our gallant men are fighting, we are opposed to its continuation in Canada. The Government has stated its position that no more shall be conferred, and if proper legal means can be found for putting an end to the hereditary character of titles already conferred these means will be found and the spirit of this Order in Council will be carried out to the full extent and power of the Government.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to give way to some honourable gentleman on the other side who would continue this debate, following in the footsteps of the right honourable the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has done me, the humble member for West Peterborough, the very signal honour of having announced himself a convert to my views. I wish to express my gratitude to the leader of the Opposition for his gracious acknowledgement of the correctness of my statement. I must confess that, knowing how broad his sympathies were and what a splendid and highly illuminated idea he had of democracy, my feelings received a severe rebuff when, having brought a resolution before the House on a previous occasion, I found that he could rise and speak against it. The leader of the Government for the time being probably felt called upon for some reason beyond my penetration to object to it. The members of the House, I had found, were distinctly in

favour of my view that all titles of honour in Canada should be dispensed with as being entirely inconsistent with the necessities of democracy. But, when the right hon. leader of the Opposition, without waiting for others to intervene in the debate, and without giving the humbler members, the back benchers, an opportunity to express their opinions, snuffed us all out in a genial, thoroughly polite and chivalrous manner, I felt there was nothing much more to be said. I went away considerably abashed. But, how proud am I to-night to feel that, having thought the matter over, his conscience having pricked him, he has come to the conclusion that it is necessary to retrace that step and speak according to the promptings of his own heart, the teaching of his own knowledge and the aspirations of democracy and to vote for doing away with all those artificial distinctions which mean nothing and which cannot make a man any better than he is.

I view, as I did on that occasion, the long procession of people who pass in the course of everyday life. The last shall be first and the first last. It was sometime before I grasped the true idea of that phrase. When a woman has been left, by the untimely death of her husband with a large brood of small children to bring up, when she faces her task boldly, meeting all the trials that we know surround her and fighting the good fight; when she brings her children up and turns them out good citizens, working her way for herself and family as the hirelings perhaps of people who have done nothing but who have received the very titles to which we now object, if virtue, if greatness, is to be rewarded, in Heaven's name, why is it that such a woman should not be created a Lady of the Washtub if others are to be created Ladies of the Bed Chamber?

We have had to-day a magnificent restatement of the case of democracy by the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). He went into the whole case thoroughly and well realizing how difficult it is to read copious quotations and put them all down on Hansard so that those who come to read the matter up will have a thorough grasp of the whole question. I admired his perseverance just as much as I was charmed by his fluency of speech. Democracy, as the previous speaker has so well said, is a growth, the very flower of the people of the world; and instead of being rebuked by having titles thrust upon people who, in many cases, do not deserve them at all, it should be encouraged by an emphasis being placed upon the equality of all people who deserve recognition. How absurd it is to analyze the question of the bestowment of titles. Pray, who could give Plato a title? Who is there would venture to dub Aristotle or Socrates with a title. They did attempt to give a title to Sir Isaac Newton, who interpreted the heavens for us. He probably knew nothing about it, but they gave him a knighthood which one of our Kings of England gave to a roast of beef. We have also Shakespeare remaining without a title; Milton, Leibwitz and Laplace. When we come to investigate the history of learning, the history of greatness, we find that as a matter of fact titles are a blot, not an honour. We should therefore be much less scrupulous than we might otherwise be in addressing a request to His Majesty to discontinue bestowing titles of honour upon people when they are in themselves unnecessary, and historically incorrect.

The resolution is to be interpreted in two ways: One is, do the people of this country want titles? I do not suppose there is a member of this House who is not prepared to answer and to say: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: If that be the case, why not dispense with further discussion; it is not necessary to go into the merits of the case, at all, because the people rule. This is the age of democracy. When we speak of prerogatives, there is no prerogative but that of the people. When the people have said we do not wish for titles, that is enough.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: Whether it is philosophically and intrinsically correct, or otherwise, it is not for us to say. The people, not le Roi, reign, and what the people will must be done. I am not, nor is anybody else, speaking in the slightest disrespect of the institution of monarchy. It has served its purpose in the past, and no doubt will serve its purpose in the future. That does not in the least derogate from the fact that the people do not want precedence and privilege which were once and for all swept away by the French Revolution. The people want more of that; and if this war does not suffice to convince men that the good and the peace of the world depend upon democracy, then in God's name, what will convince them?

I have been asked why I did not bring this matter up again. For two reasons: One was that I thought that titles were an

insignificant thing in comparison with the issues at stake at the present time, and in the face of the very fact that our soldiers one and all deserve titles which we have not the power to give them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is one reason and in response to the request of the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) I gave him that reason. There was another reason which I did not give him and that reason is this: Having the abolition of the titles of honour thoroughly at heart, I was looking for co-operation, and if I could find one, two, three or a dozen more who would take up the burden—I knew my own heart was true—I was glad to see them co-operate and undertake it. Therefore was I not delighted to see the member for Kingston and the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) put resolutions on the Order Paper? Far be it from me to say that they have stolen my thunder. More power to them. Let us have more expression from the people of this country. We had an expression from the people through the newspapers. The newspapers exercise a very great power in this country, and I must freely and frankly say that it is a power for good. They are doing with a conscientiousness the work of expressing public opinion upon democratic principles in Canada that speaks well for the future of this country, and the men of this House must see to it that they keep abreast of the times, of the newspaper, of the aspirations of the people, and of the very right and justice of the case.

I cannot sit down without saying that I quite heartily concur in the statement of the member for Kingston when he says, in appreciation of the very forward steps taken by the Government in the Order in Council, that a vote of this House would very greatly strengthen the hands of the ministry. I trust therefore, that the resolution will go on record, and not only so but that the chief men of this House, the men who in future will historically represent public opinion in Canada, men like the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition and others will be chronicled with the men who represent Canada in this great new Parliament, throbbing with the new life of the country, where there are so many representatives of a high order commercially and otherwise, in this new Parliament fresh from the people and through thoroughly understanding what the spirit of democracy in Canada is, in putting on record that they do not wish any further so-called titles of honour to be conferred upon its citizens, but that every man should do his level best for his country and realize that the highest reward he possibly can have is a consciousness of having unselfishly done his duty.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): My hon. friend from Peterborough did not charge me with being a convert to his idea because I had the honour to second his motion when he introduced a Bill into this House two or three years ago. I believe, however, that he is not quite accurate in his appreciation of the stand taken by my right hon. leader at that time. The right hon. leader of the Opposition did not say that he was against the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. gentleman, but that this Bill could not come under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and that the hon. gentleman should have taken the steps which have been taken to-day by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I remember quite well that my right hon. leader told me at that time that he was prepared to support a resolution asking for what is asked to-day by the present resolution before the House. I congratulate the hon. member for Kingston on the admirable speech which he delivered, which is certainly an unanswerable argument against the absurd and demoralizing custom of bestowing titles upon Canadian citizens, and I do not make exception for those which are not hereditary. We must be grateful to the Government, or whoever are responsible for the condition of things which exists to-day, because by distributing titles by the bushel in this country they have aroused a public opinion and have created a feeling of resentment which will cause the disappearance of a threatening evil for Canada. We have been assured that the Crown was giving those titles of its own grace; but everybody realizes in this country that the appointments are ordinarily made on the recommendations of the Government. and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has just told us how the thing generally occurs. We have come to the point where citizens in every quarter of Canada are enquiring why certain gentlemen have had titles conferred upon them, and where, on the other hand, many titled citizens prefer that the people should not enquire why they have received their titles. When we consider the fact that in the great country to the south of us, the President of the United States is called by the plain, democratic name of Mister Woodrow Wilson, and that one of his predecessors was plain " Teddy "

Roosevelt; that the President of glorious France is plain Monsieur Raymond Poincaire; that the Prime Minister of France, the great statesman who has just achieved his long-cherished idea of having unity of command on the western front, is called Monsieur Georges Clemenceau, and that in this country, in both the federal and provincial fields, we have titles of all kinds, flavours and descriptions, I say that this is a condition of things which must be done away with, and that blue plague of aristocracy, or muck aristocracy, must be driven from our shores. To use a stereotyped phrase, our country is fighting with the Allies "to make the world safe for democracy," and we must see to it that Canada must not be made unsafe for that very same democracy. We must prevent the class system from being organized in this country, and we must prevent the establishment of the system against which all the free peoples of the world have fought, even to the extent, in some cases, of resorting to revolution. There is no place in the public life of this country for hereditary leaders or rulers. Brains, honesty and work should be the only qualifications for leadership in a democratic country like ours. This contagious disease, this thirst for titles, is not new. It has been so for centuries. It is a remnant of the Middle Ages, and in these modern days the people are getting sick of it, and the hon. member for Kingston demonstrated this afternoon that in Britain there is going to be a change. At least, the people are trying to effect a change. The hon. member read many extracts from the debates which took place in the House of Lords. I will read only one quotation, from the remarks of Viscount Knutsford, who said:

> The noble Earl (Lord Selborne) suggests that a statement should be made in public of the reasons why an honour had been conferred. That would remove the pleasure we experience every New Year in endeavouring to solve the puzzle set us. But it might be carried further. Letters might be put after the name of the recipient to indicate why he had received a title. For instance, "B.C." might stand for "Beggar for Charities," or "B.O." for "Bazaar Opener," and so on. That would be a way of indicating why the smaller titles were given. Moreover, if titles are purchaseable, they ought to be saleable. We all ought to be able to sell our titles to enable us to give a handsome present to the Red Cross.

We have had in this country glaring instances of the condition of things which has been described in the debate referred to. I would not like to mention any names, but there is one which comes to my mind just now, and that gentleman was very fortunate in the selection of his new name, which indicates that there is as much "water" in his nobility as there is in the capital stock of the companies he organized on this side of the Atlantic.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not forget the "beaver" either.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That gentleman has been given a new position recently. I must say that if a capacity for disseminating the opposite of truth is a qualification for the office, he possesses this fitness to a remarkable degree. Buffon has said:

> "La louange publique, signe éclatant du mérite est une monnaie plus précieuse que l'or, mais qui perd son prix et même devient vile, lorsqu'on la convertit en effet de commerce."

The translation of these words is as follows: "Public praise, shining sign of deserving merit, is more precious than gold; but it loses its price, and even becomes valueless, when it is perverted into a negotiable article."

A lavish distribution of titles has had the effect of depreciating the institution itself, and of making it no longer a valuable distinction for a citizen to be given a title. The institution itself is vicious and productive of evil. It works as an inducement for gentlemen of proud dispositions, or whose ladies have social ambitions, not to do anything which might injure their chances of obtaining honours and putting them on bad terms with those who are responsible for their distribution. I am not sure that this has not had a certain effect with certain gentlemen during the last general election, or previous to it. It has always been so. When old republicans protested to Napoleon because he had instituted new orders in France, he said: "You call them toys; know that by these toys people are led." It is the same policy to-day, and has always been so. The ambition to acquire something which distinguishes one from his fellows is as strong to-day as it was in the days when the Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans were the great nations of the world. Now, Sir, I admit that great acts of heroism and of public devotion, great services to the State, outstanding talents and virtues, deserve special recognition, but I deny that such recognition should take the form of empty titles. The public soul and spirit shall always discern true merit. M. Thiers, the great French statesman, had been created a baron by King Louis Philippe, but he never used the title. This did not prevent the French people, after 1870, from giving him a more glorious title, and from hailing him as "Liberateur du Territoire."

I hope that a vote will be taken on this resolution, that it will carry, and that the practice of conferring hereditary titles will be entirely done away with in this country. To those who are eager to get titles and to those who are actually wearing them with distinction, I commend these words of the poet:

> Titles of honour add not to his worth
> Who is himself an honour to his title.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I should have risen at this stage of the debate were it not that I have an amendment to offer. I should have preferred first to listen to the remarks of other hon. gentlemen, because, being a new member, I like to sit at the feet of modern Gamaliels and learn wisdom. However, there is one objection to waiting until all other members have spoken: one finds that arguments that he had carefully worked out are used, one after the other.

The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in his elaborate speech, to which I listened with interest and admiration, covered the ground very thoroughly. I had, however, one note that I thought nobody would touch, and that was the instance of the French revolution. According to my reading of history, the French revolution was brought about largely by the aristocracy. The aristocrats of old France, coupled with the kings, were paramount, and the people—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do not forget the church.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will leave my hon. friend to deal with the church; he is probably better qualified to do that than I am. I assume that the church had something to do with it. However, those who have read the history of the French revolution know how the kings and the princes and the aristocrats were all-powerful; how the people were down-trodden until the clash came and the common people rose and cut the king's head off, cut the queen's head off, cut the heads off half or most of the aristocracy. All honour to them for doing so; for when they did that they sounded the tocsin of liberty in that great nation of France. Moreover, I believe that it is not unlikely that the present war is largely due to the creation of titles, to the existence of the aristocrats. If the common people throughout the world were ruling as they should rule, as I believe God intended that they should rule and shall rule in the future, this bloody war would not now be going on. I regret that the member for Kingston did not make his motion more sweeping, by including all titles. I spoke to him about the matter a day or two ago—he will not charge me with violating any confidence, because I asked him if I might make this statement—and he informed me that he was heartily in favour of the abolition of all titles, though he feared that if he introduced a resolution to that effect, it would not carry.

After listening to the right hon. leader of the Opposition in his splendid declaration of democracy, my mind is brought back to the old days when the right hon. gentleman used to tell us that he was a democrat to the hilt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It was delightful to me, an old Liberal, to find my leader of twenty-five years ago coming back to the old line and declaring that he would be proud to stand by and see the title that the King had conferred on him burned in a bonfire. I wish that we could set that bonfire in the House of Commons to-night, and burn up all the titles.

The amendment that I propose, if I am in order—it is so long since I have been in Parliament that perhaps I am a little rusty on the rules; however, you will set me right, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong—has for its object the abolition of all titles. Had I not secured a seconder, I should have asked the right hon. leader of the Opposition, in view of the statement just made by him, to second the motion; and I am sure that he would have been willing to do so, as would also the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe).

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Anything in that line.

Mr. RICHARDSON: So that I have a number of seconders. The wording of my amendment, which is seconded by Mr. Levi Thomson, is as follows:

> That the word "hereditary" be struck out from the resolution and that the third paragraph thereof conclude with the word "Canada" in the ensuing line.

That means that the word "hereditary" be eliminated from the resolution, which would then read as follows:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon Your subjects domiciled or living in Canada.

The rest of the resolution is deleted. I believe, with my leader of former days, that if we are not going to have a new heaven at the close of the war, we are at least going to have a new earth. A tide is rising against titles of any kind. I was interested in the Order in Council and the correspondence which the leader of the House read, and I could not help thinking that after all what a waste of time and money is involved in even discussing the subject of the conferring of these titles; let us be done with them altogether.

It is said that that great independent democrat, Robert Burns, was invited by a local laird to participate in some amusement which a number of distinguished guests had been invited from Edinburgh to enjoy. When Burns arrived at the house he was shown into the kitchen with the servants of the house, while the titled persons who were invited enjoyed their feast in the dining-room. It is said that while Burns sat in the kitchen he wrote that great declaration of independence, "A Man's a Man for a' That:"

A prince can make a belted knight,
A marquis, duke, and a' that;
But an honest man's aboon his might,
Guid faith, he maunna fa' that.

Tradition says that he recited these lines before the company, and that when he came to the following passage he pointed his finger at the person who was being entertained, and spoke out in declamatory tones:

Ye see yon birkie ca'd a Lord,
Wha struts and stares and a' that;
Though thousands tremble at his word,
He's but a cuif for a' that.

We have had one Prime Minister in Canada who has refused a title. I refer to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie—and I am sure when I speak the name of Alexander Mackenzie who was Prime Minister of this country from 1873 to 1878, the blood must flow fast through the veins of Liberals because Alexander Mackenzie was a real Liberal. Alexander Mackenzie was the type of Liberal who would sooner go down fighting for what he believed to be right than stand for what he thought to be wrong. Then we had that great tribune of the people, Hon. Edward Blake, who led the Opposition in this House for years and years, and who was perhaps one of the noblest sons that Canada ever produced. Hon. Edward Blake refused a title when it was offered to him. We have also a newspaperman in Canada—hon. members will pardon me for mentioning his name, because I am a journalist from boyhood myself, and I like to think we had one stalwart newspaperman in Canada, John Ross Robertson, proprietor of the Toronto Telegram, who recently refused a title. He preferred to go down to posterity as plain John Ross Robertson. He preferred that his children should remember him as plain John Ross Robertson. The State, the Crown, can do nothing to dignify our manhood. After all, I agree with what the Prime Minister said, that whatever is inherent in man will come out and that titles cannot make him greater than he is. If that be so, let us accept the declaration of the Prime Minister this evening, and let us declare that in this young democracy, in this gem of the British Empire, we will set our faces steadfastly in the direction of democracy, and it shall not be said of us that we love titles, or that we shall receive any title from the Crown or from any other source, but let it be said that we Canadians will do our duty in a plain, simple manner and be content with such dignity as manhood can confer upon us.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, as my name has been associated with the amendment, I beg to offer a very few remarks. I think the Union Government of the day is to be congratulated on the stand it has taken on this question. Those of us who have supported Union Government, sometimes perhaps a little against the grain, and who have made Union Government possible, may congratulate ourselves on the work that has been done by that Government. I have noted what the Prime Minister has said in the beginning of his remarks, and which has been quoted partially by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), that is, that we are to judge men on their merits and not on any titles that are conferred upon them. That was the idea, if I do not quote the words exactly. They were very much along the same lines as the words quoted by my hon. friend from the great poet Robert Burns. If we are to judge men in this way, what, after all, is the use of titles? Titles, of any kind, are absolutely useless, if we are to so judge men. And if titles are useless why have them? There are plenty of useful things in this world without bothering our heads or wasting our time about the useless things. I have, therefore, very much pleasure, in seconding the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Springfield.

There can be no question that every hon. member present must support the original

resolution if we come to that resolution. I am heartily in accord with that resolution, and the Government are heartily in accord with it, because they have agreed to that themselves, and there can certainly be no objection to this House expressing its approval of the action of the Government of the day, which is all we should be doing by passing the resolution which is submitted to us. I believe we should go further, and I for one am prepared to go further; I am prepared to follow the matter to its legitimate conclusion, and in doing so, I believe we should do away with titles altogether, and in doing that, we should only be carrying out the principle laid down by the Prime Minister in his address.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great pleasure and interest to the remarkable speech delivered this afternoon by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). After having listened to him and to my good friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), I thought their resolution was not broad enough. I am glad my hon. friend from Springfield has implemented that resolution by the amendment which he has just moved in very eloquent language. I shall give my support to that amendment, and I hope the House will face squarely the issue. Public opinion will be very much disappointed, indeed, if, after the House has spent the day over this question, it should be dropped. My hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) has cited the words of Buffon about the inanity of titles. Might I be allowed to quote a few lines of a French-Canadian poet, which describe the situation in very noble language? The lines run thus:

"Sur cette terre sauvage
"Où les titres sont inconnus,
"La noblesse est dans le courage
"Dans les talents, dans les vertus.

On this barren land where titles are unknown,
True nobility resides in courage, talents and virtue.

These are the true sentiments which are embodied in the masterly addresses which have been delivered this afternoon by the mover and by the seconder. Titles in the Old Country have been a source of corruption. They are a source of corruption in Canada to-day. As my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), whom I was so pleased to welcome in this House, after so many years of absence, said a moment ago, titles in the pre-revolutionary days in France, as he will read in Carlyle's history, were the cause of malfeasance in office. Privileges and titles also precipitated a revolution in England, where, Sir, you must not forget that also a king was beheaded. Let my hon. English-speaking friends, who are so proud of the glories of old England, not forget that if the French once beheaded their king, the English beheaded theirs also.

Mr. RICHARDSON: He deserved it just as much, if not more.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some appointments of late have created a commotion in England. I regret to say that such a commotion was created on the occasion of honours bestowed on a Canadian far more famous for his cement merger than for his accomplishments on behalf of the Empire. I am sorry the name of Canada is to-day being branded in England on account of the bestowal of titles on such an individual. Sir, I cannot forget that during many months before the last election that individual libelled and slandered the province to which I belong, the faith which I profess, and the race from which I come. Sir, aristocracy of that brand is not healthy; it is not congenial to our soil.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the hon. member have any objection to stating how the gentleman to whom he refers libelled his people?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. If my hon. friend will go to the library, and ask for Max Aitken's Epitome of the War, one edition published in English and one published in French, the one purporting to be a copy of the other, although it is not, he will see where Sir Max Aitken libelled the province of Quebec.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not believe it.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Read the Daily Express, his newspaper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At all events, thank Heaven, the French Canadians are not alone in gauging the nobility of Lord Beaverbrook. In England to-day, if you read the Westminster Gazette, the Manchester Guardian, and some of the most influential organs of public opinion, his appointment is very seriously questioned. Aristocracy, I say, is not healthy for this country; it is not congenial to Canada. In the old days we had some nobility during the French domination, but if Canada is what it is to-day, we do not owe it to the French nobility. It is a matter of history that as soon as our ancestors were defeated

on the Plains of Abraham, the whole of the nobility returned to France, and the peasantry, the habitant of French Canada, with his curés, remained in the colony, and made it what it has become since. The nobility of the French régime, with a few honourable exceptions, which exceptions only prove the rule, did not take much interest in the colonization, the settlement and the industrial development of New France. That nobility was busy breaking the law enacted by His Majesty the King, against trading with the Indian and exchanging liquor for furs. They were indeed most picturesque, those coureurs des bois. They were mostly all noblemen, but nevertheless they were breaking the King's laws. I repeat it, the best nobility that French Canada ever produced was the French Canadian habitant himself, the honest simple peasant of old. It has been stated, and quite erroneously, that the province of Quebec had been a feudal country until 1854. That statement is an historical error. There was never in French Canada any feudal system. The seigniorial tenure was only an undertaking for the colonization and the settlement of lands in Canada. There were a few of the old seigniorial privileges enjoyed by the seigneurs, and for the time being all went well, but, Sir, after a while, it became evident that the seigniorial system created an impediment to not only colonization but to the industrial development of the country, and in 1854 the French Canadian censitaires demanded the abolition of the seigniorial tenure. I said a moment ago that titles were a source of corruption in Canada. Does it not strike you, Sir, that on the eve of an election the Government of the day bestows titles on journalists? Hon. gentlemen will have noticed that during the past five, six or seven years past many journalists have been made knights, baronets and lords. That is where the greatest source of corruption is felt. The wells of public opinion are poisoned by those new aristocrats, who, in return for the titles that are being bestowed on them, libel one good half of their fellow-countrymen—one good half of Canada. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the President of the Council spoke of the progress which self-government had made in the Empire, and he said that Canada had been in the van in each of these progressive movements. It is quite true that Canada has been in the van of progress in the many developments which have been accomplished by the various dominions composing the Empire. In my judgment, the greatest forward movement that was ever accomplished was the granting of responsible government to Canada by the Mother Country, thanks to the efforts, the energy, the courage and the true Canadianism of the men of 1840. Responsible government made a step further by the coming of Confederation, and, Sir, I regret that my hon. friend forgot that it made one step further when the right hon. gentleman beside me (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) created the Canadian Navy, and obtained from the Mother Country the right for Canada to control her own zone in the Pacific and in the Atlantic ocean. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to find that at least in the Canadian House of Commons we have had a Canadian field day. We heard expressions of opinion from the other side of the House which make me think that many of the hon. gentlemen should sit on this side. I see no one on this side who would want to cross and take a seat on the other side. I believe there has been a healthy injection of good sound Liberal doctrine into the present Government, but I must warn my hon. friend, the President of Council, that if titles are abolished, as they will be if this amendment is voted upon this evening, there is great danger that with blatant jingoism, acute Imperialism and haughty militarism, the curse of every land, titles might still revive in Canada.

Imperialism which invariably leads to jingoism, because it is a more acute form of imperialism, breeds aristocratic tendencies, it is the seed plot of titles. Sir, there are some gentlemen in this country who do not care much now to be called Canadians. In this city of Ottawa a society of women gravely decided that in future they should not sing "O Canada." It was too vulgar; it was too common! We have reached a point in our history when some people are ashamed to claim Canada as their native country. I think my honourable friend the president of the Council (Mr. Rowell), when he was a Liberal, claimed that he was proud to be a citizen of the British Empire, but it is not our only citizenship as we are all proud to be Canadians. The one citizenship doesn't exclude the other. But, when a journalist has acquired a large fortune in this Canadian commonwealth, if he tastes the wine of imperialism and of jingoism, if perchance he goes across and meets lords and dukes, he suddenly asks himself: "Why should I not get a title?" That is the psychological moment when he forgets his Canadian citizenship and adopts flunkeyism. He then is ready to sacrifice the independence of his paper, to sell his pen

and that of his editors in order to parade as Sir So-and-So, or Lord So-and-So.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that in the House of Commons, Conservatives and Liberals have united this evening in the sentiments which have been embalmed in both the resolution and the amendment. We have at last realized that the time has come to do away with all these trappings, with all this fuss and feathers, proclaiming that we are proud to be simply Canadians, simply British subjects, law-abiding citizens of a great democracy.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I would not have interjected any remarks into this debate but for the unfortunate reference made by the honourable member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to Lord Beaverbrook.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I can prove that, you know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The honourable gentleman has undertaken to prove things before and has signally failed. Lord Beaverbrook is a gentleman of whom every honest Canadian may be proud. The statement which my honourable friend made that Lord Beaverbrook had reflected on French Canadians in his book is absolutely untrue and without foundation in any way, sense or shape. His reflections on Lord Beaverbrook in connection with any business transactions in which he has engaged are utterly unfounded. The cement merger, or any other merger that has been spoken of, or any other transaction that the honourable member has mentioned, is clean in comparison with deals that my honourable friend has been associated with. He will not question me; I have the facts.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sir Sanford Fleming had the facts.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman failed to get a knighthood when nearly every Liberal in the Cabinet of the right hon. gentleman who sits at his left (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was plastered with titles, hereditary and others, obtained from the British Government. Lord Beaverbrook's name will go down in history while the names of some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here to-night will have been forgotten. Lord Beaverbrook will stand as having done more for the cause of democracy and humanity than all the Lemieuxs that ever wore mufti or uniform in any part or at any time in the history of the world. It is absolutely uncalled for to drag in the name of an honoured man who has done so much for the cause of democracy

in this war and who has derived no profit while engaged in upholding this great cause. The hon. gentleman has vituperated the leader of the Opposition to-night. Why did not the leader of the Opposition recommend for a knighthood the hon. member from Maisonneuve? Nearly every man in his Cabinet got one. Canada was dosed with them as never before, and if there is a revulsion of feeling against titles coming from Great Britain now it is partly due to the fact that the leader of the Opposition accepted a title himself after declaring on every platform that he was a democrat to the hilt, and then labeling his own followers for sixteen years until titles got to be common.

An hon. MEMBER: What about honorary colonels?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Honorary colonels were conferred, as honours are conferred on men at the front, on citizens who had done this country some service. Take Jack Stewart and scores like him; their names will go down as men who have done something in this war. We are proud of what some of these honorary colonels have done. We are not ashamed of the honorary colonels. I would not have said one word if it had not been for the reference made to my friend, Max Aitken, who has done not only more than I can tell here to-night but has practically saved the situation on more than one occasion in connection with this great war. I have examined statements which have been made about Max Aitken over and over again, and I tell the hon. member from Maisonneuve that the meanest transaction that Aitken was ever associated with is clean compared with the best that the hon. member from Maisonneuve and his friends were ever associated with. I am in a position to back that up. I had the honour to be talking with a gentleman in Montreal and he said that he could not understand how it was that I would associate with Max Aitken. He named Max Aitken and a couple more of my good friends. I said to him: "My Christian friend, I have heard of all your palavering from one end of the country to the other, and I am in a position to tell you that the dirtiest transaction in which Lord Beaverbrook was ever concerned was clean in comparison with the best I have heard of you, and I know of your doings from British Columbia to the Atlantic." Now I make the statement to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve—let him take it up and I will meet him on his own ground: Lord Beaverbrook's dirtiest transaction, that I have heard of, is clean

compared with what my hon. friend has been associated with. Come along, now.

I stand here to-night to endorse the Order in Council as read by the Prime Minister. As far as the amended resolution is concerned, I am not just prepared to endorse it; I have never yet been troubled, either on account of my crown, stars, cross-swords or titles; I do not have to be. Let me supplement the remarks of my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), my good old opponent and colleague in days gone by in the House. He quoted from Robbie Burns about some character who was a laird in the old days in Scotland. Let me point out to him that one swallow does not make the summer. There is a supplementary statement to the verse he quoted from, it runs like this:

> And man for man the world o'er
> The best is he, an' a' that
> Who stands erect in self respect
> And acts the man, an' a' that.

Whether labouring man or laird the individual who counts and whom we want in this part of the world is the "man" and not the "autocrat." I want to point out, Sir, that the spirit shown by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in his little braggadocio was amusing to me. Imagine for an instant, if you can, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier sliding over the market square to deposit his insignia of office in a pile. Why, wild horses would not drag him there. Talk about autocracy and democracy, there is not a democratic act I have known of that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has ever practised. In the past he has taken the most autocratic position, and as a member of the old Liberal party he always did that. He ruled his following then and rules them now more firmly than the Kaiser ever ruled Germany. We have sitting on the floor of this House to-night a gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who was Minister of Finance in the Cabinet of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and when the great question of creating two new provinces in the Northwest, was consummated, the gentleman to whom I refer never was consulted but was led into the House to vote like a whipped child.

Mr. W. S. FIELDING (Shelbourne and Queens): If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt. I was in Europe when the Bill respecting the organization of the new provinces in the Northwest was drawn and I could not be consulted. When I came back I took my stand on that matter, and my position was stated in the House. When the hon. gentleman states that I was not consulted he is not putting the facts fairly before the House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I made the statement that the hon. gentleman was not consulted, and I repeat it. I do not know where he was, but I make the statement that he sat in the House and went back on the principles which he had enunciated year after year, to my certain knowledge. The then Minister of the Interior, Mr. Clifford Sifton, now Sir Clifford Sifton, was not consulted either. He told me that he had not been consulted in relation to these matters. But the Apostolic Delegate from Rome was consulted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the formation of the provinces in question when responsible ministers of the Crown and responsible members of the House of Commons were not consulted. Talk about your democracy, why that is the very height of autocracy.

I might point out to this Government that a great many persons consider that many of the Orders in Council passed from time to time by the present Administration do not savour of democratic ideas as interpreted by the people. I might point out further that we talk of democracy, but where in the world can you find—and I am no defender of the nobility, I have taken just as strong a stand against the aristocracy of Great Britain as any man living, I believe now and have always believed in democracy and try to prove myself a consistent democrat—where in the civilized world can you find a race of men who have so solidly stood for the cause of democracy and have again and again intervened between the tyranny of the Crown on the one hand and the tyranny of the mob on the other, to such an extent and to such a degree as the so-called aristocracy of England have done whether you take the laws made on the field of Runnymede, which has been referred to by the Prime Minister, the time of King Charles referred to by my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson), or the time of King William. Always the British aristocracy have been on the side of true democracy, and I say here that the aristocracy of England have ever been the greatest democrats. That is, taken as a body. Of course now and then you will find autocrats among them, but taken as a body they have stood more for the liberty of the people than the people themselves have ever done, and always to a greater degree than the Sovereign himself has in that regard excepting William Prince of Orange. Moreover, in the

South African War—and I do not hold any mandate from those gentlemen, because as every one knows I have had my own struggles with some of them to keep them in their place—the nobility showed the spirit that they are made of. When gentlemen here were opposing every move made to protect the integrity of the Empire, and were doing nothing to bring about a proper defence of the Empire and to assure victory, at that time the nobility of Great Britain were going down like ninepins, leading their men on the field of battle. And in the present war famous house after famous house, famous name after famous name, has been wiped out from amongst the nobility of Great Britain, having gone down in the great struggle. Whatever else they may be reproached with, the aristocracy of Britain cannot be accused of not taking a fearless stand for the great cause of democracy and going down almost to a man.

I might point out while on my feet that the charge made against the nobility of Great Britain—and I want them distinctly separated from the autocracy of Britain, because the autocracy of Britain, as I regard it, are the labour unions, not the nobility of the country at all—it has been charged here today by the hon. gentleman who so beautifully moved this resolution, that a great deal of the vacant land of England was due to the nobility who had driven the people off it. The exact opposite is the fact to-day. I want to tell the mover of the resolution that one can raise grain at Calgary and land it in London cheaper than it can be brought from the highlands of Scotland to London, and it is the competitin of the western states for the last half century and of our own great prairies which has caused the lands in the highlands of Scotland to be unproductive.

Mr. NICKLE: Possibly the hon. gentleman did not quite catch my meaning this afternoon. I said nothing about sowing grain, I talked about raising sheep.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My hon. friend does not know what he is talking about. Let me inform him that the ground formerly devoted to raising oats is now used for raising sheep. On the island of Mull the very ground that for the last thirty years has been raising sheep was once raising oats. There were once 37,000 people in the Island of Mull. There are now only 2,500. They raised oats then, and they raise sheep to-day, and it is not due to the fact that there is a landlord, but that their fields could not compete with the prairies of the United States, and accordingly the settlers have gone hither and thither, and the inhabitants are now raising sheep, because it does not pay to raise oats. The honourable member for Kingston should be more careful, and know whereof he speaks.

They are truly democratic in England. I remember the first time I was over there many years ago. The toast to the King was honoured by every one standing. The next toast was to the Prince of Wales, and in this country, this land of autocrats and nabobs, everybody bobs up when the toast to the Prince of Wales is drunk. I stood up, but a gentleman pulled me down, saying: "We never stand for the toast to the Prince of Wales in England." They toast the King, not because he is King, but because of the sovereign position which he occupies. They never stand for dukes, lords and princes; they remain in their seats and drink in silence. England is where you find the truest democracy.

Now, speaking of labour unions—and I had no intention of bringing this up—the great danger to this country to-day is the autocracy of labour unions. I use that statement advisedly. We have had in recent times the example of Bolshevikism, and the greatest autocracy that has ever disgraced the world, to my mind, has been in Russia, where the attempt to raise a nation from labour unions is being tried by those who pose as democrats and who are looked up to as democrats. The greatest tyranny we have to face now is the autocracy and tyranny of the men who pose as democrats, though they have not a democratic principle in their whole constitution. Until these labour unions are put in their place, until the country sees that these organizations have no right to limit the production of commodities in our factories, until labour unions abrogate the right to hold themselves as a separate and distinct body in the nation—a nation within a nation,—we will never have democratic government, we will have government by the most irresponsible and autocratic element in any land. I back labour unions so far as they benefit their members and help production; but when they say: You shall limit production, and no man shall act on his own behalf—even the Order in Council introduced last Friday which ties up every man for labour—limits a man that goes out on strike; that is the only thing that I objected to in that Order—until that time arrives we are going to have

trouble, and we will be ruled by the most irresponsible autocracy.

I have no intention of saying a word in this debate, but the unfortunate rejoinder of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who probably feels hurt that he was ignored by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the days when he was securing titles for everybody, and who was smarting under that disappointment, evidently caused him to speak as he did.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the hon. gentleman be willing to throw his title on the bonfire in the market-place?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not have to depend on titles. The people know I am one of the boys, and that I am always ready to deliver the goods

Mr. BUREAU: If they do not, then you tell them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, never mind. Let me repeat: Lord Beaverbrook has been attacked most maliciously in this country. I tell the hon. gentlemen, and those who have been attacking him here, and the irresponsibles in England, who are not fit to black his shoes, that I know the man himself as I know the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I am speaking of what I know.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Flavelle?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I say to him here to-night that the meanest transaction which Max Aitken has ever been connected with is clean compared with some of the deals that the hon. member has been associated with. Some one asks me: What about Flavelle? He is a gentleman who has caused all this turmoil. Talk of the water in stocks—what about the water in pork?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My good friend, the President of the Privy Council is supposed to be his right hand man, and he is a "democrat to the hilt"; and the other runs the pork end of it. I shall not here enter into a discussion of anything in that connection to-night, but I am taking the liberty of informing the House, that possibly at no distant date, should opportunity arise in the House, I am prepared for a very interesting and lengthy discussion in connection with many institutions with which that gentleman is connected. There are old things to be uncovered, and a true statement of affairs on many matters of interest to the public in the past two or three years may yet come out fairly and squarely, and will prove very interesting. Let me tell the hon. member for Maisonneuve that I shall not tolerate the making of wrong charges or the slandering of a gentleman as he has slandered Max Aitken here to-night.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) who has just sat down is a splendid illustration of the desirability of doing away with titles. We are too close to judge of men's honour here, we have to see them in perspective, and coming down from our province by the sea, with the straits of Northumberland between us and the mainland, we can view this gentleman's virtues better than those in other parts of the Dominion. I want to say of my hon. friend who has just sat down, with all his idiosyncrasies and peculiarities, with all his humour, that, in my judgment, notwithstanding all these, and all the mistakes he has made, he will occupy a niche in the hall of fame in future history because of his great performance in connection with this war. But simply for that probably, and nothing more. With regard to another titled gentleman here, whom I see beside me, his title is a rag compared with the glorious position that he will occupy in the history of his time and of his country—I refer to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that grand, lone figure, who during the last five or six months has stood out and led his people out of the land of Egypt and the house of bondage alone, with the men who ought to be supporting him heaping vituperation and abuse upon him! In the future, when the history of these times is written, his name will stand out as the greatest star of these times. The greatest Imperial statesman of our great Empire. Imperial in the best sense of that word.

There are two kinds of imperialism. There is the kind that stands for the integrity of the great British Empire, not as a solidified nation, but as a great federal body, in each part of which autonomy, home rule, obtains. The only way that this great Empire can be united is, as the poet Willie said, by the "chains of liberty." That is Laurier imperialism!

Some hon. gentlemen have referred to Robbie Burns. They do not seem to realize that Robbie Burns was a prophet. The following are the concluding words of that famous poem of his to which hon. gentlemen opposite have referred:

> "Then let us pray that come it may,
> As come it will for a' that;
> That sense and worth o'er all the earth
> May bear the gree and a' that.

For a' that, and a' that,
Their tinsel show and a' that;
The man of independent mind
Is king of men for a' that."

What would it matter to our titled friends if they should burn their titles to-morrow? The position given to them by their miserable titles does not amount to a scrap of paper compared with the position they must occupy in the future ,when each man will be judged on his merits.

Like other members who have spoken on this subject, I am against the degradation of Canadian public life by the conferring of titles, and I desire to put myself on record as supporting the amendment.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Mr. Speaker, it will doubtless seem presumptuous to you that at this late hour of the night and after so lengthy a debate I should rise to address the House, particularly when I am deeply conscious of how far I fall short of the eloquence and research which has had my admiration and envy this afternoon. But, like the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), I had given hostages on this question, as it had come up among others during the election, and I should not be redeeming one of the few promises I was called upon to make if I did not put myself on record.

It was a pleasure to have the resolution introduced into this House, and it was a still greater satisfaction to have the Order in Council which had been prepared by the Government laid before the House. The amendment just proposed receives, it is evident, the support of practically every member present, if one may judge from the unanimous expression of opinion; and so far as I am concerned it receives my heartiest support. I do, however, wish to dissociate myself from some remarks which may be fairly construed into an attack on the House of Lords. While the Parliament of Cromwell might well pass a resolution commencing as follows:

The Commons of England assembled in Parliament, finding by too long experience that the House of Lords is useless and dangerous——"

I do not think it becomes the Parliament of any overseas dominion to reflect upon or criticize an institution which pertains almost altogether to the legislation of Great Britain, particularly at a time like this, when, as a former speaker said, that institution, its members and their descendants have done much to redeem themselves from the disdain with which they had been treated.

[Mr. Read.]

In view of the fact that 150 heirs to hereditary titles have already fallen in the war, and that some 2,000 recipients of honours have gone to their last home, I should be sorry to be a party to anything in the nature of criticism. But it is clear that neither the Order in Council—I think that the Prime Minister referred particularly to that point—nor the resolution or amendment do reflect in any way upon that House, so that one can support them without hesitation.

I agree with what the mover of the resolution said, that even in the midst of war this question should receive our immediate and urgent attention. Debrett states that during the past three years, since the war began, honours have been conferred in 7,900 cases; that, of course, includes the various companionships. During the last twelve months, 3,870 such Orders have been granted; 18 peers have been created; 32 baronets, 277 knights and 3,472 companions. These, with some additional honours granted to existing peers make up the total of 3,870, so that if that flood is to continue—and in comparison with past years, it is a flood—we in Canada could not fail to be inundated by it.

As the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) has said, the objection to speaking late in the course of a discussion is that one's arguments have all been advanced, one's quotation used, and little remains to be said. I should like, however, to emphasize the difficulty which the Prime Minister pointed out regarding the fourth section of the Order in Council. I agree with him that great difficulties exist, and although they may be removed by the action of the Imperial Parliament, that, as he pointed out, involves the consent of the House of Lords. As late as 1907 a case came before the House of Lords which illustrates the tenacity with which the Lords guard their privileges. It appears that in 1302 a picturesque individual who went by the name of Roger le Bygod surrendered his earldom of Norfolk to Edward I. Ten years later Edward II. granted to Thomas de Brotherton this earldom, and for many years that new family enjoyed the honour. In 1907 a direct descendant of Thomas de Brotherton asked to be confirmed in the title. But the Lords held that the original earl could not surrender his title, that the charter granted ten years later was invalid, and that the only persons entitled to the Norfolk title were the original descendants of our friend Bygod. As Lord Halsbury puts

it "No peer of this realm can drown or extinguish his honour." As one knows, the doctrine of ennobled blood, based perhaps upon the same foundation as the divine right of kings, appears to endow the nobility with that ichor or ethereal fluid which supplies the veins of the gods instead of the blood of mortals, so that do what one may, it is a difficult matter to get rid of hereditary titles once they are granted. This, then, is the time to take action to prevent their entry into Canada, and for that reason the resolution should have the support not only of this House but of the country at large.

The mover of the resolution and others have pointed out very strikingly the evils which spring from the granting of titles. The harm is not so much to the recipient as to the rest of the community. Man is prone to worship, and too often, as we all know, he is ready to worship false gods. I remember Henry George prefacing one of his chapters with the translation of a proverb of India:

White parasols and elephants mad with pride are the flowers of a grant of land.

It seems to me that might be paraphrased under these circumstances:

White stockinged serving men and a populace mad for worship are the flowers of a patent of nobility.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Westminster District): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say at this hour, but I venture to think that perhaps the House will permit a new voice from the far West to express his very hearty endorsation of the principles that have been so ably and fully set forth this afternoon and evening. I labour under a disadvantage and a handicap. Being a new member, I have been careful to read the rules of the House, and I find there is a prohibition against repetition. It is, therefore, almost impossible to avoid the consequences of an injunction at this hour. I think I voice to some extent the opinion of the far West when I say that the expressions that have been made here today will give to the people of the West intense satisfaction and delight. We were inclined to think that perhaps radicalism would find, or had found its fullest expression in the West. But I do not think there has been heard from any platform in the West any more radical or thoroughgoing democratic expressions and statements than have been made here this afternoon from the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

I would not presume to pass any criticism whatever upon any English habits or customs at the present time. We know that the Premier of Great Britain has stated openly and publicly his great debt and gratitude to the labour unions of Britain. He has gone out of his way, if I may say so, to express his intense satisfaction with the attitude of the labour element of England their contribution towards the victory that is before us as a people. It becomes us, I take it, to confine our criticisms at least to our own country, and our own business, and the question that is before the House. If there is one reason more than another why I believe the people of Canada are in sympathy with the attitude and action that is proposed this afternoon, it is this, that certain people receive titles which, in the judgment of those who know them best, their fellow citizens, their own friends, they do not deserve. I may be wrong in some cases, but I know in many cases this is the deliberate conviction of the people of Canada. The question may be asked: Why are the Canadian people opposed to this? Answers have been given in great numbers this afternoon, and I shall sum them all up in one sentence which, I think, covers the entire ground—the Canadian people do not want titles. They have many reasons for taking that stand, but the result is the same in every case. They believe that true merit is, "when unadorn'd, adorn'd the most."

I have been impressed with this thought that after all the voice of history is truly democratic. Reference was made by my hon. friend from Springfield to certain names which are known in history without any appendage. The fact is that in the whole realm of history, whether we take the field of letters, the field of science, the field of art, the realm even of religion, the realm of philosophy or the realm of statesmanship, the outstanding names in each one of those departments is without a title of any type, shape or character. To quote the language of one of my hon. friends this afternoon, who would dream of adding any title to some of the great names of English history, particularly of English letters? From Homer down to Lloyd George they are all alike; they stand unadorned because they are adorned with the force of their own merit, their own manhood and their own superb character. If I remember my Canadian history aright, I think that during the last few years when the people of Canada have been appealed to to decide some great national question, two or three words would have summarized that appeal. In 1873 the issue before the Canadian people could have been summarized in two words.

In 1878 possibly two words again would have summarized the character of the appeal. In 1896, possibly three words would have covered the character of the appeal. In 1911 one word summarized the great issue, and in 1917 I claim that one single word before the Canadian people from East to West summarized the character and the nature of the issue which the people of Canada were called upon to decide. And, Sir, if it were feasible, even hypothetically considered for a moment, that this Canadian Parliament were dissolved, and an appeal to the country made on one issue, and that issue were summarized in these words "Canadian democracy," and on the obverse side of the shield "Titled aristocracy," and the people of the country voted on that issue, what would be the result? I believe we should have a unique thing in the history of the parliaments of the world—an absolutely united Government. There would not be a man in opposition from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and then, Sir, for once in our life, I believe we would be free in such a contest from all that appeals to race and religion and sectional strife. They would be all set aside, and the people from the East to the West, and from the North to the South would unite solidly, and there would be no words such as some of us deplored having heard in the House of Commons. There would be no disagreement, such as we have listened to in this House, but from East to West we would have a united Canada, and, perhaps, some one might be able to compose a new national anthem that would bring in the strains of "The Maple Leaf," "O, Canada," and "God Save the King," and we would be no longer French Canadians or English Canadians, but Canadians, from North to South and East to West.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne Queens): I regret I had to be absent during part of the evening, having had to attend a committee meeting, and had not the pleasure of hearing my hon. friend, the President of Council (Mr. Rowell), nor the addresses of the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the amendment. I am informed, however, that an amendment has been moved, condemning all titles, and that is the issue upon which we are about to vote. Let me say that while, as most of my friends are aware, I have less appreciation, perhaps, than some others, less enthusiasm as to the value of these titles, I have never gone to the point of saying that all titles in Canada should be put an end to. I think the argument against hereditary titles is absolutely complete and unanswerable. I am glad that that argument was presented, not only by the hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Brome, but also in the very important Order in Council which the right hon. the Prime Minister brought down. But with respect to titles generally, leaving aside those of an hereditary character, though, as I say I am not as enthusiastic as some others in my admiration of them, I am free to admit that there may be circumstances—it has seemed so in the past—that might justify them. I do not think we should discuss it from a personal point of view. If one cared to do that, we could go over the list of gentlemen honoured with titles, and many of them would be recognized as men who have won eminence in the particular lines in which they are engaged. Some titles have been granted which are open to criticism. In some cases gentlemen who have been a short time in the public service, who might modestly have waited a little longer, have been ready to seize the title when the opportunity came. From one viewpoint if you take the whole list of titles you could find very little ground to take exception to any one of them. One may say that all the recipients are decent, honourable respectable people. But if you take up the list and go over them one by one and say, wherein does this man differ from a hundred men around him, what service has he rendered, what distinction has he in the community, what reason was there for giving him a title any more than giving it to a hundred men around him?—you may fail to get an answer. It is a case in which you might quote the old lines:

> The thing itself is neither rich nor rare,
> The only wonder is how it got there.

But I am not prepared to go so far as the hon. gentleman who would condemn the titles generally. I think, properly awarded, there is something to be said in favour of the system, and an abuse of a system is never a good reason for abolishing it. While I am not as warm in my admiration for titles as some others, I would be content to-day to adopt the moderate position taken by the hon. member for Kingston and I should be content to vote against hereditary titles, because I think, in that respect, the argument is complete and unanswerable.

A word more—not of any importance. My hon. friend from Victoria-Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes), who is not in his seat now, made some allusion to the conferring of

titles at the time when the right hon. leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister, and he rather intimated that all the gentlemen in that Government got titles. They did not all get titles. Quite a number did not. While my hon. friend was speaking, I made a little calculation. I may be wrong, I am giving this thing in all good faith, subject to correction—"errors and omissions excepted." If I am correct in my memorandum—I am confining myself to the Cabinet ministers who quietly drew titles to themselves, and I am not finding fault with any of them—I find that in the Cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the following gentlemen drew titles: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Louis Davies, Sir Allen Aylesworth, Sir Richard Scott, Sir Frederick Borden and Sir William Mulock. They all received titles when they were Cabinet ministers. These count six in number. I find that in the Cabinet which succeeded them, and of which my hon. friend the hon. gentleman from Haliburton was an ornament, the following gentlemen drew titles: Right hon. Premier, the Hon. Messrs. Kemp, Perley, Foster, White and Hughes. They count six. That means that in six years of the Government of which my hon. friend was a member they drew to themselves as many knighthooas as the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier drew in fifteen years.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: While I was absent from the Chamber a little while ago my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) moved an amendment to the resolution which is now under consideration, and to the exact meaning of which I think the attention of hon. gentlemen of this House ought to be directed before any vote is passed upon it. As I understand the amendment of the hon. gentleman, it would convert the resolution as originally proposed into a resolution which reads as follows:

> To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, Most Gracious Sovereign,
>
> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon your subjects domiciled or living in Canada.

Now, if we are to proceed along the lines evidently intended by this resolution, I think all hon. members of the House will agree that the language should be carefully selected, and we should not adopt any form of words which might go beyond the meaning and intent of those who are proposing to vote in favour of it. During the past three years we have had a very large number of men fighting overseas for this Dominion, for the British Commonwealth of which it forms a part, and for the cause which the allied nations are supporting in this war. In the course of their military service, a great many men from our own Dominion, from the other dominions of the Empire, and from the United Kingdom have from time to time been honoured by their Sovereign, in recognition of their heroic services, with certain classes of distinction which might be regarded as coming within the terms of the resolution as now presented. The word "title" might probably embrace a great many of the honours which have been conferred upon men during the past three years for actual service in the field. It certainly would cover distinctions that have been conferred upon several of them at least. There are two classes of the Order of the Bath. One is a civil class conferred upon people for services of a civil character. There is also a military class of the Order of the Bath, conferred in its various distinctions, upon men for actual service in the field. There are also other orders by which actual service in the field is recognized. There is the Victoria Cross, the highest of all. There is a D.S.O is there not?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, the Distinguished Service Order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is the Military Cross and there are other distinctions for actual service in the field. I should think that the House might well pause before it should exercise upon our men, who have fought as gallantly and as well as any men from any other part of the Empire, or any allied nations, a discrimination which they would regard as absolutely unjust, and which might be brought about by the terms of the amendment as proposed. If we are to embark upon this proposal, we should carefully select the language in which it is to be couched. Further than that, I would respectively suggest that if we are to embark upon the policy of affording no recognition for any kind of service by any such means in future, we might very well consider whether those distinctions already granted in this country ought not to be abolished. In view of the fact that we have had no notice until to-night of the proposal which has been put forward by the hon. member from Springfield, I think the House should consider the question more maturely and, at all events select some form of words which would not discriminate against

the soldiers from this Dominion and place them in a different position to those from the United Kingdom and from other parts of the Empire. Having in mind these considerations, I move, Mr. Speaker, that the debate upon this motion, and upon the amendment, be now adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the debate is to be adjourned, will my right honourable friend give us a day to take it up again?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Probably the right honourable, the leader of the Government, would prepare a resolution worded in such a form as might be acceptable to the House, and if so, would be perfectly willing to accept it in place of my amendment.

Motion agreed to,and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—DECORUM OF THE HOUSE.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. SPEAKER: I would draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that it is provided by the rules that honourable members may not leave their seats until the Speaker has left the Chair. It is hardly in conformity with the dignity of the House that the Speaker and the mace should rustle with honourable members for possession of the means of egress from this chamber.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Tuesday, April 9, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. JOSEPH READ.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Kings): I rise to a question of privilege. I notice in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning an excerpt taken from the Hansard report of the debate on April 5, as follows:

Quebec Difficulties.

From Hansard Report, House of Commons, April 5, 1918.

Sir Sam Hughes: I am satisfied that if common sense had been exercised this trouble would not have occurred. I do not look upon it as a matter of very great importance, but it is of great importance to know what the unseen power is that has prevented these splendid boys—and there are no finer in the world—from following the dictates of their own impulses and joining the forces. What has prevented them—?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. Joseph Read: Let me tell you—bigotry.

Sir Sam Hughes: I am very sorry to hear that. I do not think these boys are actuated by bigotry; I know they are not, and I hope that the power behind them is not bigotry.

The honourable member for Victoria when he made that statement, misapprehended the methods of a good soldier because by implication he made me appear to say that these boys were actuated by bigotry. I never intended to make that assertion, and the subsequent speech which I made in the House at the end of the debate will show what I did mean. I just take this opportunity of drawing attention to it so that there will be no misapplication of what I said.

VAN BUREN BRIDGE COMPANY.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways) for the third reading of Bill No. 14 to confirm an agreement between His Majesty the King, and the Van Buren Bridge Company.

Mr. MICHAUD: I wish to move an amendment to the third reading of this Bill:

That all the words in the said motion after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The said Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole of the House for the purpose of adding to clause 1 of said Bill the following words: Provided that the Railway Station at St. Leonards on the line now known as the International railway shall be maintained, reconstructed if destroyed and kept in operation during the term of the said agreement.

This means that the present station shall not be removed but shall remain where it is at present.

Mr. REID: Perhaps the honourable gentleman will explain what he means by that.

Mr. MICHAUD: The explanation is that the people living at St. Leonards do not wish to have the station now built on the International railway transferred to the Transcontinental railroad. They want to leave the station at the terminus of the International railway. On the second reading of the Bill I presented a petition which urges very forcibly that no change be made in case the Government leases the branch line between the Transcontinental and the International railways. In the name of the people of St. Leonards I ask the Government not to remove the station but to leave it where it is at this moment.

Mr. REID: We discussed this matter in committee and the honourable gentleman

is only moving again on the lines of that discussion. The object of the Bill is to make provision that the International railway and the Transcontinental railway may be connected by a small piece of railway, two or three miles in length, that we are leasing and which has been operated by the Bangor and Aroostook railway. I do not think that any member of the House would think that the suggestion of the honourable member that we keep both stations is fair or reasonable. The Government now own and operate the Transcontinental railway between Lévis and Moncton, and on that line there is a station in the village or town of St. Leonards. Since the Transcontinental railway was taken over by the Government, they have purchased what is known as the International railway running between Campbellton and St. Leonards. The International railway had a station also in the town of St. Leonards, and it has been running into that station. The Government therefore are compelled to keep up two stations and to maintain that portion of the road, two or three miles in length, that is being operated by the International railway from the point where it will branch off to go over to the Transcontinental station. It does not seem to me that it is in the public interest that we should keep up two stations in one place and it does also strike me that it is much better for the travelling public that all the trains should go to the one station. As I understand, from what the hon. member said a few evenings ago, the International railway station is a little nearer that of the Canadian Pacific railway and it would be more convenient perhaps for passengers coming in on the International who wanted to go to the Canadian Pacific railway. They would have a little less distance to walk than if they had to go from the Transcontinental Railway station. But, as shown by the statements of the hon. member, and by plans which I submitted the other evening, the distance between the Canadian Pacific Railway station and the Transcontinental is only about one thousand or twelve hundred feet. I cannot see why the people of St. Leonards should ask us to keep up two stations. This small piece of road is necessary for traffic passing over the International railway to the Transcontinental railway and in order that we shall not be paying for the carriage of that traffic to the Bangor and Aroostook railway. Under the circumstances I could not possibly accept the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member, and in the interest of the public service, and for the convenience of the public that travel on both Government lines, I would ask the House to reject that amendment and accept the agreement that has been arrived at and signed.

Mr. MICHAUD: I would like to point out—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. MICHAUD: The Minister of Railways is under a misapprehension with respect to a certain fact, and I simply desire to correct him. I wish to state that people getting off the International Railway train have not to walk to the Canadian Pacific Railway station. They have their own line running to the Canadian Pacific Railway station, and people getting off a train there connect with the up-train to Edmundston and the down-train to Grand Falls.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma E.): It may seem out of place for a member representing a constituency in Northern Ontario to interject himself into the discussion of a proposal that has to do with a purely local matter in the province of New Brunswick, and in so far as anything I may say on this subject might be interpreted as interfering in that connection, I apologize to the House for making any observation at all. It has not been my privilege to have visited St. Leonards. As a matter of fact, I believe, if it was necessary for me to go there I would have to consult a railway map in order to determine just how I might reach it. St. Leonards may be a metropolitan or commercial centre of very considerable importance, or it may be simply a rural community of no great importance—that is neither here nor there in so far as this subject is concerned. But there is a principle involved in the discussion that has taken place with regard to this Bill that strikes at the very root of the whole question of government ownership and operation in this country. If I have interpreted correctly the remarks of the Minister of Railways on the occasions that he has spoken on this Bill, I take it that he is acting under the advice of the responsible officers that are in charge of the Government railways; and I say, that if government-owned railways are ever going to be operated successfully, it will be when this House and the country stand behind the minister in assuming just that position.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: If Government-owned and controlled railways are to be made a pure matter of parish politics, then I have grave doubts as to the success that we shall ever attain in the operation of such railways; and if it is any consolation to the Minister of Railways to know it, I would like to say to him that here is one member of the Commons that is going to stand behind him rigidly in following the policy of his predecessor and turning an absolutely deaf ear to those who would subjugate a great national undertaking to a simple basis of political grab, which is what many members of this House, representing different parts of the country, apparently desire to do with Government-owned railways.

Amendment negatived, Bill read third time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 5, to amend the Dominion Lands Act, was read third time.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

PROVISION FOR APPOINTMENT OF A JUDGE AD HOC.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 27, to amend the Supreme Court Act, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Appointment of ad hoc judge; Quebec appeals; evidence of appointment; duties; compensation; delivery of judgment.

Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to move to amend section 1, not with any desire of materially altering the nature of the Bill, but merely for the purpose of modifying the procedure by which the particular judge who is to serve may be designated.

The proposed amendment would provide that in the cases where the Exchequer Court judge is not available the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, instead of directly himself designating a particular judge who would be called in, would request of the Chief Justice of any of the provinces to designate one of the judges of the High or Superior Court in his province. I suggest this amendment because it has been pointed out to me that it was not desirable, that it might, perhaps, even be considered not to be absolutely courteous to the Chief Justices of the provinces for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court directly to intervene and select the judge who should act. In the second place, it has also been pointed out, and with considerable force, that the Chief Justice of the province from whose court the judge is to be taken is in better position to determine what judge is most available in the existing condition of business of the court in the province. The modified section will have the further advantage of proceeding, say, in the same manner as is provided in some of the provinces, if not in all, for analogous cases where it is necessary to have a judge ad hoc to sit in the Court of Appeal of the province. In the province of Quebec, for instance, where there is occasion, similar to the occasion foreseen here, to call for a judge to sit ad hoc in the Court of Appeals, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals addresses himself to the Chief Justice of the Superior Court, who, in consultation with his judges, designates the one who is to act. I think that the reasons which I have outlined, and to which my attention has been called, are sufficient to make clear that the amendment which I am about to propose would be an improvement over the system which the section originally in the Bill as introduced proposed to adopt. I beg, therefore, to move, Mr. Chairman:

That subsection (1) of Section 1 be amended by adding at the end of the subsection the words "to be designed in writing by the Chief Justice of such provincial court upon such request being made to him in writing."

That amendment will necessitate some further modifications in the balance of the section, and we might as well deal with them all at once. There is one other amendment which does not turn upon them, which I desire also to move, and it is:

That sub-section (2) be amended by striking out the designation of numeral (2) and inserting the words "provided always that."

It will then read:

Provided always that unless two of the judges of the Supreme Court available fulfil the requirements of Section 6.

And so on.

Mr. BUREAU: Those words will be inserted at the beginning of subsection (2) before the word "unless"?

Mr. DOHERTY: Instead of section (2) we will have a proviso to the first subsection. I desire further to amend it by substituting in the second line of the subsection, before the words "ad hoc," the word "the," instead of "an."

Mr. BUREAU: Striking out the words "ad hoc?"

Mr. DOHERTY: No, but substituting the definite article 'the" for "an." I wish

also to amend the third line of the present section (2) by striking out after the word "judge" the words "from a provincial court." The effect of this modification would be to make the requirement that where one of the two judges who is absent or ill, and who is to be replaced, is one of the two judges which by the statutes are required to be judges of the province of Quebec, that in this case application should be made for the judge of the provincial court wherever it is a matter of cases coming from the province of Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU: It would be a King's Bench judge?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, or if the Chief Justice chose to designate a judge of the Superior Court, I do not think he would be limited in that regard. The application would go to the Chief Justice of the provincial court. I presume he would designate a judge of his own court, I think it would be probably the proper action on the part of the Chief Justice. Of course, there might be cases where it would be difficult to do that, because an appeal might be from the judgment of that very court of appeal in which possibly one of the judges of the appeal court might have sat.

I would beg further to amend subsection (2) which, if my amendment carries, becomes the proviso, by adding at the end thereof the words "designated as above provided," so that the provision would be that he "shall be a judge of the court of King's Bench or a judge of the Superior Court of that province designated as above provided."

I beg further to amend subsection (3). This is also an amendment consequent upon the previous change to amend subsection (3) of section 1, in the first place, by substituting the figure (2) for (3) and in the second place by inserting in the second line, after the words "senior puisne judge," the words "and where a judge of the provincial court is designated to act, of the letter designating him." That particular subsection made the requisition of the Chief Justice the proof of the authority of the sitting judge, whereas in virtue of the proposed change it will be necessary to have not only a requisition of the Chief Justice but a designation by the Chief Justice of the province to complete the proof of the authority. It would be proper, at all events, to provide that the requisition and the designation shall be the proof of the authority.

Also, following upon the proposed change in subsection (1) I beg to move to amend subsection (4) by substituting the figure (3) for the figure (4), and by inserting after the word "requested" in the second line of the subsection the words "or has been so designated," to provide for the case of the judge who is properly requested, and the case of the judge who is designated.

I beg further to move to amend section (5) by substituting (4) for (5), and by inserting in the second line of the subsection, after the word "request," the words "or upon such designation." And, finally, to amend subsection 6 by substituting (5) for (6)

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I understood from the minister during the previous discussion on this Bill that he would have no objection to calling upon the second judge of the Exchequer Court in such cases.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should have no objection to allowing the second judge to sit, but as we are dealing with the final Court of Appeal of Canada it seemed to me that we should not provide for the sitting of a judge who, in the particular court to which he belongs, is the assistant judge. The reason why it had been considered desirable that the assistant judge should sit was in order to have, in cases from Quebec, and in cases where the absent judge was a Quebec judge, a judge versed in the law of that province. That object is attained by the provision that where the absent judge is one of the two judges required by the statute to be judges of the province of Quebec, and where the case to be dealt with is a case from that province, there shall be asked for and designated a judge of the Superior Court or Court of the King's Bench of the province of Quebec. So that the provision as it now stands, with the amendment, meets the necessity of having at all times, in cases from Quebec, the statutory number of Quebec judges. It did not seem, therefore, desirable that we should specify or designate the assistant judge of the Exchequer court when we had open to us the entire field of provincial judges.

Mr. MORPHY: A Bill of such importance as this cannot be properly considered until it is printed in the form which it will assume with the amendments. Five or six amendments have been proposed and discussed; some members have not heard them, and some cannot understand them. Moreover, a large number of members have not heard the remarks of the minister, and I suggest that he have the Bill referred

back and reintroduced in proper form so that we may consider it intelligently.

Mr. DOHERTY: Under ordinary circumstances I should be glad to meet this suggestion, but I should like to point out that the Supreme Court is prevented from carrying on its business at present because Mr. Justice Duff is engaged in the hearing of appeals under the Military Service Act, and, by reason of the illness of one of the other judges, it is not possible for five judges to sit in court. Accordingly, they adjourned their Court until April 15 in the hope that this measure would be adopted in time to enable them to proceed with the business. The situation is, perhaps, peculiarly urgent because of the fact that in the last term they were suffering largely from the same difficulty, and were in a position to hear only those cases in which the parties were willing to proceed with four judges. Though the amendments are numerous, they are all, with the exception of a slight modification making subsection 2 a proviso instead of a subsection, the consequence of one change, which is as follows: under the Bill as introduced it was provided that where there was need for an ad hoc judge the chief justice or senior puisne judge of the court could himself select that judge. The effect of the amendment is that where there is need for an ad hoc judge, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court may address himself only to the Chief Justice of any of the provinces, asking him to provide an ad hoc judge. The Chief Justice so applied to would thereupon, no doubt in consultation with his judges, designate the particular one who was to act. That is the entire effect of the proposed amendment. The others, with one exception, are the necessary consequences of making that change. Then there is an amendment merely to meet what was suggested the other evening: that in cases coming from Quebec you might not have a court constituted in compliance with the express requirements of the statute, which makes it necessary that there shall be two judges taken from the bar of the province of Quebec. The amendment provides that in such a case a judge shall be applied for rather than a judge of the Exchequer Court taken. I should be glad, therefore, if the committee could see its way clear to deal with this matter to-day. If, of course, hon. gentlemen feel that they have not had proper opportunity of fully grasping the effect of the amendments, we must meet that; I would not ask the committee or the House to pass a measure without having ample opportunity of becoming thoroughly familiar with its provisions. But I may add that if the measure is to enable the Supreme Court to proceed on the 15th, it will have to go through the Senate as well as through this House and receive the assent of the Governor General during the present week.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. MORPHY: I appreciate to the full the argument of the Minister of Justice, but I still feel like adhering to the request I have made, that the Bill be brought back printed as it will appear with the amendments, for further discussion. The minister has told us that through his importuning all the Superior Court judges of the province of Quebec are sitting on the tribunals. I suggest that he take the balance of the Supreme Court judges that are here and put them with Mr. Duff in order that the work may be speeded up. In the meantime, the Supreme Court work can be postponed for a little while, notwithstanding the great importance of the cases that may be awaiting trial.

I am pleased that my main objection, about which I purposed saying a word, was removed by the amendment striking out the name of the Chief Justice in section 1. Nevertheless, the measure is a very far-reaching one; it extends over the jurisdiction of the whole country, and there may be some points to be raised even as the Bill stands now. I do not think it is fair to ask the House, on such an important measure as this, to take absolutely the word of the Minister of Justice for everything. As we are supposed to be individuals here, we are surely entitled to consider for ourselves the full effect of any measure that is brought before the House. I again request the minister to have the Bill referred back, reprinted and introduced in the proper form, even although that may cause some delay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I, for my part, take very strong objection to the suggestion of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy). The Bill has been introduced and is in the possession of the House. When it has gone out of Committee, it can be reprinted. But I do not think it is in the power of this Committee to order that the Bill be reprinted with amendments that have not been accepted by the Committee. There may be some discussion on the amendments, and objections may be taken to them. I think, therefore, before we order the reprinting of the Bill, we must discuss the

Bill as it stands, and then when it is accepted by this Committee, it may be reprinted.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I regret very much that I have not heard the remarks of the Minister of Justice in regard to this Bill. While it is a very short Bill, it is very important, and it lays down a principle in connection with the judiciary of this country which should receive very careful consideration before any change is made in the general practice. Under this Bill, we give the Government power to fill temporarily vacancies which may be caused by the illness of members of the Supreme Court of Canada; but when we do that, we should not go any further, and the Governor in Council should perform its function in connection with temporarily filling these vacancies just as it does in connection with a permanent appointment to the bench. It is perhaps unfair to this country to place such a power—as would be done under this Bill as originally printed, or as it is proposed to be amended by the Minister of Justice—in the hands of the Chief Justice of Canada or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of any province. Perhaps it would be wise if the Government would adhere to the original practice, and have these appointments made, even although they are made temporarily, by an Order in Council, for which the Government shall be responsible. As to delay in having these amendments printed, I call the attention of the House to the fact that, prior to the calling together of the House of Commons, there was dislocation of the work of the Supreme Court of Canada. About a month before Parliament assembled the Supreme Court of Canada had to adjourn its sittings by reason of the illness of two of its members. If there had been absolute necessity for haste this matter might have been disposed of much earlier in the session than now. Personally, I am desirous of seeing in type the amendments which the Minister of Justice proposes to make to this Bill, and then I shall be able to vote intelligently on it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to press once more the suggestion I made the other day to the Minister of Justice about the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court. The minister will remember that when the Supreme Court was constituted Exchequer work was done by the Supreme Court. It was only in after years that a separate jurisdiction was created, and that the Exchequer Court came into existence. At first there was only one judge of the Exchequer Court, Mr. Justice Burbidge. Then the present incumbent, Sir Walter Cassels, was appointed, and an assistant judge was appointed with the same jurisdiction, the only difference being that one was the senior judge and the other the junior. My hon. friend is right in stating that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court may request the Chief Justice of any Superior Court to delegate some one to act as judge ad hoc. Would it not be more proper and more in the interests of the litigants, inasmuch as it would save time, for the chief justice to request the judge of the Exchequer Court, who originally had the same jurisdiction as he has, either to give his services as judge ad hoc or to ask his assistant to act in his stead? The reason is obvious, because it may happen that the Chief Judge of the Exchequer Court may be away. The Exchequer Court judges travel from one part of the country to another. Sometimes you have Mr. Justice Audette or Sir Walter Cassels in Prince Edward Island, or Quebec or Nova Scotia. One of the two is generally in Ottawa. There is no distinction as between their jurisdiction; it is the same except that the one is Chief Judge and the other is Assistant Judge. It seems to me it would serve the ends of justice, and it may on many occasions save time to get right in the same building the very man whom the Supreme Court would like to have to fill a gap. I shall, under these circumstances, give notice of an amendment to add to line sixteen, after the word "judge," the words "or the assistant judge."

Mr. DOHERTY: I appreciate what the leader of the Opposition has pointed out as to the impossibility, so far as I can see it, of our reprinting the Bill at this stage with the amendments in the position in which they now stand. At the same time, I have every desire in the world that the measure should not be dealt with, without every hon. member feeling he has had every opportunity to grasp its full effect and significance. Under those circumstances, we might proceed to-day in committee, and if, after we have got through the committee stage of the Bill, hon. members still feel they desire further time for consideration, we might perhaps not press the Bill further to-day. It might still be possible, if we get this Bill through this House to-morrow, to attain the result, which I think is desirable, of having the measure passed, if the House desires it should be passed, in time to put the court in a position to act next week.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Bill can be printed after it has gone through committee and before the third reading.

Mr. DOHERTY: We could have the Bill reprinted before it goes to third reading, and then everybody will have an apportunity to grasp its meaning and effect.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Will it be brought back into committee again after it is reprinted so that we may see the amendments? I have not heard a word the Minister of Justice has said to-day and I am particularly interested in the first clause of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that the Minister of Justice proposes to amend the Act by requiring the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada to ask the Chief Justice of a provincial court to designate a judge of his court who can be spared for the purpose of attending to the duties of an ad hoc judge in the Supreme Court of Canada, and thereupon it will become the duty of the Chief Justice of the Provincial Court to designate such a judge. When so designated, he becomes an ad hoc judge for the purpose of this Act.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What limitations are there as to the particular province in which the Chief Justice shall be requested to make an appointment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the judge is to supply the place of one of the judges from the province of Quebec, the application will be made to the Chief Justice of the province of Quebec. If the judge is to supply the place of one of those who have been selected in the other provinces, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would apply to the Chief Justice of the highest court of the other province.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is only in the one exceptional instance where these two things combine, namely, that the judge to be replaced is a judge originally from the province of Quebec, and secondly, that the case to be dealt with came from that province, that it is imperatively required that the Chief Justice shall go to a particular province. The reason for that is obvious: We have to meet the statutory requirements that there shall be two judges appointed from the province of Quebec. With regard to the other provinces, as the Act stands at present, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court might apply to the Chief Justice of any province. It might be desirable to provide that where the judge who had to be replaced came from some province other than Quebec, and the case itself came from some other province than Quebec, in that case the Chief Justice should address himself to the Chief Justice of some of the other provinces. That was what I had in mind. I am not quite certain if that is made absolutely clear in the Bill, but I shall be very glad to make it quite clear if, in the judgment of the committee, that method is thought the most desirable.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Is there any objection to allowing the Governor in Council to make these temporary appointments? In my opinion there is no need to pass legislation which will involve restrictions as to the appointments which may be made by the Chief Justice of a province with the assistance of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. I think if the Governor in Council would simply take the responsibility of making these appointments, in the same way that he makes permanent appointments, our troubles would be at an end.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is hardly proper to speak of these as appointments. It is simply calling upon somebody to perform duties of essentially a temporary character, and if, to meet that requirement, we legislate, as we would have to legislate, to empower the Governor in Council to appoint an ad hoc judge, we should create a situation where an assistant judge was appointed to a specific office and would hold that judicial office for only a limited period of time. I would submit to the committee that it is not desirable to have men act as judges for only a little while—men who are taken from the practice of the profession to sit as judges for perhaps a month or two, and then return to the practice of that profession. I think that would hardly be consistent with the idea, which is a very important and very fundamental one, that judges dealing with cases should be men whose entire work is of a judicial nature—men set apart for that purpose. By the method we propose we secure that the men who will act are men who are already judges, and that the individual man will be designated by the man who is in the best position to judge which one of those judges can be spared to the best advantage, from the point of view of the ordinary business of his court. It is true we might by statute empower the Governor in Council to appoint a man and to select him from among the judges of the other courts, but that would be putting in the hands of the Governor in Council the determination as to which judge in any

particular province could best be spared from the judicial work of that province. If you put that power in the hands of the Governor in Council, acting, as it would seem to me he ought to act, if he wanted to act wisely, he would consult, I think, with the Chief Justice of the Court from which he was going to take a judge away; that is one consideration. There is another consideration which I submit is not without importance, and it is this: I think it is undesirable to create a situation where we would have a particular class of appointments— appointments, it is true, not carrying with them any financial remuneration, but still implying the very high honour of being asked to sit in the Supreme Court of Canada— which would be in the hands of the Government of the day to make, and which the Government of the day would be constrained to make as among the judges. Personally I think that would create a situation where it might be suggested that the judges were liable to have ambitions for something which was in the gift of the Government. Anything tending to create that position is undesirable from the point of view of maintaining the principle which I think is of great importance, that the judicial officer should be acting in a position of absolute independence and without anything before his eyes as an object of ambition which is in the gift of the Government of the day. The question whether what is desired to be done had better be done by direct appointment of the Governor in Council or by some such method as we here propose, whereby we leave the designation of the individual who is temporarily to act to the Chief Justices, had very careful consideration before the Bill was introduced. I think that the proposed amendment improves what was originally contemplated, but as regards the choice between the Bill as now proposed to be amended, and a system by which the Governor in Council would make the appointments from among the judges, I must confess that after the best consideration I have been able to give to it, though I would of course defer to the opinion of the committee, it seems to me the balance of advantage is in favour of leaving the selection of the individual to the judicial officer in the very best position to determine who, among the judges, can best be spared. I think that there is a further objection to the appointment of these men coming from the Governor General in Council. If the Governor General in Council designates a man to act as judge ad hoc, in the Supreme Court, and the circumstances are such that he remains in that position for a term or two, and a vacancy then occurs, I think, as human nature is constituted, he finds himself face to face with a gentleman who will think that in some way he has a claim, or a particular right, to be appointed to the vacancy that occurs. That is an undesirable state of affairs. In so far as it is humanly possible, when the Government is called upon to appoint a judge, and particularly a judge of the highest court in the country, it ought to be able to approach the question of who ought to be appointed as free as possible from any claims to preference upon the part of anybody. I have tried to put before the committee the reasons which, as the result of careful consideration, led us to the conclusion that it would be better to have the matter dealt with in this way through the intervention of the existing judges than by the direct action of the Governor General in Council. There are possible objections which may be suggested to the method originally proposed. I have tried to make clear to the committee—I am sorry if I did not make myself heard by everybody—the reason which led us to think that this modification would be an improvement on what was originally proposed.

4 p.m.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would like to know if the question of remuneration is dealt with in the Bill and if there is any change in the remuneration which a provincial judge will receive when he is appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, he will receive no additional salary. All he will receive will be his travelling expenses and living allowance just as he would if he went from one city to another to perform the duties of his own court. There is no remuneration attached.

Mr. BUREAU: There are five or six amendments before the Chair which means that the whole section is now being discussed as it was first put before the House. I understand the first part of the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but not the last part. I suppose they were a repetition of the remarks made to my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Tweedie). The Minister of Justice knows very well that in the province of Quebec certain action has been taken to remedy our judicial system and I have been one of the prominent kickers as to the constitution of our Court of Review. My objection is based upon the fact that our Court of Review is composed of three judges and that these

three judges, when they sit in Montreal, are taken from among the judges of the Superior Court of the district of Montreal. Every time there is an appeal before them they have to pass upon the judgment of one of their confreres sitting on the same tribunal. If the appeal is from the judgment of the Superior Court of the district of Quebec, there are three judges chosen from the Superior Court of that district and these same judges for the time being sit as judges of the Appeal Court and have to pass upon the judgment of their confreres. I do not mention this because I have any suspicion about the honesty or righteousness of the judgments of those gentlemen sitting in review but there is a feeling about it among the public. I have often heard it said among business men that they could not understand how it was that these judges should be sitting in the same court. It is only natural that they should consult with one another when a case comes up. My honourable friend the Minister of Justice knows better than any one else, because of his long experience while practising at the bar and while occupying a position on the bench, that judges consult with each other at the court house when an intricate or a new question comes before the court for decision. That being the case, the first objection I take to this Bill is because of the provision it makes with regard to a judge of the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court is a court of exclusive federal jurisdiction. It is a Federal tribunal and when you appeal from any decision of the Exchequer Court you go before the Supreme Court and the first man you want to appoint to the Supreme Court is the man whose judgments are subject to revision by that court.

Mr. DOHERTY: In that case the judge of the Exchequer Court would be unable to sit. If it is necessary we will put in a proper provision. He is not to be applied to if he is absent or unable to sit. If there is any ambiguity about that we will correct anything that would make it possible to ask him to sit in appeal on his own judgment.

Mr. BUREAU: I am sorry if my hon. friend has ever suspected that to be my view. I do not understand the Bill in that way and I do not believe that you would ask the Exchequer Court judge to sit on the bench to pass on his own judgments. It is not the fact that he would expect to sit on his own judgments to which I take exception because I know he would not. He would not be a judge of the Exchequer Court if he went so far, or if he were so wanting in self respect, to sit and pass upon his own judgments. But there is the idea of a judge of the only federal court in Canada with original jurisdiction sitting as a judge of an appeal court which has to pass upon his own judgments. I do not say that he will sit on a case upon which he has already passed but the fact of his being part of the tribunal is not absolutely right. There is a shadow of doubt about it. I have the idea but I cannot express it. Among the judges of a court, as I think my brother lawyers well know, there is a certain solidarity.

Mr. McMASTER: Camaraderie.

Mr. BUREAU: More than camaraderie because when they meet at the court house they consult upon any important or intricate question. Judge So-and-so has given a certain decision and a judge, of course, is anxious to justify his judgments and to have them confirmed by the higher court; therefore judges consult their confreres. There is a close relationship between the judges. I do not think that the judge of the Exchequer court ought to sit as a judge of the Supreme court.

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the suggestion of the hon. gentleman be that it would be better to eliminate the judge of the Exchequer court?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not; I do not mean to abolish the Exchequer court.

Mr. DOHERTY: But to eliminate him as a judge to be called upon to act as a judge ad hoc in the Supreme court.

Mr. BUREAU: What I mean is this: instead of appointing a judge of the Supreme Court to investigate all the scandals of the late Government let that judge remain in his own court and attend to the discharge of the duties which are imposed upon him by statute. If a judge falls ill, or the increase in the business of the country demands it, why not increase the number of judges, the same as has been done in the district where I reside? There owing to the industrial growth, the litigation has been increasing, and the existing judges could not overtake the work, and therefore other judges were drawn from Montreal, Arthabaska, and other districts. If litigation is increasing rapidly the first remedy to apply is to return those judges, who are now doing outside work, to the bench of their own court and make them stay there. The second remedy I would suggest is to appoint another judge of the

Supreme Court, if the volume of business is too great for the present staff. If that were done it would give great satisfaction. I am confining my remarks to the province of Quebec because I am not familiar with the constitution of the courts in other provinces. Taking that province let me say that there is not a case which goes to the Supreme Court which has not originated from the Superior Court. If my learned friend (Mr. Doherty) is going to take a judge from the Court of King's Bench, the chances are that the case has originated in the Superior Court, and from there has gone to the Court of King's Bench, and the appeal to the Supreme Court is from the Court of King's Bench. The possible exception may be a judge taken from the Circuit Court in Montreal, where the judges have Circuit Court duties exclusively and no other jurisdicion. In my opinion, what is proposed is not a proper way to deal with litigation; the judges of the highest court in the land should be kept absolutely apart from any influence or contact whatsoever with any matter which might weigh with them when they render their decision. In taking this position, however, I want the committee clearly to understand that I do not entertain the slightest suspicion about the character of any of the judges who may be called upon to decide appeals coming before the Supreme Court. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) stated a moment ago that he would like to see an outsider appointed by the Governor General in Council. Speaking for myself, I do not concur in that.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The hon. gentleman did not correctly gather the purport of my remarks.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought my hon. friend wanted an outside barrister appointed by the Governor in Council to act as Supreme Court judge ad hoc.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I said that the Governor in Council should take the responsibility of filling vacancies temporarily, the same as they take the responsibility of making permanent appointments to the Bench, I do not care whether it be a barrister, or a judge of any Superior Court or Exchequer Court.

Mr. BUREAU: With respect to the appointment of an outsider, the Minister of Justice has answered that suggestion. If it is proposed to appoint a judge of the Superior Court for the Supreme Court my position is the same whether he be appointed by the Governor in Council, by the Superior Court, or by the Chief Justice of the Court from which he is drawn. My idea is that Courts of Appeal should not be connected in any way, whether temporarily or otherwise, with any justice or any court of inferior jurisdiction upon whose judgment they have to pass. That is one of the defects I find in our Court of Review, and it is one of the pleas I have been making for a long time that we should have a special Court of Review, composed of three judges. Under the circumstances it will be possible to secure great improvement in the judicial procedure by wise thought and careful deliberation over this matter. Our tribunals ought to be organized in such a manner as to render justice to all litigants in this country. At the present time there may be circumstances which justify the Government in utilizing the knowledge and experience of certain judges in other directions, but such provision would only be temporary, whereas what is proposed by the present legislation is of a permanent character. Now, if it is proposed to enact permanent legislation because of prevailing extraordinary or abnormal conditions, we ought to think twice before we pass such a law. Mr. Justice Duff will conclude the consideration of these war-time appeals some day, and then he will revert to his normal position in the Supreme Court and stay there. Mr. Justice Brodeur will soon recover his health, I hope, and will be able to sit all the time, as heretofore, in the Supreme Court. If the Minister of Justice considers, from the reports made to him, or as a result of his own observations, that the business of the Supreme Court has increased to such an extent as to warrant it, why not do as is done in other courts where the business becomes too great for the judges who have to administer it—why not appoint another judge. That suggestion, I submit, is worthy of the consideration of the committee. I am perfectly indifferent in the matter because I shall not suffer very much whether my suggestion is carried out or not, but I think the principle proposed to be adopted is not —I will not say vicious because that implies a meaning contrary to what I have in mind—is not a correct one, to have a man pass upon the judgment of any of his colleagues who have been acting or sitting in a particular court.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): I agree with the hon. member for Three Rivers in the opinion that it is a great mistake to have judges stepping from one jurisdiction to another. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau)

has just mentioned that he is one of the kickers with respect to the Court of Review. Let me say that he is not the only one, but that practically all the lawyers that I know of in the province of Quebec, or in the district of Montreal, are also kickers with respect to that particular court. In French it is styled the Cour de Révision, but many have called it a Court of Confirmation, because its function is to confirm judgments. If we take the record of that court we will find that it allows appeals at the ratio of perhaps one in ten cases. This does not mean that the judgments of the Court of Review are bad. Nor is there any intention in this discussion, as my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) has just said, of casting any reflection on the reputation of the Court of Review. But I maintain that when the Court of Review in Montreal hears from six to eight or ten cases each day for three or four days in succession, the court cannot fully study the records and render to them the attention which they deserve. What is true of the Court of Review should be true of the other courts; but the main point is this: It is not right and proper that judges in one tribunal should sit as judges in another tribunal.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. DENIS: We know that such is the case to-day, and any lawyer who practises in the province of Quebec is aware of it also. It is only right that judges should consult among themselves. It is only right that the five judges of the Court of Appeal should consult, but I do not think it is right that the judges of the Superior Court should consult among themselves and after that that their judgments should be revised by other judges of the Superior Court, because it is inevitable that it will often happen that when a judge of the Superior Court consults with his confreres about a case, the same case may come before the Court of Review, and one of the three judges of that court, who has been consulted before, would be sitting in the Court of Review. I do not think that is right or fair. The same principle applies here. My hon. friend has said that this Government is well able to provide the country with judges. I think that if an advertisement were put in the newspapers we could get as many judges as we need; and I do not think that in order to get a supply such a step should be necessary. There are plenty of learned and well-read lawyers in the country out of whom the Government can make judges. I do not want to launch out too far, but perhaps I may go so far as to say that it is bad enough that judges should be named for life, without taking a judge who is appointed for life and who has no account to render to anybody but his own conscience, and transfer him from one court to another. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I follow the leadership of the hon. member for Three Rivers in the conviction that this Bill should not be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt subsection (1) as amended?

Mr. BUREAU: I understood from the Minister of Justice that his amendment was made only as a matter of courtesy to the Chief Justice of the province of Quebec.

Mr. DOHERTY: Not only to him.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood that.

Mr. DOHERTY: That was one reason; it was not the only reason, nor was it only for the Chief Justice of the province of Quebec. I did mention that it was a matter of courtesy to all the Chief Justices that if a judge was to be taken from their province, they should be asked to designate him.

Mr. BUREAU: As the minister well knows, there are two judicial districts in Quebec covering the whole province. The Chief Justice of the Superior Court, Sir François Lemieux, is now in Quebec, and at other times the Chief Justice may be in Montreal. How would it be to leave to the discretion of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or the senior puisne judge of the Supreme Court, the making of this request either to the Chief Justice of the Superior Court or to the Assistant Chief Justice? While I do not want to be taken as acquiescing in any way in this legislation, because I am dead against it, and consider that it is wrong in principle, if it is going to be enacted I want to get the best procedure that I can, and that is why I make this suggestion.

Mr. DOHERTY: I hardly think there would be any advantage in providing that the acting Chief Justice in the district, say, of Montreal, shall act. Although there is an Acting Chief Justice in the district of Montreal, there is a Chief Justice of the province of Quebec, and he is the Chief Justice of the entire province.

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing he is away?

Mr. DOHERTY: If it is to meet the case of his absence, then perhaps we could provide in his absence for somebody else doing

it. There may be some advantage in that. If we carry that out, or it the chief justice——

Mr. BUREAU: Or the assistant chief justice. I do not know how it is in other provinces, but talking with my confreres I think Quebec is the only province with that situation. I understand that in other provinces there is only one judicial district for the whole province. The chief justice, whether in Montreal or Quebec, could take necessary action.

Mr. DOHERTY: The chief justice could undoubtedly draw from the whole province.

Mr. BUREAU: I admit that.

Mr. DOHERTY: If we are going to provide for the case of his absence, we will have to nominate the acting chief justice or the senior puisne judge, because if we are going to foresee it is possible that both will be absent, and if we specifically provide——

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing it happens that you have only one chief justice?

Mr. DOHERTY: In Ontario they have four or five chief justices. They are rich in chief justices in Ontario.

Mr. BUREAU: They are luckier than we are. I was not assuming any knowledge other than that of conditions in my own province. Under the circumstances, how would the Minister of Justice get around it if our chief justice was away or absent from the province of Quebec?

Mr. DOHERTY: If we insert the words "or the acting chief justice," would not that meet such a case?

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose both were away?

Mr. BOYS: We had better make it read "the senior puisne judge."

Mr. DOHERTY: If we make provision for the absence of the chief justice, then we ought to make a provision which will give assurance that there will always be somebody competent to act. Perhaps we might add the words "or acting chief justice, or senior puisne judge," or perhaps it might read "or in the absence of either or both, the senior puisne judge."

Mr. Du TREMBLAY:: Does this Bill not provide for the calling of more than one ad hoc judge at a time?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, there is no power for the calling of more than one ad hoc judge. This is the first time that there has been any provision for an ad hoc judge in the Supreme Court of Canada, and I think that if we make provision to fill the absence of one judge we are, perhaps, going as far as is necessary at present. There are six judges, five being required for a quorum, and, therefore, unless two are incapacitated for some reason, there is no need of resorting to any such provision. I did give thought to the possibility of two being needed, but I came to the conclusion that it would not be wise to create the possibility of more than one ad hoc judge sitting at a time in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: The clause does not seem to be very clear on that point. It seems to me that under the Bill more than one judge could be called to replace judges who were absent. A couple of judges of the Superior Court of Quebec might be called, or two or three from other provinces.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the language of the section makes it amply clear that the power is limited to calling for one judge. The Exchequer Court judge is first called upon, and in his absence only one other judge. There is something to be said for the suggestion that power should, perhaps, be extended to the calling of two, but for myself I do not think that desirable. I think it is undesirable except in case of absolute necessity to have sitting in the Supreme Court a judge or judges ad hoc.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Justice has stated my case exactly. I agree that it would be extraordinary if three Supreme Court judges at the same time should not be in a position to sit; therefore, this provision is for the appointment of only one ad hoc judge. The only difficulty that might be experienced in replacing the absent judge would be to comply with the Supreme Court Act in the case of judges from the province of Quebec. If this legislation is passed, I think the minister had better reconstitute the Supreme Court and be able to show whether or not the increase in business justifies an increase in the number of judges, or whether the inclemency of the weather or other circumstances will result in our being obliged to having a spare man in the background for emergencies. I was suggesting that this point should be taken into consideration, and the suggestion of the minister with regard to the provision for the emergency for a judge being absent makes my request a little bit stronger than it was before.

Mr. MORPHY: The member for Three Rivers has raised a very important point.

This Bill has not had the consideration which a measure of its importance should have had. I think that the whole difficulty can be got over if the Government itself will take the responsibility of appointing such judges as may be required—two, or three, if necessary—so that the court may always be properly constituted and so that the difficulty suggested by the member for Three Rivers could not possibly arise. The country would have confidence in the appointments of the Government, and all the difficulties suggested would fade away like a snowball in the hot sun. Let the minister put a provision in the Bill to this effect; let him do away with all these varied conditions which are likely to arise in the case of judges not being present or the case of two being required when only one is provided for. Let the Government take the responsibility so that the business of the country may not be held up at any time for want of a quorum of judges in the Supreme Court of Canada, and so that we shall have a court with, perhaps, more life in it than it has had for a long time past.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I do not think that it is a good principle to adopt that the Government should appoint a judge or judges in special cases when the properly constituted judges are unable to sit. The people would complain of these appointments; they would certainly be displeased, and would not believe it to be a good principle. Moreover, the principle of the Bill in every way is wrong. I support very strongly the suggestion of the member for Three Rivers; let us appoint another judge of the Supreme Court, if necessary. The minister knows well the position of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec; we have no judges to spare, and if any move in the matter of appointment is to be made, a good move would be to appoint someone to that Superior Court. The business of the Quebec courts is suffering, especially during certain months, and I suggest that the Minister of Justice look into the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MORPHY: No.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not wish to be understood as having stated that if any judge was to be taken from any Superior Court or inferior tribunal to sit ad hoc in the Supreme Court, he ought to be appointed by the Governor in Council. I say that judges should not be taken from their jurisdiction. The appointment of judges in such cases by the Governor in Council would be radically bad. The chief justice would at least be able to tell what judge he could dispense with or what judge would have more time to spare than another; while the Governor in Council could not possibly be familiar with any of these conditions.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am heartily in sympathy with the measure brought down by the Minister of Justice. I feel that no man is more competent to express an opinion as to what men should be chosen to sit on cases in the Supreme Court than the chief justice of the court to which the application is made. From the experience which the chief justice has had in dealing with the particular judges of the court, he is, it seems to me, in a position to know who has the most talent, who has the most experience, who is the best versed in law. I readily support the Minister of Justice.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lemieux moves to further amend clause 1 by adding to line sixteen, after the word "judge" the following words "or the assistant judge." The clause will then read:

—as an ad hoc judge, for such period as may be necessary, of the judge or the asistant judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want to appear as being in the position of criticising in any way or suggesting that the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court is not, speaking of him as an individual, in every way thoroughly competent, but I do think it is incongruous that, when we are dealing with providing a judge for the ultimate appellate court of the country, we should, in preference to the chief justices and the judges of all the higher courts of the provinces, call in a gentleman who, however high his qualities, does hold the position of assistant judge in the court to which he has been appointed. I do not wish, as I have said, to suggest that that implies any lack of qualification upon his part, but at the same time it does not seem to me to be desirable that we should take an assistant judge of any court and place him in the position of sitting in the ultimate tribunal. There is also this that might be pointed out as a practical consequence, namely, that you will create a situation in which, although the letter and the spirit of the law is that you fully meet the special system of law in Quebec by providing two judges from that province, you will, in every case, even in cases coming from other provinces, where you need an ad hoc judge

—if the judge lacking is from some other province and the cases come from some other province—be compelled to have three judges sitting from the province of Quebec. While we all want to see that the statutory rights are recognized, on the other hand, there is this to be considered from the point of view of the other provinces, that we should not impose upon them the possible absolute necessity of trying the cases in that way. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that there is not anything of sufficient importance involved in his suggested amendment that should prevent him from reconsidering the desirability of insisting upon it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not at all converted by the argument of the minister. It seems to me that the judges of the superior courts of the provinces should, only in exceptional circumstances, be called upon to sit as judges ad hoc in the Supreme Court of Canada. The first call of the chief justice of Canada—and in such case he would have to exercise his own judgment—should be at the Exchequer Court where he has two judges who heretofore would have been members of the Supreme Court; that is to say, under the old system that prevailed they would be members of the Supreme Court, the Exchequer jurisdiction being exercised by the Supreme Court. There he has two judges with exactly the same jurisdiction, except that the one is junior and the other is senior. Having those two men available, you provide for all contingencies and emergencies, and it seems to me, that in the interest of justice, without any additional cost, without any travelling expenses, the chief justice of the Supreme Court should call upon the one or the other. It may be that to-day Sir Walter Cassels is in British Columbia or Mr. Justice Audette is in Prince Edward Island, but at all events there is always one of the two in Ottawa, and the chief justice can call upon either of them to sit as ad hoc judge. It is only under extraordinary circumstances that we should rely on the Superior Courts of the provinces. We should not deprive the provinces of their judges, because, as the minister knows, the courts are generally congested, and they will be congested for a long period of time. The Exchequer Court is sitting in Ottawa. It is admitted that the two judges have equal jurisdiction. It seems to me, therefore, they should be called upon to sit, the one as well as the other. Why should we make this invidious comparison between the chief justice and his assistant? While one is the senior and the other is the junior, they have exactly the same jurisdiction; they hear exactly the same cases; they interpret exactly the same statutes. By permitting the appointment of either of them as ad hoc judge, you would save money and you would save time in emergencies. Let us take a case in point. The minister informed the committee a moment ago that the legal fraternity could not proceed to-day before the Supreme Court because one or two of the judges are away. Mr. Justice Duff is sitting as Central Appeal Judge, and Sir Louis Davies is, I think, ill. The court, therefore, cannot sit. According to this first section, if it is not amended, the chief justice would have to inform, let us say, the chief justice of Ontario, that he is deprived of two of his brother judges on the bench. This would entail some correspondence, and the chief justice of Ontario would have to select two of his judges to sit in the Supreme Court. This means a lot of correspondence and delay, whilst the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada can, by pressing a button in his office, send for one of the two judges of the Exchequer Court and have him sit on that very day. The matter is so clear I am surprised that my good friend the Minister of Justice does not yield to my appeal.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am afraid I would make a poor member of a Union party. Just a moment ago I agreed with the Minister of Justice in saying that I believe the chief justice of the province was the better man to choose the judge. I now find myself in the position of differing from him in his idea of ostracizing one of the two judges of the Exchequer Court. I know the Minister of Justice is not doing this because he feels one is less competent than the other, but simply because the one is the assistant of the other. I support the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) because in choosing one of the members of a certain bench to sit in special cases of the Supreme Court, I do not think it is right to cast the stigma on the other judge on that same bench that, simply because he is assistant judge, he is not qualified to sit with his brother judge and try the cases.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am very sorry indeed that one of my hon. friends should look upon this as being invidious, and the other as casting a stigma or ostracizing. Certainly nothing was farther from my mind. I must confess I fail to grasp why it is considered that there is any ostracism or any reflection whatever cast on the capacity of

an individual gentleman, when in enacting a statute it is provided that a man holding another and a different office from his shall be the person called upon to do a particular work. I do not think there is any reflection upon a gentleman because he is an assistant judge while someone else is the judge, nor any reflection because one may be a puisne judge and somebody else a chief justice. It might appear proper, and there are not wanting instances where powers and functions are conferred upon the chief justice as such. Does anybody say that that is a reflection on any one else? I entertain the highest respect for Mr. Justice Audette, and I am very sorry it should be insisted upon that this is in any way intended to cast the slightest reflection upon him. It is not a question of personality at all. Parliament in its wisdom thought it was right that there should not be two judges on absolutely the same footing in the Exchequer Court. Parliament so provided, and the gentleman who holds the position of assistant judge accepted that office and accepted that decision of Parliament. I am very sorry the personal equation should be introduced in a matter in which there is nothing personal at all. Whatever the distinction was that Parliament intended to create between a judge and an assistant judge, when we are dealing with the question whether it is wiser and better for us to call upon someone in some other court to sit in the Supreme Court of Canada, and not to call upon the gentleman who holds the position of assistant judge of the Exchequer Court, I repeat, I am sorry it should be insisted that we are casting any reflection on the assistant judge. For my part there is no reflection intended.

Mr. MOWAT: After the explanation of the Minister of Justice, and the very generous remarks he has made about the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court, showing there is absolutely no personal question in the matter at all, but a distinction created by statute, which should govern, I think the amendment of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve might very well not be insisted on. We know this: the Supreme Court is supposed to represent the great judges of the Dominion. They are all great lawyers, and while men who are not as eminent lawyers as the judges in some of the Supreme Courts of the provinces, may, perhaps, get into the Supreme Court, yet the public looks upon the personnel of the Supreme Court of Canada as comprising the greatest lawyers in the whole Dominion. In this Bill provision is made that the judge of the Exchequer Court shall be the judge to do this work. The question of personality does not enter into the matter at all, and I think it would be a pity, after the minister's explanation, for my hon. friend to insist upon his amendment. I might suggest here what has been in my mind for a long time, and that is that there is no reason why there should be six judges sitting in the Supreme Court of Canada all the time. In the greatest court in the Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, composed of the hardest-headed and best lawyers that ever existed in any country, it does not matter how many judges sit; whether it is seven or only three, the opinions or advice of that tribunal is effective and is held in equal respect. I do not see why there should not be some such system here, whereby, say, four judges could sit equally as well as six. Furthermore, I think I represent the opinion of the vast majority of the bar of all the provinces when I say there are too many individual judgments given in the Supreme Court of Canada. The number of separate judgments given in all our courts is getting to be intolerable, when one has to read through them all to see the small points on which the judges may agree or disagree. It would be far better if the judges would adopt the practice of deputing to one of their number the task of reading the opinion of the majority and, if necessary, the opinion of the dissenting judges, so that we could have a clear-cut statement of the view the majority of the judges took, as well as the view taken by the minority. In the judicial committee of the Privy Council, we lawyers all know that it is a great advantage to get only one judgment; we do not have dissenting judgments there; we have but one judgment, or opinion, or advice, as you may call it, which is the judgment of the whole court. That judgment obtains, no matter how many or what judges sat. That judgment carries to the people in every corner of the British Empire the conclusive opinion of the Privy Council as to what is the law by which they are to be governed. I think it would be an excellent thing, and it would relieve the Supreme Court and the country of the great expense which is now proposed by providing for an ad hoc judge, if the court were to give two opinions, one declaratory of the law, the other of dissent, and then it would not matter how many judges sat. It would avoid the necessity of bringing in an ad hoc judge with all its attendant embarrassments.

Mr. BOYS: As I understand it, the amendment proposes to insert after the word "judge" in line 16, the words "or assistant judge," and to make a change in the next line by saying "or should they be absent." It seems to me to come down to this: These changes would render almost useless the following language in the section, for as I understand it, either the judge of the Exchequer Court, or the assistant judge thereof is always present in Ottawa, and in consequence no other ad hoc judge would be designated. I think that would be undesirable, because you might get a case like this—in an appeal from the province of Ontario, two regular judges of the Supreme Court might be unavailable; you would then require an ad hoc judge. The judge of the Exchequer Court might be absent, in which case the assistant judge, Mr. Justice Audette, would be called upon to preside. You might then have the Supreme Court constituted of three judges from the province of Quebec trying an appeal from the province of Ontario. I do not think that would be any more desirable than having three or more judges from the province of Ontario, or some province other than Quebec trying an appeal from the province of Quebec. It seems to me that the section as worded is more desirable than as proposed to be amended by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) were to have the consequences which have just been pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Boys) I would altogether agree with him. This takes us back to the formation of the court. Section 6 of the Supreme Court Act reads as follows:

> Two at least of the judges shall be appointed from among the judges of the Court of King's Bench, or of the Superior Court, or the barristers or advocates of the Province of Quebec.

What is the reason of that exceptional provision? When the Act was passed in 1875 establishing the Supreme Court there was great objection in many of the provinces, in Quebec particularly, to having the Supreme Court constituted as a court of appeal to pass upon provincial laws. Many held, as I did myself—I was a young member then—that it would be better to have a court of appeal, to be known as the Supreme Court, to pass upon the laws of the Dominion alone. But a contrary opinion prevailed and it was made a court of appeal for all the provinces. The province of Quebec, not being under the common law but under the civil law, it was thought fair that two judges of the court should at least be versed in the civil law and not in the common law only. That, I think, was a wise provision. If the effect of this amendment were to be that three judges versed in the civil law would have to pass upon a case from the province of Ontario, which is under the common law, it would be very unfair. If that should be the consequence I would advise my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Lemieux) not to press his amendment. But, let us look at the Bill. The Bill provides that if there is a judge ad hoc to be appointed, the first choice should fall upon a judge resident in Ottawa. Everybody can understand the advantage of having a judge resident in Ottawa. There come here lawyers from all parts of the country, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, their time is precious; of a sudden a judge cannot sit, the court has no quorum and it is indispensable that the quorum should be filled at once so that it can go on with its business. The first thing that happens is that the judge of the Supreme Court takes a judge sitting in Ottawa—the judge of the Court of Exchequer. If there is no judge in the Exchequer Court available, the chief justice of the Supreme Court, or in his absence the senior puisne judge, has to seek one elsewhere. If you say that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court shall have the power to address himself, first, to the judge of the Exchequer Court, or, if for any reason he is unable to act, then to the assistant judge or to a judge of any provincial Superior Court, leaving a discretion open to the Chief Justice to call either for the Exchequer Court judge or the assistant judge or for a judge in any of the different provinces, the difficulty is obviated.

Mr. BOYS: That is not the wording of the section as amended by the hon. member for Maisonneuve.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear. I agree, but I repeat what I said at the beginning: If the wording is such that the possible consequence might be that three judges from the province of Quebec could not be avoided, or if we should have to take the judgment of three judges from that province, I would advise my hon. friend, (Mr. Lemieux) not to press his amendment because it would not be fair nor in accordance with the principle which was embodied in the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. BOYS: I understand that the chief justice of the Exchequer Court is away

most of the time which would mean that the assistant judge would be called upon to act as the ad hoc judge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It would be sufficient to say in the Bill that the judge of the Supreme Court should have discretion to call either the judge of the Exchequer Court, or the assistant judge or a provincial judge. I am sure that the judge of the Supreme Court would always see that there were not more than two judges from the province of Quebec on the bench. If we would not trust to his discretion in that regard it might easily be provided for but I do not see why there should be that exclusion, mentioned by the Minister of Justice and by my hon. friend from Simcoe, of the assistant judge of the court of exchequer.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think it is susceptible of question that, with the amendment in, the provision will reach the results pointed out by the hon. member for Simcoe because, if we leave it as it stands now and add the amendment of the hon. member from Maisonneuve, it will be imperative for the chief justice of the Supreme Court, before he asks for any provincial judge, to take either the judge of the Exchequer Court or the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court. If the judge of the Exchequer Court be away it will be imperative upon the chief justice to take the assistant judge. If the absent judge who had to be replaced was a judge from a province other than Quebec you would have three gentlemen, all of them originally versed in the civil law of Quebec, sitting. If I seized rightly the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition it was that we should remove from the chief justice the obligation in any case of taking the Exchequer Court judge and leave to him freedom to say whether he will call on the Exchequer Court judge or whether he will call upon the assistant judge, or whether he will call upon the chief justice of a province to give him a judge. As the Bill stands now, with the amendment as suggested this afternoon, it has the effect of leaving the chief justice no choice as to the individual judge. His duty is to call upon the Exchequer Court judge. If the Exchequer Court judge is not available then it becomes his duty to call upon the chief justice of one of the provinces to furnish him with a judge. If we accept the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition we put the chief justice of the Supreme Court in this position: the judge of the Exchequer court is here and the assistant judge is here. If for any reason the chief justice would rather have a provincial judge he will be put in the position of having to make an invidious distinction by having it placed in his hands to select either of these two judges or by passing them over to ask for a provincial judge. I hardly think it is fair to put the chief justice of the Supreme Court in the position of having to decide as between individuals. As it stands at the present time his duty is all marked out for him. Hs asks for the judge of the Exchequer Court. It is not because he wants to do it but because the law says he has to do it. Failing him, he has to ask the chief justice of a province to furnish him with a judge.

Mr. MORPHY: Will it be competent for the provincial chief justice to furnish him with the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court according to the meaning of this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not as the law is worded now, and it would perhaps be a little anomalous for the chief justice of a court, say in British Columbia, to designate the assistant judge of the Exchequer Court for any particular duty. I am afraid to do so would be to introduce confusion into the operations of the Bench. While I am quite prepared to admit the force of the different objections that have been made from that point of view, from the best consideration I have been able to give the matter up to the present time, I am still disposed to think that the section as amended perhaps meets all the exigencies of the case, and I would like to repeat that it could not be interpreted as implying any reflection upon the gentleman who happens to be assistant judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (Simcoe, S.): There are only two Exchequer Court Judges for the whole of Canada, and it seems to me that if this amendment be carried we may have this result: It will be some months yet before Mr. Justice Duff may be liberated from his duties as Central Appeal Judge, and be free to return to the Supreme Court. Now if one of the two Exchequer Court Judges should be required elsewhere, it might have the effect of causing a congestion in the Exchequer Court, and tying up business there. That is the reason I would not be disposed to favour my hon. friend's amendment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Supposing that one of the judges of the Supreme Court of the province of Quebec is ill, and has to be

replaced, does not some objection arise there?

Mr. MORPHY: I quite agree that there should be a provision in this Bill that where an ad hoc judge is to be chosen, he should be appointed from the province from which the judge whom he is to replace comes. I gathered from the remarks of the Minister of Justice that he really intended that, but I find no provision in the Bill which makes it plain. I quite agree that in case of an appeal from the province of Quebec there should be two judges from that province; but there is no interference with that arrangement because it is a statutory provision anyway.

Mr. DOHERTY: As far as regards existing legislation, the proviso is quite clear in its terms if the case is a Quebec case and the absent judge is a Quebec judge. As regards the other provinces, I am quite in the hands of the Committee as to what is the wisest course to pursue. All the other provinces have a common system of common law; Quebec is the only province which has a distinct common law system of its own. Now would there be any advantage in having an Ontario judge because a case comes from Ontario, or in having an Alberta judge because a case comes from Alberta? Both of these judges will be men versed and trained in the same common law. I must say that if it were not for this exceptional system of law which prevails in the province of Quebec, I would not dream of making any exception in the case of that province; it would probably be an advantage that the judge who is to go to the Supreme Court of Canada to try a case coming from Quebec should be a judge from some other province, because then we would avoid the suggested objections of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) of a possible relationship between judges from the same province who have been associated in the same court. Similarly with regard to the province of Ontario, if you could have an outstanding lawyer, trained and brought up in that province's system of common law, but who has had no relations with the judges upon whose judgments he is sitting in appeal, I think it would be a desirable thing. If it is considered that any advantage would be gained by getting a man from the same province I would not be disposed to strenuously oppose it, although I think it is wiser to leave the field as wide as it can be left.

Amendment negatived.

On subsection 2—Evidence of appointment.

Mr. Doherty moved to amend the subsection by adding after the word "judge" in the second line, "and where a judge of a provincial court is designated, the act of the letter designating him."

Amendment agreed to.

On subsection 3—Duties.

Mr. DOHERTY: I move the following words be added in the second line after the word "requested," "or has been so designated."

Mr. McMASTER: Should the word "or" in the phrase "or any conference" not be "on?"

Mr. DOHERTY: No. In that event he will get nothing when he attends a sitting of the court.

Mr. BUREAU: Would not the request be sufficient? A designation would correspond to a request.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. But if he is a provincial judge he cannot attend merely on the request. The Exchequer Court judge will attend simply on the request of the chief justice of the Supreme Court. But a judge coming from any other court, in order to be entitled to sit, must come in consequence of the request of the chief justice of the Supreme Court addressed to his chief justice, and the designation coming to him from his chief justice is the authority upon which he attends. And for that reason I thought it wise to say in the Bill "a judge who attends a sittings of the Supreme Court on such request or upon such designation." Then the reason why we say "or any conference of the judges" is in order that the judge so attending may get his travelling expenses, not only when he comes to attend a sittings of the court, but also when he comes to attend a conference of the judges with regard to the rendering of the judgment.

Mr. BOYS: Would it not make it plainer if you said "an ad hoc judge" and left out the words "on such request" in the second line of the section?

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the words "on such request or upon such designation" be added after the word "who." The wording would then be: "A judge who, upon such request or upon such designation, attends a sittings of the Supreme Court or any conference of the

judges called for the consideration of judgments," and so on.

Mr. BOYS: Would it not simplify it still more to strike out the words "on such request" in the second line, and to begin the subsection with the words "an hoc judge?"

Mr. DOHERTY: That will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN: The section as amended now reads:

An ad hoc judge who attends a sittings of the Supreme Court or any conference of the judges called for the consideration of judgments in cases in which he sat, shall be paid his travelling expenses and shall receive a per diem allowance for living expenses of ten dollars for each day that he is necessarily absent from his place of residence, as provided by section eighteen of the Judges Act.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection (2)—Valuations in assessment appeals.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: This amendment deals with appeals of a special nature provided for by section 41 of the Supreme Court Act, which provides that an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from the judgment of any court of last resort created under provincial legislation to adjudicate concerning the assessment of property for provincial or municipal purposes, in cases where the person, or persons, presiding over such court is, or are, by provincial or municipal authority authorized to adjudicate, and the judgment appealed from involves the assessment of property at a value of not less than ten thousand dollars. This is an appeal especially with regard to the assessment of property for provincial and municipal purposes, and, as will be seen, provides for a general right of appeal if the value of the property is not less than ten thousand dollars. I understand that in certain of the provinces there have been constituted assessment boards, who have been constituted the final valuators or judges without further appeal, or which are courts of last resort practically for valuations of this sort. It is not proposed to withdraw the appeal in cases of judgments or determinations of such valuations, but to add a proviso to the effect that the Supreme Court of Canada shall not disturb or vary the judgment unless it is satisfied that in fixing or affirming it such court of last resort in the province has proceeded upon an erroneous principle, and, instead of its fixing the amount of the assessment, which in its opinion should be varied, the court may remit the case to the court of last resort in the province to fix the same according to the principle which the court declares to be applicable. In other words, there is not to be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada for the mere purpose of valuating or estimating values. If this proviso be added to the section, the court is not to disturb the judgment merely upon the simple question of valuation if it finds in the principles upon which the original courts have proceeded that there is no error.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that not the present jurisprudence?

Mr. DOHERTY: That principle is very generally laid down, but inasmuch as these very questions themselves are questions of valuation, and that there is a special section giving an appeal in this particular kind of valuation, it did appear that there was room for the suggestion that since the cases are cases that involve nothing but valuations, and the especial appeal is created for them, there might be the inference that the intention is that the Supreme Court should substitute itself as a valuator pure and simple.

Mr. BUREAU: Would that be a limitation of the prerogative of the court?

Mr. DOHERTY: It will be a limitation of its power, certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should we do that?

Mr. DOHERTY: Because it seems to me that so long as you keep this to the exclusive question of valuation with no principle involved at all, and the province has provided for a board to make that valuation in the place itself, and has determined that in its judgment that valuation ought to be final, the Supreme Court of Canada seems to be rather a peculiar body to substitute as a board of valuators for the exclusive purpose of correcting valuations, in portions of the country which, in a large number of cases, the judges, even if they were expert valuators, are not at all familiar with, and it seems to me, as suggested by the right hon. gentleman, that it is only clearing, where the case is purely on a question of valuation, the right of the court to decide what it practically, I think, decides in the great number of cases, that is to say of ordinary appeals, that it will not interfere where it is a question purely and simply of estimating values and there is no error whatever in the principle upon which the court below proceeded.

As for its being derogatory to the prerogative of the court, I shall be disclosing no secret if I say that the court itself desires in the strongest possible way that this legislation shall be enacted. As the result of its experience it is very much impressed with what I am trying to point out: that it is not the best body in the world to perform the pure and simple operation of the valuation of property.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—courts of final resort:

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of this amendment is to subject appeals from all the provinces to the same rules and restrictions that are imposed upon appeals from Ontario; to assimilate the law determining in what class of cases there shall be appeal in all the provinces other than Quebec. As the law now stands, certain restrictions are imposed on the right of appeal from Quebec, and certain restrictions on the right of appeal from Ontario, those effective in the former case being greater than those effective in the latter. The other provinces remain under the general provision of section 36 of the Act, which provides that, except as otherwise provided, appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from any final judgment of the highest court of final resort now or thereafter established in any province of Canada, whether such court be a court of appeal or of original jurisdiction, in cases in which the court of original jurisdiction is a superior court. But there is no limitation, for instance, as regards amount. In Ontario there is no right to appeal from a judgment of last resort unless the amount involved on the appeal be at least $1,000, or unless the case comes within the limited category of cases provided in section 48. The effect of this provision is to assimilate the law in regard to the right of appeal in all the provinces other than Quebec, and that assimilation is brought about by subjecting them all to the same limitations that are presently imposed on the right of appeal from Ontario. I understand that when the restrictions were imposed on Ontario and not on the other provinces, it was largely because in all or in the majority of the other provinces at that time there was no distinct and separate Court of Appeal, appeals within the province being from a judge of the court to the court itself in banc. In all the provinces now, with the exception of Nova Scotia, there is a separate and distinct Court of Appeal, so that there seems to remain no reason why there should be a distinction between the conditions respecting the right of appeal from Ontario and those respecting the right of appeal from the other provinces. It is possible that Nova Scotia will at no very remote period be put on the same footing with regard to the existence of a separate Court of Appeal as the other provinces.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read the third time?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understood from the leader of the Opposition last week that he would be willing to facilitate the passage of the Bill in time for next week, and I should be glad if the Bill could be read the third time now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The objection was made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy.)

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that the hon. member for North Perth is satisfied.

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

RAILWAY EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS.

ACQUIREMENT BY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS FOR CANADA DURING THE PRESENT WAR.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, Minister of Railways and Canals, the House went into Committee, Mr. Boivin in the Chair, to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that during the present war and for one year thereafter, the Minister of Railways and Canals, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may acquire engines, cars, rails and other railway equipment and materials, and may sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any such equipment to any Canadian railway company or companies upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Governor in Council, and may defray all expenditure made hereunder out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada; and that for the payment in whole or in part of any such equipment the Minister of Finance, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may issue equipment notes or other obligations or securities, or may guarantee the principal and interest of any securities issued by any company approved by the Governor in Council; and the times and manner of the issue of such securities, and the forms and terms thereof or of any trust deed, lease or other instrument incidental thereto, and the trustees, shall be approved by the Governor in Council, and the provisions of section four of chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1907 shall apply to any instrument relating to such equipment

executed under the terms hereof, and such securities shall be made payable by instalments, the last instalment to be made payable on or before the expiry of ten years from the issue thereof; and further, to provide that the Minister may transfer to the Canadian Government Railways any equipment so acquired, and in such event there shall be charged to the accounts of the said railways such amounts as may properly be chargeable herefor, and the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act shall, as far as applicable, extend to the accounts and charges incurred hereunder.

Mr. REID: I may explain the necessity for this legislation. Owing to the Government taking over the Canadian Northern railway, and owing to the Government requiring more equipment for the Government railway system, and then, on account of the war, owing to the other railways requiring equipment, it is necessary for the Government to purchase and finance this equipment. In doing so, we wish to have the power, after purchasing it, to lease or sell it to railways, other than the Government railways, that may require further equipment. In purchasing this equipment, we wish to be in the same position as other railways are at the present time in making such purchases. For instance, other railway corporations, such as the Canadian Pacific, or the Canadian Northern, or the Grand Trunk, are in a position to issue equipment bonds and in that way not pay the full purchase price of the equipment at the time delivery is made. By issuing equipment bonds they can spread the payment over a term of years. It certainly makes it very difficult for the Government to finance the purchase of equipment when it is called upon to pay a very large amount in one year at the present time. For instance, last year the Department of Railways and Canals ordered 150 engines and six or seven thousand cars. We put the amount in the estimates, and of course we were compelled to pay the amount of the equipment delivered last year. We received the equipment, and we leased a portion of it to the Grand Trunk railway system and a portion to the Canadian Northern railway system. The Canadian Pacific railway got four or five of our large engines, and the other engines went to the Canadian Government railways. If we had not purchased that equipment, we would have been in a very serious position during last winter on account of not having sufficient motive power. It was, therefore, a good thing that we ordered the engines last year. The other day we had, in order to protect the transportation situation during the coming winter and for the future, on account of the heavy movement of troops and so on, to give orders for a very large quantity of engines, cars and other railway equipment. We had to order 100,000 tons of rails that will cost five or six million dollars. We want to be in this position that we can pay for the equipment and then transfer it to other companies by way of sale or lease. The purchase of the items that come under this Bill is all done in the regular way by tender and Order in Council, and any lease or sale is done by Order in Council in the usual way.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is any part of the $500,000,000 loan to be effected under the Bill introduced by the Prime Minister to be used for purchasing any of this equipment?

Mr. REID: No, this is a regular operation, irrespective of any war measure at all.

Mr. DEVLIN: I find in the Canadian Daily Record of Saturday, March 23, 1918, a paper published by the Canadian Records office for the boys in the trenches, this article:

> Record railroad order, Government places contract of $22,500,000 value, mostly cars for Canadian Northern railway.
>
> (Daily Record Cablegram), Ottawa, Friday.
>
> One of the largest railroad equipment orders ever placed in Canada has just been given by the Dominion Government. The order totals $22,500,000, the bulk of it being for cars for the Canadian Northern railway. The Canadian Car and Foundry Company, of Montreal, receives about $16,000,000 worth of orders, which will be distributed between several subsidiary companies at Montreal and Hamilton and in Nova Scotia.

Will the minister state what other companies are to have the balance of the orders totalling $22,500,000?

Mr. REID: This is the equipment that we have ordered. In the first place, we have ordered 150 engines, that is divided between the two companies in Kingston and Montreal. That disposes of the question of engines. In regard to other equipment, we ordered 5,000 forty-ton steel frame box cars from the Canada Car and Foundry Company. They are dividing that order amongst the plants at Fort William, Montreal and Amherst. We ordered 1,000 forty-ton steel frame box cars from the National Steel Car Company. We gave them an order for 1,000 cars a year ago, and up to the present time they have delivered about one-half, but they say that they will, about the first of May, deliver the balance of those cars ordered last year, and that they will have this last order of 1,000 ready by the fall.

Mr. DEVLIN: Where is that company?

Mr. REID: The National Steel Car Company, Hamilton. We ordered 750 forty-one

foot, forty ton flat cars and 650 fifty ton coal cars from the Eastern Car Company. That is all they said they could handle. We ordered from the Hart Otis Company 250 Hart Otis side dump cars and 200 Hart Otis side and centre dump cars. Those are all we wanted of those types. We ordered from the Pressed Steel Car Company, I think of Pittsburg, or some other American point, 25 general service tank cars, that is oil tank cars.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that the only American order so far?

Mr. REID: Yes. That was the only company that tendered for those cars or that could build them. We also ordered from that company 25 water service tank cars. From the Canada Car and Foundry Company we ordered 250 refrigerator cars. From the Pullman Car Company we ordered fourteen sleeping cars and seven dining cars. No company in Canada wanted orders for those cars at the present time. From the Montreal Locomotive Works we ordered 50 consolidated freight engines and 10 switching engines. From the Canada Locomotive Company we ordered thirty Pacific type engines, 60 Mikado type engines, six switching engines and four narrow gauge superheated engines.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is the total amount of those orders?

Mr. REID: $32,966,515.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is that the total amount of orders given within the last year?

Mr. REID: That is, so far as my memory serves me, the total amount. When I say within the last year, probably it was about the first of April or the first of May when we gave last year's orders.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The only objection I have is that we are giving carte blanche to the Minister of Railways to order equipment to any amount. Will the Bill contain any limit beyond which the minister shall not go? Can the minister give the House an approximate idea of the amount that will be involved by these operations in the course of the next fiscal year?

Mr. REID: $32,600,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the amount be mentioned in the Bill?

Mr. REID: No, it is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: However reasonable the minister's explanation may have been, he will understand that this is a very large order. Why not insert in the Bill an amount a few thousand dollars more than the minister thinks he will require, so that he would be within the mark.

Mr. REID: It is very difficult for me to name a certain amount. We have taken over the Canadian Northern railway, and people in all the provinces are urging us to take over more lines. These railways, if taken over, will want equipment, and we would not buy equipment if it were not needed; we shall buy no more than is absolutely necessary.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at 8 o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) said that he was asking for this resolution on account of the Government having acquired the Canadian Northern and other railways, that it was now their purpose to purchase engines, cars and rails; and that, in order to finance these purchases, the minister required legislation authorizing him to issue equipment notes. The inference I gathered from the statement of the minister was, that, in his judgment, the men who will sell to the Government of Canada the engines, cars or rails, would consider a mortgage on this property of greater value than national bonds.

Mr. REID: No, that is wrong.

Mr. ROBB: Why, then, is it necessary to obtain this legislation? Why cannot the minister, if he desires to purchase this rolling stock, pay for it as we have paid for dredges or steamboats in the past? That is something I would like to have cleared up. I am not at all objecting to the policy of purchasing engines and cars. Indeed, the minister will remember that I myself advanced the idea, a couple of years ago, that the trouble we had experienced in the past in getting the grain crop moved from the West was due to the fact that we were short of engines and cars. It was suggested from this side of the House that the Government might very well consider the possibility of purchasing engines and cars and leasing them to the roads at a time when they might require them. Certainly, the minister created in my mind the idea that in his judgment these equipment bonds would be more acceptable to the parties selling this rolling stock than bonds of the national

treasury, and I think it would be well to have that cleared up.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member (Mr. Robb) must have misunderstood my explanation. What I wanted to say was that the several railways—the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern—required extra equipment in the way of cars, engines and rails. At the present time these railways are not allowed to put out loans. If they purchase equipment and issue bonds they cannot go on the money market of the United States and sell those equipment bonds, they are not allowed to do it by the United States Government. The British Government will not allow them to raise money in the United States. They have to get the consent of the Canadian Government to put their bonds on the Canadian market. In order to protect the public and the railways we are purchasing equipment of all kinds. When we purchase the equipment we pay for it, but we take the equipment bonds of the railway company, for instance, the Grand Trunk, and dispose of them at the proper time. The money will come back in that way. The conditions which I have explained are attributable to the war, and the Bill which I purpose to introduce will make provision for a term during the present war and for one year thereafter. The financing conditions are a little difficult, but the Government can take the equipment bonds from the railway, purchase the equipment and at the proper time dispose of the equipment bonds. We ordered a hundred thousand tons of rails the other day. Part of that order is going to the Grand Trunk railway, several hundred miles to the Canadian Pacific, some to the Canadian Northern and some to another railway in Quebec owned by the Delaware and Hudson. We will be able to sell the rails to the Canadian Pacific, and they will pay the money immediately. The Grand Trunk and some of the others may not be able to do this, and we will have to take their securities. This Bill is for that purpose and no other. When we get into committee honourable members will see the Bill, and it will perhaps be easier to understand it. The clauses of the Bill give information that probably the resolution does not.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has not quite cleared up the point I raised. I understand him now to say that the Government are to take the equipment notes or bonds of these several railways, guarantee them, I suppose, and give them in payment of the rolling stock. The legislation asked for authorizes the Government itself to issue equipment bonds. Does the minister consider these equipment bonds of greater value than national bonds issued in the ordinary way?

Mr. REID: If it were for the Canadian Northern we might issue equipment bonds. I do not consider them better. No man would admit that; no bonds in the world are better than Canadian Government bonds. But it is the custom of the railways to issue equipment bonds. I do not say it will be necessary to issue Canadian Northern equipment bonds but they can be issued and if on account of our taking over the Canadian Northern railway it is necessary for us to guarantee the equipment bonds issued by that company, there is no reason why we should not do it, because we own the Canadian Northern now. We are not asking for any powers here other than we should receive in connection with the operation of these railway systems. That is the opinion I get from the lawyers and solicitors who understand everything that is necessary in carrying on the operation of a railway.

Mr. SHEARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister—and I ask simply for information, not wishing to be critical—if, in his opinion, this resolution is not broad enough to authorize the purchase of the whole of a railway excepting the right of way, and, if the Government at any time saw fit, would it not be possible to convey that railway to any other corporation? I ask the question because I understand this resolution is preparatory to a Bill being introduced based upon the resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Bill gives the answer to the question asked by the hon. member. It states that notwithstanding anything in the Act, or in any other statute or law, the minister, during the present war and for one year thereafter, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may acquire directly or indirectly, or assist in acquiring, engines, cars, rails and other railway equipment and material hereinbefore called equipment, and so forth. This explains that the resolution relates only to equipment.

Mr. CAHILL: It seems to me that before this resolution passes, the Government should give the House a statement of its proposed policy with regard to the railway situation in Canada, which is undoubtedly one of the gravest problems with which we have to deal. We are told by the minis-

ter that the Government has taken over the Canadian Northern railway, but I understand that there is at the present time an arbitration board sitting in Toronto valuing the stock of that railway. If such is the case, the road has not been actually taken over by the Government.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: We have acquired five-sixths of the total shares of the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. CAHILL: But as a matter of fact the railway has not yet been taken over. I sincerely hope when it is taken over its administration will not be placed in the hands of a minister of the Crown, because this is entirely too big a proposition to be handled by any minister, the administration of nine thousand miles or more of railway, with the thousands of employees. I believe the argument has been used that the Canadian Northern is being taken over on the strength of the recommendations contained in the Drayton-Acworth report. One of the recommendations in that report is as follows:

> We do not consider that the operation by a minister directly responsible to Parliament would be in the public interest; it would not secure better service or lower rates. We therefore reject the idea of direct Government ownership and operation.

Before the Government asks for this blank cheque, so to speak, for the purchase of equipment for roads which either are now owned by the Canadian people or may be acquired as the hon. minister suggested, we should have a statement from the Government as to what their intended policy is. The minister suggested that other railroads may be bought because every province in the Dominion was asking that that be done. When the Drayton-Acworth investigation was undertaken, we are told the men in charge had to take inexperienced men to make a valuation of the road. On the recommendation of these inexperienced men, after an investigation of six or eight weeks which should properly have taken a year, we are being asked to take over some nine thousand miles at a cost of five or six hundred millions of dollars; and it is now further proposed that we should hand the Minister of Railways a blank cheque to expend the balance of the country's money. Before this is done we ought to know something more about the proposition. There is no question but that our railway condition in Canada to-day is a very bad one, and it will be very much worse judging by existing circumstances. I cannot see how we can possibly manage this great railway system without placing thoroughly experienced railway men at its head, and in my opinion we should hesitate to authorize the expenditure of such great sums of money for equipment and new purchases.

In connection with the purchasing of other railways, we have the statement of the Drayton-Acworth report, in which it is stated that the Mackenzie and Mann interests had no equity in the stock. Nevertheless we find that a board of arbitration is sitting for the purpose of valuing the stock. Either we should or we should not accept the Drayton-Ackworth report. What is being done with the railway situation? Personally, I am strongly opposed to spending one dollar of Canadian money on these railway propositions as long as the system is to be left in the hands of a minister of the Crown. I think that such a policy will lead Canada, as well as the Government, into grave difficulties. I think the situation is one that merits the best consideration of the greatest railway authorities in Canada, and the fact that representations are coming from other provinces in favour of our assuming other railways should should bring home to the Government the actual condition of railway affairs in this country. It would seem to me a good plan to appoint a commission of practical railway men to review the whole railway situation of this country and see if something cannot be done to put our railway systems in such a position that they can be financed and carried along, and not literally "eat us up" as they are apparently doing now. I venture to make the prediction that if conditions continue as they are, if the management of the Canadian Northern railway remains in the hands of a minister of the Crown for two years more, public ownership of railways will be killed for a long time in this country, because the railway systems will get into such a condition that nobody in this country will want to hear any more about Government ownership or public ownership of railways. I know nothing about the abilities or capabilities of the present Minister of Railways, but I do know that he is not a railway man. The railway situation in this country should be handled by practical railway men, and until we take that step I am afraid we shall be heading for a bad state of affairs in the Dominion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the purport of the resolution before the committee was to empower the Government to acquire further railway systems in Canada, the

remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat might be quite pertinent and well worthy of consideration. But that is not the object of the present resolution, which is simply to enable the Government to assist in the purchase of rolling stock for some of the railway systems in which we are interested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What railway systems?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will come to that in a moment. It is hardly fair, I think, to expect a declaration of the Government's policy on a resolution of this character, because that would hardly fall within the scope of the resolution. The Minister of Railways will be going into supply almost at the first opportunity, and then, I think, the House would be entitled to some statement as to the Government's policy with respect to the railways of this country.

Now, what is the position of the Government in respect of the railways systems in Canada. In the first place, we are the sole owners of the Intercolonial railway known as the Canadian Government railway system. As far as the Canadian Northern railway is concerned, we have acquired practically all the shares of that system, and a commission is now conducting an inquiry at Toronto to determine the value of the equity of redemption of the shareholders. The maximum amount of the equity was fixed at ten million dollars, so that any amount which Canada may be called upon to pay by that commission cannot exceed that sum. Nevertheless, at this moment we are in possession of the shares of the company and that railway system is under our control. A certain number of the board of directors have been nominated by the Government, and to all intents and purposes it is a railway system belonging to the Government. Hon. gentlemen know that the road is not financially strong and that in one way or another it must be assisted for many years to come by the Government in order that it may carry on the ordinary functions of a railway system. At the last session of Parliament an Act was passed enabling the Government to pay an amount not exceeding $25,000,000 to meet obligations maturing during the year, to pay interest, and to supply such equipment as was necessary to carry on the operations of that road; and, during the year, that amount of money was advanced by the Government to the Canadian Northern railway. A similar Bill, not quite exactly the same, will be submitted to Parliament this session. There are obligations of the Canadian Northern railway maturing this year to the extent of $78,000,000 which we must care for in some way or other, because that railway system belongs to this country.

The purpose of this resolution, however, is to enable the Government to assist the railway systems in which it is interested directly and indirectly, and to assist some roads in which it is not interested at all as owners to secure sufficient rolling stock so that the trade and commerce of this country can be carried on unimpeded and without loss to the citizens of Canada. Last year hon. gentlemen know the traffic of this country was seriously tied up at many times, and it would be a very serious matter, indeed, if at any time in these days the traffic of Canada could not be moved by our railway systems. While it is a very difficult thing, and quite embarrassing in these days, for a government to be called upon to finance to such a large amount as forty or fifty million dollars any of our railway systems, still for the common good, and in order that the commercial strength of this country may not be impaired, we must do it in one form or another. The Minister of Railways has already intimated to the committee that it is desirable to purchase rolling stock for the Intercolonial railway, the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk Pcificè and the Grand Trunk system itself. None of these roads, outside of the Intercolonial, is in a position to finance the purchase of the equipment which they severally require, therefore the obligation falls upon the Government to assist them.

Now, for the Government to purchase this equipment, involving such a vast amount as was indicated by the Minister of Railways, and at the same time carry on our civil and war expenditures, entails quite a serious burden upon this country, and very naturally the Government are anxious to devise some other method of financing these expenditures if it is possible, and in a manner that will not entail any larger outgo of revenue than is absolutely necessary. Therefore, the Minister of Railways proposes by this resolution to purchase rolling stock on behalf of all the roads which I have mentioned.

Mr. DEVLIN: And others.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Well, there would be no others. They might be limited by name, but that would be hardly necessary. The Minister of Railways proposes, as a matter of fact, to purchase and has in fact already ordered, rolling stock for the Inter-

colonial Railway system, the Canadian Northern system, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How much for each?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot distribute the figures among the several systems, but the Minister of Railways can do that. This rolling stock will be distributed among the several railway systems which I have mentioned according to their necessities. This, as I have already said, will involve a very large expenditure, and if the Department of Railways can finance this operation by the sale of equipment bonds, it necessarily entails less financial outgo on the part of the Government, and I submit to the committee in all fairness that this is a very fair, proper and businesslike arrangement in all the circumstances of the case.

Further, the resolution asks that the Government may guarantee equipment notes issued by any company for the purchase of rolling stock. Now, perhaps I can best illustrate the purpose and intention of the resolution upon that point by pointing out to the committee that the Canadian Northern railway will require, I think, about $30,000,000 worth of rolling stock. While the Government of Canada own that railway, still our ownership is evidenced merely by the possession of the shares of the company; the corporate entity still exists as the owner of the road. It may be that, later on, the rolling stock ordered by the Minister of Railways may be acquired to the extent of twenty-five or thirty million dollars by the Canadian Northern railway, and it will issue against that rolling stock so acquired equipment bonds which it will sell in the Canadian market, or in the American market if it can. And if the Government's guarantee will facilitate a profitable sale of these notes, evidently it is in the interests of the railway, and certainly in the interests of the Government, that they be relieved as far as possible this year and next year of as much of the cost of purchase of this rolling stock as is possible. The Government may exercise either power as defined under the resolution, but whichever is taken it seems to me that when one considers the large financial obligations entailed upon the Government these days, it is only fair that in acquiring this rolling stock it should be permitted to resort to this system of financing, which is common with all other railway systems and which, I think, is not objectionable in any respect.

Mr. ROBB: Before the Finance Minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean) leaves that point, what does he mean by exercising either power as defined in the resolution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I understand the resolution, under the first part the Government may acquire all the rolling stock necessary for these railway systems and itself issue equipment securities, or it may hand over to the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk railway systems whatever portion they require, these companies, in turn, issuing equipment securities, guaranteed, if necessary, by the Government. It is unfortunate that so many of the railway systems of Canada are at present in such a financial position as to require government assistance to the extent shown by the large purchases of railway equipment. Nevertheless, the Government must stand behind these railway systems, because if it did not the whole commercial fabric of the country would fall to the ground, and we should find ourselves in a very uncomfortable position indeed. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) suggested that there should be some limitation as to time or amount in this resolution. That may be well worth considering, but I suggest to him that he allow that consideration to stand until the Bill is introduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what I intended.

Mr. FIELDING: I judge from what the member for Maisonneuve says that there has already been some discussion as to the limitation of amount. The object of this resolution is one which we should all heartily approve. The need of rolling stock on most of the railways is urgent, and the companies themselves are not in a position to do their own financing. I agree that somebody must help the railway companies to get rolling stock, whether this help be given through the medium of equipment bonds or by the Government's paying for the rolling stock and then lending it to the companies. These are matters of detail; the Government are wise in leaving these various avenues open. But the resolution is open to the observation made by an hon. gentleman who has spoken: that the Government are taking a "blank cheque." The Minister of Finance is authorized to issue equipment bonds. Whatever you may call them, if issued by the Minister of Finance, they are the bonds of the Government of Canada, and under this resolution the Government may issue them for untold millions. I do not speak in a criti-

cal spirit, but I suggest that this is a matter into which inquiry might well be made and that an estimate—not necessarily exact, an approximate estimate—be made of the amount required by the several railways for this purpose. It would be the wiser and safer thing, before the Bill is through, to provide a reasonable limitation, so that there shall be no such thing as the "blank cheque" which has been spoken of.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall be pleased to consider that matter when the Bill is introduced. I think it is worthy of consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Before we vote this resolution, we are entitled to have a more detailed statement as to its application. A general and vague statement has been made, but we have not been furnished with details.

Mr. J. D. REID: This afternoon I gave a detailed statement of the $32,966,515 worth of equipment that has been ordered. I gave the details in respect of each company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what proportion is this amount divided among the different companies—the Intercolonial, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. J. D. REID: There will be a small amount for the Canadian Government railway system, which, of course, includes the National Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Moncton, as well as the Intercolonial.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: And the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The largest portion of it, however, is for the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk. Seventy-five of the engines ordered are for the Grand Trunk railway system; $4,500,000 is being expended in engines alone. Last year we purchased 100 or 150 engines, and the Grand Trunk got 45 or 47 of them, so that we are really providing equipment for the Grand Trunk system. An hon. member a few moments ago said that I should make a statement with regard to this matter. It has been the custom of the Minister of Railways to make a statement when he brings down his estimates, and I intend to do that so far as this railway question is concerned. The same hon. gentleman said that the railways of Canada were not in a very good shape in the matter of operation. Taking everything into consideration, I think that the standard of the operation of the railways of Canada during the last winter was equal to, if not better than, that of any other country.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Except Prince Edward Island.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will tell you why I believe they were well operated. The equipment that we purchased a year ago gave great assistance during last winter, which was a very severe one. In the month of October last the presidents of the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk and New York Central railway systems met in Montreal and formed an organization known as the national railway defence association. They practically agreed to operate the several railway systems of Canada as one. They have since formed a subcommittee of the several railways; the members of that committee have been meeting every week and have been operating the railways practically as one system. In other words, if one railway gets into trouble the railway which is in the best position to do so comes to its assistance and runs trains over its lines. The members of that association are entitled to the greatest credit for the splendid assistance they have rendered during the last winter. I am in communication with that association every day; its secretary has sent me the minutes of its meetings and has kept me advised of everything it has been doing. I have a full report, if it is of any interest to the members of this House, of all that the association has done from the time of its organization up to the present day.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Has that association reported to the minister, in his official capacity as Minister of Railways and Canals, that many engines, on account of not having been overhauled, have been lying idle at junction points? And has the Government been requested to supply skilled labour to overhaul those engines?

Mr. J. D. REID: I never heard of any such complaint until the hon. member mentioned it to me this evening, but, since that organization was formed, when I received a complaint of any kind I immediately communicated it to Mr. W. M. Neal, secretary of the organization, and it did not matter whether that complaint was in regard to shortage of cars or trouble at any point, I always received an immediate reply and assistance was at once forthcoming, or the matter in regard to which the complaint was made was taken up by the association and promptly dealt with.

As I have said, the heads of that organization are the presidents of the railways. Some of the men on the subcommittee are: Sir George Bury, representing the Canadian Pacific; Mr. Gillen, representing the Grand Trunk; Mr. Hanna, representing the Canadian Northern; Mr. A. E. Warren, representing the minister here at Ottawa; and Mr. Hayes, representing the Government railways. I think Sir George Bury, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Gillen, and the rest of those gentlemen will bear me out when I say that they have done everything possible to operate the railways during the past winter practically as one system, and to give the very best service and assistance in their power as operators, and as the railways themselves could render. I wish at this point to give those men all the credit that is due to them. At the present time they are carrying on that organization and doing everything they possibly can. I should not like the impression to go out that the railways had not, during the past year, been operated to their fullest capacity. I should like it to be known that in my opinion those men, from the president down to the humblest man on the railways, have, during last year, worked harder and had better co-operation than at any previous time in the history of the railways of Canada. I believe they all realized that, on account of this war, it was their duty, as men, to do all they could. I believe they did their work sincerely and honestly; they are continuing to do so now, and they will continue to do so as long as this war is going on.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I did not wish to attack the association, and I do not wish to oppose the purchasing by the Government of the equipment necessary for our railways. I do not object to that at all. I think, however, it is a matter of amazement for the public to see the Government of this country giving the railways financial assistance to purchase engines, while at junction points everybody is at liberty to see many engines lying idle, and when you ask why all those engines are lying idle there, thus diminishing the hauling power of our railways, you are told the reason is that the railways of this country are unable to secure the skilled labour necessary to overhaul those engines. If that is the reason why you often see trains with two engines when one should be able to do the work, my opinion is that instead of purchasing new engines, it would be better for the Government to supply skilled labourers to overhaul those engines in order that the greatest tonnage might be hauled. That is the point I am endeavouring to make.

Mr. J. D. REID: Might I ask the hon. member at what point he saw so many engines lying idle? The reason I ask is this: Complaints of that kind should be brought to the attention of the organization. If the hon. member will tell me on what road and at what points those engines are lying idle, I shall be able to explain the matter when my estimates come up in a few days from now.

Mr. GAUTHIER: When the minister brings down his estimates, I shall be able to give him all the information. It is a matter of public notoriety, even in our province, that at all junction points you see those engines lying idle. When you travel, you will come across two engines hauling a train when one engine is generally able to do the work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is because the engines are not sufficiently strong in motive power. The railways have not been able to purchase engines of sufficient strength to operate their trains. During the last year or two they have not been purchasing a sufficient number of locomotives. Therefore the condition the hon. gentleman describes might very well happen. Railway companies in Canada during the last year have had to operate trains with engines which in ordinary times they would use in their yards, or which would be engaged in light and unimportant work.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The explanation of my hon. friend may be all right; but when your curiosity is excited by seeing two engines hauling a train and you inquire into the hauling capacity of each engine, and you make the addition of the tonnage, and when you are told the reason why there are two engines on the train is because the engines are not properly overhauled, the explanation of the minister does not fill the bill.

Mr. J. D. REID: I should like again to ask the hon. member to tell me at what point on any railway he has seen a number of engines lying idle since October last, and I shall tell him the reason why. Time and again during the last month or so I have had up in my office the head officials of the Grand Trunk railway company. I have had Mr. Robb, who is the general master mechanic of the Grand Trunk railway company, and Mr. Robb assured me that every engine of the Grand Trunk rail-

way was in operation and that there was no trouble to keep them in repair. Therefore, from the statements made to me by the Grand Trunk officials, I do not believe that it is on that railway that engines have been lying idle since October last. As to the Canadian Northern, Mr. Hanna tells me that all their engines have been in operation and they have had no trouble making repairs when necessary. So far as the Government railways are concerned, the officials tell me they can keep their engines in repair, and they have sufficient men to do so. I cannot for one moment believe that the Canadian Government railways have any engines lying idle at any point on the system. Therefore, from the information before me, and not having heard from the Canadian Pacific, I conclude that if engines have been lying idle since October last it must have been on the Canadian Pacific. In discussing matters with the Secretary of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, I was informed that the railways had used all their equipment. The question came up whether the Canadian Pacific could loan four engines to the Algona Central railway, and they would only consent to loan them on condition that we gave them four of the new engines in their place; that is the way I understand it. It was the greatest surprise to me this evening to be told that on any of the railway systems of Canada there have been a lot of engines lying idle since last October. It is such an important matter that I think the hon. member should give me the names of the different railways, so that I can take the matter up with the Canadian Railway Association for Naional Defence and ascertain why engines were allowed to remain on the railways unrepaired.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I will supply that information at the proper time.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman should let me have it now, so that I can give him a reply when my estimates are up.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I will give the information privately to the minister if he desires; I want to put the facts before him.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It appears to me that some of the remarks made this evening with regard to railway equipment are in keeping with much of the criticism we have seen in the public press during the past year on this subject. It is a plain indication that there are a great many people in this country discussing railways and their operation who have very little idea of what the operation of a railway really means, or of what it means to keep the motive power and rolling stock of a railway one hundred per cent efficient. In this country the season of heavy traffic, the time when the strain on the motive power and rolling stock of the railways is greatest, is from November 1 to April 1, and there are not in this country adequate facilities for keeping the locomotive and rolling stock of our railways up to one hundred per cent of efficiency during that period, no matter how many mechanics you may be able to employ. The railways may start in on November 1 on a one hundred per cent efficiency basis, but they will gradually depreciate until the climax of the difficult season is reached about March 31 or April 15, and in the meantime they will of necessity have accumulated a certain number of locomotives and cars which will have to be put in the shops for repairs during the season when they undertake to do that kind of work. I have myself seen statements in the newspapers with regard to the conditions which prevailed on some sections of the railways last winter. It was stated that a specific number of locomotives were tied up, on certain sections of railway, owing to the fact that locomotives had been sent out on the road in a condition that made it impossible for the men to get them over the road—simply another evidence of the fact that men are interjecting opinions on a subject they know nothing about. I have had the privilege of running up and down the railways of this country for about seventeen years on locomotives and I know something of what it means to keep locomotives in repair, and what it takes to put locomotives out of repair, and what it takes to repair them when they go into the shops Conditions will arise at certain times of the year when it is humanly and physically impossible to keep the locomotives in any part of this country up to one hundred per cent of their efficiency. My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) stated that he had frequently seen on the railways two locomotives hauling one train. There is nothing new in that. Any man with any experience whatever in the operation of railways knows that that is done frequently in order to get additional tonnage over the roads and in order to use locomotives which on account of the fact that they have become more or less obsolete are not fit to go up against the heavy traffic they meet with during the winter months; it is not due to the fact that they are not in proper repair. I grant that certain cir-

9 p.m.

cumstances will arise in the operation of any railway when a locomotive not in first-class repair will go out upon the road, but it does not follow that that is done deliberately. It is a common thing on the Canadian Pacific to meet trains coming east from Port Arthur with two locomotives, but one of those locomotives may be en route to the machine shop for a general overhauling, and possibly while doing that it is performing the service of hauling perhaps fifty or sixty per cent of the load and assisting in that degree in moving traffic.

Just a word with regard to the resolution itself. If the Minister of Railways did not take the step he now contemplates, if he did not foresee the conditions that may possibly arise during the winter of 1918-1919 and provide, so far as it is possible for him to do so, the necessary locomotives and cars to assist every railway in this country, he would be derelict in his duty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before six o'clock I urged the Minister of Railways to fix a limit to the amount required for the equipment of these railways, and I am glad that this evening the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) promised the committee that when the Bill founded upon this resolution is introduced my suggestion will be considered; I am quite satisfied with that. In view of that, I think the minister should amend his resolution because, as it stands, it is still a very large order. It reads:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that during the present war and for one year thereafter,—

I think everybody will agree that during the course of this war we shall have to come to the aid of all the railway companies of Canada with the possible exception of the Canadian Pacific. I quite admit that this equipment will be more urgently required during the winter months on account of the heavy traffic. But I do think the minister should amend his resolution to read as follows:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that during the next fiscal year,—

And so on. The minister knows that every railway company prepares an annual budget, just as the Government does, and estimates its requirements for the coming fiscal year, and it would be quite easy for my hon. friend to thus estimate his requirements of rolling stock.

In fact, if you read the annual report of any railway company, you get the data about the requirements of that company. I repeat, this is a very large order. Nobody objects to helping the railways during the present emergency; on the contrary, the people are quite ready to commit their Government to the aid required by the railway companies in order to facilitate the transportation system. But this is, after all, a money Bill. Whether the Finance Minister is called upon to give cash, or to issue treasury bills, or to endorse notes, or to sign bonds, or to sign equipment bonds, the credit of the country is none the less engaged. Being a money Bill, we cannot amend it by decreasing it, because we do not know the amount which will be required by my hon. friend under this resolution. We could, however, decrease the amount if we knew it. At all events, my hon. friend can easily find out from the companies what help they require from the Government in the matter of equipment for the next current year, and with that information at hand he can say about what amount will be involved during that period. Otherwise my honourable friend is not amenable to Parliament; he puts himself above His Majesty the King. His Majesty the King, requiring supplies from Parliament, states the amount in the estimates, and each item is checked and debated. But, my hon. friend is above the King. He comes and asks, not for a limited sum, but for any amount during the present war and for one year thereafter. If my hon. friend will amend his resolution and provide that there will be a stated annual amount based on the estimates which he will receive from the railway companies, he will meet no opposition in the House, because everybody is anxious to help the transportation system.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance explained that if the resolution is allowed to go through he will introduce the Bill, and when we get into committee we can amend it there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Amend it in what respect?

Mr. REID: We can then consider amending it in so far as limiting the amount is concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I was glad to hear the hon. Acting Minister of Finance say, in answer to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), that he proposes to limit the appropriation. But I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that he must do it on the

resolution, because he cannot do it afterward.

Mr. REID: Why?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Because the Bill is founded on the resolution and you must limit the amount that you are asking Parliament to vote by your resolution.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill must not authorize a greater amount than was authorized by the resolution. There being no amount stated in the resolution, it would seem to be perfectly proper for the Bill to put a limitation to the amount. Therefore, I do not think there will be any violation of the rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There would certainly be a violation of the rule. The rule is that no blank cheque can be given to the Government. They must state what they ask of the people to spend, and if they ask for a limited appropriation, a fixed amount, that certainly must be put in the resolution. The point is worth considering.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not examined the point particularly, but I would think that if a resolution, upon which a Bill is to be founded, authorized an expenditure of $100,000,000, the amount could be reduced in the Bill to $50,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the absolute point which the Acting Minister of Finance has made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He says that inasmuch as there is no limit in the resolution you may nevertheless properly put a limit in the Bill, and that is what he proposes to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If you have a money Bill it must be founded on a resolution to limit the amount that may be expended. You may decrease it, but you cannot increase it.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I suppose, in discussing this railway question. the Prince Edward Island railway is considered as part of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is part of the Canadian Government railway system.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: It appears to me that this resolution calls for the expenditure of the whole of the consolidated fund of Canada that is not appropriated. My hon. friend has pointed out a great many difficulties that have been encountered in connection with the transportation question of Canada during the past year. I mentioned on a previous occasion that this transportation question is one of the most important which comes before the Parliament of Canada to-day. It is all very fine for people to talk about increasing production on the farms, but it is of no use to increase production on the farms if you cannot move the product. In my province the whole railway system is in the cellar and has been for the last four years. The fact is demonstrated by the acts of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid) in providing four new narrow gauge locomotives for a railway which in the natural course of events will cease to be a narrow-gauge railway in the very near future. I am not blaming the Government for that.

I want to say a word about Mr. Hayes, the General Manager of the Canadian Government Railway System. I know him very well and I have had a great deal of business with him. He is the most capable gentleman that ever at any time handled the Canadian Government Railways. When Mr. Hayes told me he was going to order these four locomotives, he said, "I suppose you will object to them?" I replied, "Not by any means; it is the best thing you can do to tide over a situation which at present is unbearable."

But, Sir, there is a better way of obviating the difficulties on the Prince Edward Island railroad, and I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to what I am going to say in this regard. Notwithstanding that I am not an expert—like my hon. friend across the House who has been riding on the railroads for a long time—I know what I am talking about because I am an old transportation man. I want to tell the minister that the best way to obviate the difficulties on the Prince Edward Island railway with reference to rolling stock and engines is to widen the gauge of that railway, or supply a third rail between Port Borden and Summerside and Port Borden and Charlottetown. That will accomplish results very much better than by buying a lot of narrow gauge cars and narrow gauge engines that we would have to re-sell within the next two or three years.

While I am on this subject I would like to ask the minister whether the Reid-Newfoundland railway system has pre-empted, or done anything towards purchasing, the narrow gauge rolling stock and locomotives on our system, when we dispose of it.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not heard of the Reid-Newfoundland railway making any proposition with respect to the purchase of any narrow gauge equipment on our railways, because we would not consider it for one moment until the existing gauge has been widened. I can say to the hon. gentleman there has been no proposition whatever of the nature to which he alludes.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The minister knows as well as I do that the Reid-Newfoundland system is narrow gauge like the Prince Edward Island railway. He knows further that a promise has been made to us, which the right hon. leader of the Government is going to implement as soon as he can, to widen or standardize the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway. Otherwise he will lose the credit which he is getting to-day for having provided the Prince Edward Island car ferry system. Our narrow gauge system in Prince Edward Island is owned by the Dominion Government, but it was paid for by the people of that province, a fact which some members of this House ought to know when the affairs of Prince Edward Island are being discussed, and allusion is made to the railway deficits, and all that sort of thing. We paid for the Prince Edward Island railway ourselves and presented the Dominion Government with it. The Government may say, "All right, take it back," but that is not the question. We will take the railway back if the Government will give us the money that is due to us, for you must remember that when we went into Confederation the Dominion owed us five or six million dollars, and that was the money with which the railroad was built.

Mr. DEVLIN: If this were not somewhat of a war measure I certainly would put myself upon record against the resolution, because it really places too much power in the hands of a minister. However, if it is to be considered in any way as a war measure I want to give my ready assent to it. Before doing so I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that under the Appropriation Act of 1916 we have already paid the Canadian Northern $15,000,000. The minister informs us that so far by way of equipment we have given over to the Canadian Northern some $22,500,000. I would like to know from him whether anything else has been given to that company, by way of equipment, material, or rolling stock?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is all that has been given to the Canadian Northern. We are purchasing some rails and that company will get some of those as well as the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific systems.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is apart altogether from the $22,500,000 which the Canadian Northern have already received during the current year?

Mr. J. D. REID: The $22,500,000 of equipment will be paid during the present fiscal year. We have not yet bought any equipment of any kind.

Mr. DEVLIN: But contracts have been placed?

Mr. J. D. REID: Not for the Canadian Northern, except as regards the contracts I read a few moments ago.

Mr. DEVLIN: What about the message cabled over by the Government directly to the boys in the trenches about the Order totalling $22,500,000, and the bulk of it being made up of cars for the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is all included in the figures to which I have referred.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has the minister in contemplation the purchasing of further rolling stock for the Canadian Northern for the coming year?

Mr. J. D. REID: Outside of what I read to-night, the only equipment that I contemplate purchasing is as follows: A requisition has been made on me to purchase ten or fifteen snow ploughs, which might probably cost another $100,000. Then I have been urged by the National Railway Defence Association, the organization representing all of the railways in Canada, to purchase one hundred tourist cars. At the present time, speaking from memory, there are probably six or seven hundred cars owned by all the railways in Canada that are available for the transport of troops to and from the seaboard, and I have been discussing the proposed purchase of one hundred additional cars with Sir George Bury, the head of the Canadian Pacific railway, with a view to ascertaining if we cannot get along without any more equipment of the kind. We have also been asked to purchase nineteen baggage cars to be used in connection with the movement of troop trains to and fro, and it may be requisite to acquire a few more things of that kind.

As to the suggestion of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that I limit the scope of this motion, I would move that the resolution be amended by adding the following words:

Provided, however, that the expenditure in any one fiscal year under this resolution shall not exceed the sum of fifty million dollars.

I mention that amount for the reason that we have 100,000 tons of rails ordered. I may have to purchase some more equipment such as I mentioned a little while ago. That is not a very large amount over what we have really contracted for, and if the hon. member will accept this amendment I would like the resolution to be moved.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly, I accept the amendment for myself. But I hope that when the Bill to be founded on this resolution comes before the House, my hon. friend will be able to give an approximate estimate of what is to be expended during the present fiscal year.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course, I will be glad to do that. I shall give the hon. member all the information I can.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: While the hon. minister is on this question, will he kindly let us know how many of the 25,000 cars which were in the United States a few weeks ago are still there? According to a statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, in a speech he made in New York or Boston, they had 25,000 of our cars down there. Have we got them back yet?

Mr. J. D. REID: There has been an excess of Canadian cars in the United States over and above the number of American cars in Canada. The highest number at any one time was about twenty-three or twenty-four thousand. I have been pressing, and the Canadian railways have been doing everything they could to get the cars back, but the car shortage in the United States has been so great that any cars sent over there we could not get back, and the number increased until it reached twenty-five thousand, and the shippers in Canada were suffering because we could not get our cars back. We had to refuse to allow Canadian cars to go over to the United States until we got the number over there reduced. From time to time the number was reduced, and if my memory serves me right in the last report I had, a week or so ago, the number was down to about eleven thousand. If we had those cars in Canada we would not have any shortage of cars to supply the public.

Mr. CAHILL: Before this resolution goes through, I would like to point out that the hon. minister's amendment further strengthens my opposition to the measure. It is further evidence to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals should not undertake the management of this great railway system of Canada. He is able here, in five minutes, to make his estimates for an indefinite period, from now until the war is over, and for a year after that. How does he know that he will not require $51,000,000 next year, or $25,000,000, or any other sum? It is altogether too large an order, stepping out here with a fifty-million-dollar-a-year resolution. I think that the Government should take the matter under consideration and come to some determination as to what they intend to do with the railway situation in this country, before we go on spending these millions by the fifties or hundreds.

Mr. HAY: If I may be permitted, and if I may make bold to do so, I would like to offer a word of advice to the Minister of Railways. I have had some experience as a railway man, not as my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) on the engines of a railway, but as a maintenance of way man on the roadbed of the Canadian Pacific. I would like to point out to the minister what, in my opinion, seems to be the necessity for the vast expenditure on equipment of the railways at the present time. The whole trouble lies in the fact that the roadbed of these different railways is in poor condition, and has been so for a great number of years. I think it would be well, if it comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways, to see that these roadbeds are put into proper shape, and I know that if that is done not nearly the amount of money which is being asked for will be required in the future to keep the rolling stock in condition. I know conditions in the West, because I have travelled over the Canadian Northern to some extent, and I know that the roadbed is in poor shape; in fact, I happened to be in a wreck on one of the branch lines of the Canadian Northern near Winnipeg; and in that wreck some seven or eight freight cars were derailed, and they were simply lifted aside with a lifting machine and burned on the ground. Now, that is occurring all over Canada at the present time on the Canadian Northern system, and, I believe, on the other Government systems in the Dominion. If the roadbeds were put into proper shape the engines at present used on these different roads would be able to pull double the number of cars they are pulling at the present time. I understand that in the West, on some sections of the Canadian Northern system, the engines are pulling something like twenty or twenty-five cars, and that is the

utmost they can pull. An engine, if it is any good at all, on a good roadbed, on the prairie sections of the road in Manitoba and the West, should pull at least fifty to sixty cars loaded to capacity. I say that if the roadbeds are put into proper shape it will be of great assistance to the Government in financing and in providing for the rolling stock of these different railroads. The whole trouble lies in the fact that the roadbeds are not kept in proper shape. I suppose, if I began to discuss the labour question, and what the Government intends to do in regard to it, I would be driving away from the question, so I shall not take up that phase of the matter at this time, but on another occasion I may have something to say on this point.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I do not think it is fair that the hon. minister should ask us to give the Government a blank cheque of fifty million dollars. We are sent here by our constituents to vote what definite amounts should be spent this year and next year and each year. The Government might just as well ask us once for all to vote them as much money as they want, and let us go back home. The Government should respect the people, and inform their representatives what they intend to spend, and how they intend to spend it, giving details. The Government comes to the House with an estimate of $250,000,000, with another estimate of $500,000,000, and now we are asked for $50,000,000 more. They are spending money as if it were peanuts. I am opposed to this method of doing business. No company would do business on such a basis. Before we go further with this resolution, Mr. Chairman, I submit that for the benefit of members of the committee and the people of the country we should have more detailed information on the subject.

Mr. DECHENE: This resolution will authorize the Minister of Railways to buy a good deal of equipment; in fact, orders have already been placed for such equipment. The National Railway Defence Association appears to be taking good care of the engines, but I do not know that they have taken as good care of the freight cars. On the way from Montreal a month ago any one could see in the yards many freight cars, empty, some with missing doors, some with parts of the roofs off—cars which could have been repaired very easily and put back in the service to help relieve the shortage of equipment. Many of these cars now lying idle could easily be repaired at Moncton. The Canadian Government railways own and operate big shops, some of which are not used at all, or practically not used. Take, for instance, the Canadian Government shops at Rivière du Loup. These shops, which were built at great expense, are now lying idle; why are they not used for the repairing of freight cars in order to relieve the situation? I understand also that many of our freight cars are used in various parts of the country for storing freight. For very little money sheds could be erected and these cars could be unloaded and put back into service. Last winter, the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) told the House some engines had been left idle and that a great many cars had been left loaded in the big yards because of the lack of water facilities. Take, for instance, in Montmagny, where there are a few miles of track and siding, and where I have seen five or six freight trains at a time delayed on account of lack of water facilities. Often the engineers have to run their engines from Montmagny up the hill to St. Pierre to get water; then they cut the train in two, leave part at Montmagny, and do not come back to Montmagny to get the other part of the train. This difficulty exists on account of water facilities not being placed at Montmagny, and consequently much traffic is not properly taken care of. The minister says that $50,000,000 or thereabouts will be sufficient to help relieve the situation during the next fiscal year. That is quite a sum. He has already ordered $35,000,000 worth of equipment; to this he adds $15,000,000—what for? We do not know. He wants the committee to adopt a provision under which $50,000,000 may be appropriated each year during the war, and one year thereafter. Surely it is in order to provide a sufficient amount for the next fiscal year, and if when Parliament meets, nine or ten months hence, more money is required, then we will grant, perhaps, another $50,000,000. That is a safe procedure; it is better than providing for the expenditure of $50,000,000 a year for an indefinite number of years. When will the war end? Will it be considered as ended when the men cease fighting at the front, or when the treaty of peace is signed? Or will it be ended by Order in Council passed by this Government under the War Measures Act? So far as I can see, anything at all can be done under that Act. I do not think it would be safe for this committee to vote so many millions under the plan suggested. I think

the position taken by the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) is very wise, and that many members of the House will support it.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister told us tonight before six o'clock that he had placed an order for 60,000 cars and 150 engines. According to the resolution, a considerable number of cars will be added to the stock already purchased. Has an estimate been made of the number of cars that will be required, and has any inquiry been made as to the possibility of building the cars, the number of shops now working, and the number of cars which can be turned out each year? I put this question to the minister because I have sent him a letter written to me by a gentleman from Three Rivers who has had considerable experience in car building and who is ready and willing if the order is placed with him, to deliver ten freight cars a day five months from this date, provided the order justifies the manufacture. Surely this amount is not asked haphazard; some estimate must have been taken of future requirements of the railways which desire to procure equipment from the Government. Has any estimate been given to the Minister of Railways as to the number of cars that the railway companies are short or the number of cars that may be required for transportation during this year? If so, are the cars so required to be ordered through the Minister of Railways, and has he any idea what apportionment is to be made to the different companies of the various kinds of cars—flat cars, coal cars, tank cars, and so on—mentioned in the statement the minister read to the House this afternoon?

Mr. J. D. REID: Before ordering any equipment at all, I got together in my office the heads of the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Government railway system, and we had a discussion as to the quantity of equipment that would be required during the present fiscal year, so that the railways could haul next season's crop and also be in a position to be operated to their full capacity during the coming winter. After going over the matter with those gentlemen, we gave an order for the equipment, a list of which I have given to the House. Each railway, of course, stated what it would require, and I have given that statement. In Canada, there are companies that manufacture cars that have a capacity very much larger than necessary to fill our orders. I see by the press, and, in fact, I know, that the Canada Car and Foundry Company have received a very large order from the United States Government, because the United States Government are giving very large orders for cars for the railways of that country. The United States Government are doing practically the same as we are doing in this regard. In this time of war, it is not in the interest of the country that railway companies should go on to the market with their bonds. I shall be very glad to give the hon. member further detailed information if necessary, but I think the information I have given covers all the questions he has asked. This equipment will be distributed amongst our own Canadian railways.

Mr. BUREAU: The Grand Trunk is the only one that is not under Government control.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern, while it is owned by the Government, is being operated as a private corporation. There is the Grand Trunk railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.

Mr. BUREAU: That is under Government control.

Mr. J. D. REID: Not yet.

Mr. BUREAU: Partly.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Quebec Southern, which I think is owned by the Delaware and Hudson, requires a few rails. The Canadian Pacific, under this legislation, will get 300 miles of rails, two or three million dollars' worth of the purchases we propose making. They will, of course, pay cash for what they receive; at least we expect they will. It will be seen, therefore, that we are purchasing equipment that will be used by the several railways.

Mr. McCREA: Do the Grand Trunk, the Delaware and Hudson and the Canadian Pacific prefer to have the Government buy their equipment for them? Are they not capable of purchasing their own equipment?

Mr. J. D. REID: I mentioned the Canadian Pacific for this reason. The Canadian Pacific have been trying to purchase rails. There are only two companies in Canada that make rails, and the Canadian Pacific could not purchase rails from those companies because they were manufacturing munitions. The Government arranged with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to change their plant from what they were manufacturing and to supply 100,000 tons of rails. We purchased that ourselves, and we intend to distribute it amongst the several railways.

Mr. McCREA: Do the several railways prefer to have it done in that way?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, they asked that it be done in that way.

Mr. McCREA: The minister told us that early this season 20,000 Canadian cars were in the States, and that the latest report he had was that that number had been reduced to about 11,000. Can the minister give any information as to how many foreign cars are in Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: There are, in the United States, 25,000 Canadian cars in excess of foreign cars in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE: At the present time the country is suffering from the lack of cars and also from a lack of passenger accommodation. That portion of the country which I represent and a part of the country represented by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), containing a population of approximately 150,000 people, is back to the old days again of construction; they get one train in the morning and one train at night.

Mr. McCREA: The hon. member should be glad to have that.

Mr. CURRIE: I want to know from the minister if there is any possibility of this war board giving any better passenger accommodation than has been given, or if it is going to be like a new "cop" on the corner, stopping all the traffic.

With reference to freight cars, I know that so far as shipping during last winter, is concerned, the shortage of cars occasioned a loss to shippers in Ontario of thousands of dollars daily. A concern in which I am interested had no less than 27 carloads of steel tied up between Buffalo and Collingwood, the amount involved being close on a quarter of a million dollars, and that shipment was tied up for weeks and weeks. Something must be wrong. We know, of course, that the snow was pretty bad, but I was held up on a passenger train, travelling thirty miles in two days, and in that thirty miles there was not a snow drift that stopped the train for three minutes. There were four snow-ploughs ahead of us. What was wrong? The crews? When the Bill comes before the House, the labour question will have to be discussed, because we all know that the men have been giving service to the railroads for a great deal less money than is paid to men in any other department of business in the country.

In regard to this resolution, I am pleased that the minister has limited the amount, because I think it is asking Parliament to go a very long way to give any minister of the Crown in such a democratic country as this a blank cheque on the treasury. That has never been done in the history of British parliamentary institutions, and I do not think we should establish a precedent. Further than that, I do not think it is a good precedent to establish an annual vote for years ahead. Are we going to give up all our parliamentary functions? Is Parliament going to cease to exist? Is Parliament going to go out of business altogether and give a blank cheque to each of the ministers of the Crown to carry on business until a year after the war? I say with all seriousness, that this war may continue for four or five years. If one reads the papers this evening, the conclusion of the war looks as far off as it did two years ago. For that reason, I think the minister should hesitate. This Parliament has never refused a Minister of Railways or any other minister any reasonable request for funds that has ever been placed before it. There is no reason why we should give up all our functions to a star chamber and allow any department of Government to have a blank cheque up to fifty million dollars a year from now on to the end of the war I believe in British institutions. I believe in maintaining the constitution of this country, and to do that I think we should carry on in war time the same as at any other time. There are too many people going around the country wanting this fad and that fad on account of the war, and men are wanting to sell corn cures and this, that and the other thing to help win the war. This Parliament is asked to vote $50,000,000 until the conclusion of the war for no other reason than that it is in connection with the railways on account of the war. I think the minister will be well advised when bringing down the Bill to limit the time to the fiscal year. I think there will be a few of us, at all events, left for next session; we do not expect the Germans to come and take possession of the country before then, and as we shall have another session of Parliament, the minister could bring down another vote next year. I am not opposing this vote, but I am opposing the unconstitutional features of it. The first thing about the resolution that struck me, and which I could hardly swallow, was that it was giving the minister a blank cheque. The second feature to which I objected was that it was good during the war and for one year thereafter. Something might be said in its favour if this were for a foreign

expenditure during a war period, but Parliament is quite able to cope with domestic expenditures of this kind by voting an amount annually.

Mr. McCREA: Unquestionably there has been a great shortage of both power and cars. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has complained about the passenger service. No doubt it is not what we should like to have, but I have never heard of a man having to wait for a week for a passenger train, as has frequently happened in the case of freight shipments. The passenger service has been curtailed, but on the whole I think the needs of the people are well taken care of. We are certainly not so badly off in that matter as we are in respect to freight. There is a great quantity of freight to be moved, and there is evidently a severe shortage of cars. One gentleman has said this evening that the sidings are filled with empty cars out of commission, but I think you will find that these cars are of an old type and of light capacity, and therefore not safe for heavy traffic.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member is a very large shipper. Has he been able to get all the empty cars he wants in which to ship his freight, or is he a month behind with his orders?

Mr. McCREA: I certainly agree that there is a shortage. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. CURRIE: Everybody says the same.

Mr. McCREA: I think the minister was justified in bringing down this measure in order to supply the needs of this country. What I was not clear about was whether the Canadian Pacific, the Delaware and Hudson, and the other roads who are able to take care of themselves were satisfied with this arrangement, but the minister assures me that they are, so that is all right. What the shippers want is means of transporting their goods, and I think the minister will be well advised to proceed as quickly as possible to provide the required equipment and rolling stock to carry on the business of the country. I must say, however, that it is not wise to give carte blanche even to the Minister of Railways. The minister might amend his resolution limiting the period to one year, and then he could ask for another vote next session, and it would be quite in order for the House to give it. But I do not think he should ask to be given carte blanche for an unlimited period, and without any restrictions on the expenditure.

10 p.m.

[Mr. Currie.]

Mr. J. D. REID: Replying to my hon. friend from North Simcoe, the passenger service has undoubtedly been curtailed during the past year.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it going to be increased this summer?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member wishes us to increase the passenger service in Canada. Let me tell him why the passenger service was curtailed, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend. We have a lot of troops to transport to the seaboard, and a lot of men to bring back, and it was necessary for the railroads to cut down their passenger traffic in order to provide the necessary cars and engines for this purpose. The position of the board of railway commissioners, of which I approve, was that we should take all the passenger cars we could possibly get and use them for war purposes during the war. We cannot build cars in a day; it takes time. All the roads have had instructions to decrease the passenger traffic as much as possible in order to provide cars for the purposes I have mentioned. That has been the policy, and so long as this traffic continues, we must have the cars. Let me give one instance where extra passenger cars have been required. A very large number of cars—perhaps I should not mention just how many—have been required to bring a great many thousands of Chinese from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast on their way overseas. We had to take cars from some of our systems for this service, and the passenger traffic was decreased on certain roads. The hon. member for North Simcoe asks whether he will get a better service during the coming year. I say to him that when the traffic of which I have spoken ceases I am willing to urge the railway commission to give him a better service on his road, but if it is necessary to transport troops from the Pacific to the Atlantic in order to help the boys at the front, then my hon. friend's passenger service will be decreased, if necessary, in order that we may get the cars. The coal situation also accounts for a further decrease in the number of cars. The railways were taxed to their utmost in order to get fuel to the different parts of Ontario, and, in fact, throughout the whole Dominion. I can say, having gone into this matter, and being in touch from day to day with the organization in Montreal, that I believe the heads of the different railways have done everything possible to give the best service they could to all parts of the Domin-

ion during the last year and they will continue to do so during the present year if they can possibly spare the cars. But war needs must be supplied first. I have been doing my best, and the railways have been doing their best, to get cars built during the past year, and the companies I have mentioned have promised to let us have these cars in time for the rush in the fall. The criticism that this resolution is practically giving the Government a blank cheque for a certain length of time, is met, I think, by the fact that the amount is limited to $50,000,000, and the period is limited to the duration of the war and one year thereafter. We all hope the war may end this year, but it may go on for another year. That is a matter that I would like the committee to allow me to consider when we get the Bill in the committee. At all events, it limits the amount to $50,000,000. It is for the war and one year after, but it may possibly be for one, two or three years. It is not for an unlimited time; it is limited by the clause "for the war and one year thereafter." We all hope it will not be for more than one year.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it not a fact that in the year 1916 there was double the number of troops moved in this country, and is it not also true, as everybody knows, that there was no slackening in the passenger traffic?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, that statement is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. CURRIE: It is correct and everybody knows it.

M. J. D. REID: I say to the hon. member it is not correct.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I want to ask the minister if, when he was making his estimate, he allowed for the extra revenue the railways are going to get by reason of the increase of fifteen per cent in freight rates. I understand the railway commission has permitted the railways to increase their freight rates by fifteen per cent. I had a letter from a western man complaining of the good western Unionists and saying it was going to take at least $20,000,000 out of the western farmers, and that it served them right. Well, that is all right. When you were estimating it at $50,000,000, did you allow for the $20,000,000 that you are going to take out of the western grain growers by this increase of fifteen per cent? That only applies to the grain crop. There are the other freights all over Canada and I should think that the fifteen per cent added to the freight rates is going to give the railways an immense sum. I see the Government penalize the Canadian Pacific to the extent of fifteen per cent showing that they can make both ends meet, like the dog when he was catching the flea. I understand that the Grand Trunk railway last year paid up all their liabilities and that they have been able to expend $26,000,000 in speculation in the last two or three years. These railways are doing all the work they can, and if you are raising the rates by fifteen per cent they must be getting a big rake-off. I want to know if the minister allowed for this increased revenue that is going to accrue to the railways by reason of the advance in freight rates?

Mr. CAHILL: I do not want to be put on record as being opposed to the country getting more rolling stock; quite the reverse. I am only objecting to the system that has allowed the country to be two or three years behind in getting rolling stock. As the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Hay) has pointed out, the roadbed is in bad shape. That will come in for consideration, I presume, at a later date. But that is another question that is being left a little late. My position is, not that this country does not need rolling stock or repairs to the right of way, or that the maintenance of way should not receive attention, but my complaint is of the system that allows the railways to get into this position before conditions are taken care of. I maintain that under the present system of management we will not have efficiency. I do not find fault with increasing the rolling stock. I know we are short.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I only heard the minister make a few remarks in reference to the status of the railways. I gathered from him that the Canadian Northern belongs to the Government, but that it is operated by the Canadian Northern corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is now the property of the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: We own the stock, but the road is being operated by the Canadian Northern directors.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There is an arbitration in regard to the majority portion of the stock, is there not?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Government have taken over the stock, and therefore own the Canadian Northern system. A portion of

the equity is subject to arbitration, and the board of directors are operating the system.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the status of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Moncton is being operated by the Government. It is part of the Canadian Government railway system. The Grand Trunk Pacific is being operated by the board of directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company, a separate corporation controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway company. The Grand Trunk Pacific practically belongs to the Grand Trunk Railway company.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They are in an entirely different position from the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental railway which belong to the Government?

M. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I understand the minister to say that this amount that we are asked to authorize, and the expenditure to be made for rolling stock will be distributed among the various companies. He also stated that the Government would give to the Canadian Pacific a portion of the rolling stock and that the Government expected the Canadian Pacific to pay them back.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said the Canadian Pacific would get a portion of the rails that we had ordered. There are a hundred thousand tons of rails. That is only a portion of the equipment to be purchased under this Bill. Three or four hundred miles of those new rails out of the hundred thousand tons will go to the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The minister said that it was the expectation of the Government that the Canadian Pacific would pay for those rails.

Mr. J. D. REID: They will pay for them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think the House is entitled to a clear and positive declaration, not that that is the expectation, but that the money will be demanded from the Canadian Pacific. That company has a surplus of tens of millions of dollars, in addition to which this Government has granted an increase in rates of fifteen per cent, which will enable the company to increase its earnings by from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. Of course, it is understood that they are to be taxed. As far as my judgment goes, that is somewhat indefinite. I had hoped that before this stage of the session was reached we would have had a field day on the railway question. The granting of an increase of fifteen per cent to the railways all round will mean an additional direct burden on the people of this country who use transportation, of not less than $30,000,000, and it will mean, in my judgment, an indirect burden upon the people of probably $100,000,000. The moment this increase in rates was announced the price of sugar advanced ten cents a hundred in Winnipeg, and an intimation was given that the price of all commodities would be increased. Merchants will seize this as an opportunity for increasing the price of foodstuffs and staples. That is the tragedy of this increase. Perhaps this is not the time to discuss this question. I should like to have a day to myself to discuss it, but at present I only point out that in so far as the Canadian Pacific is concerned, a wealthy corporation with a surplus of tens of millions, it ought to be very clearly understood by this House and the people of this country that the Government does not propose to use its resources in order to feed that company with millions and millions of dollars' worth of rails and equipment. I feel strongly that we should not give a blank cheque to the Government for an indefinite period. The question as to when the war will close is, in my judgment, a very indefinite one—the war may last ten years, it looks to me as if it will certainly last two or three years anyway—and while we want, and must provide, transportation in this country, still I think that Parliament ought to reserve to itself the right to control the expenditures from session to session.

While I am on my feet and discussing the question of rates, I want to say that I think the result of the increase will bear with especial severity upon the people of the Northwest. After all there is only a limited percentage—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to desist from discussing railroad rates, and the circumstances of the people in the Northwest, because that subject is too far from the scope of the present resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I beg pardon of the Committee, and I will not proceed further on that line. Probably when a field day takes place on this subject we will have the opportunity of expressing our views.

Mr. J. D. REID: I can say to the hon. member that the Canadian Pacific Railway company will pay for the rails they get.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Railways has mentioned only a few of the companies that may benefit from this resolution in the matter of equipment. He has mentioned the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk system. Might I ask the minister if some of the branch lines on the Intercolonial which have not been purchased by the Government and other branch systems in eastern Canada will also be heard if they require any equipment?

While opposing the mode adopted by the minister in presenting this resolution, I am not against the spirit of the resolution itself. On the contrary, I believe that we must help our railway systems to get equipment during these years, especially in view of what occurred last winter when traffic was congested during the hardest months of the year. In that connection, however, might I suggest to my hon. friend an increase in the demurrage charges? Last winter—and I know this because I am identified with the pulp business indirectly—some of the firms with which I am connected could hardly secure any cars because the railway companies were suffering from a shortage, their cars were in the United States and were not being returned. Is there not any possible means by which the railway commission in Canada, and the inter-state commerce commission in the United States, could reach an agreement whereby an end would be put to that state of things?

Mr. CURRIE: What do you say as to reciprocal demurrage?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what we have.

Mr. CURRIE: Let me give you an illustration: You want coal for your factory and the railway company switches your coal into a siding half way towards your factory, and leaves it there for a couple of weeks. Why should you not collect demurrage from the railway company? There are two sides to the demurrage question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very pleased that the minister has accepted my views and limited the amount he proposes to expend to $50,000,000 per year. But after having listened to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) and my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) I say that the minister should accept the suggestions of his friends and incorporate in the Bill that will be based upon this resolution the principle of one year's subsidy. I may say to my hon. friend from North Simcoe that, much as we differ on other esential matters, on a principle such as the one involved here, so British and so constitutional in its nature, I am with him heart and soul, and this is the best way to prove my loyalty and attachment to British connexion and to British institutions. Now here we have a case in point: My hon. friend comes before Parliament, and for a very laudable motive asks for certain large powers. He is entitled to obtain from Parliament the powers for which he asks, but he is restricted by our constitutional precedents. He must not place himself above His Majesty the King. When His Majesty the King comes before Parliament, through his ministry, and asks from the Commons a grant of money the amount is fixed, and it is a yearly vote, and if the money is not expended within the year it lapses.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Railways says that he is willing to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If he had admitted that I would not be asking the minister to refrain from taking the power to expend $50,000,000 per year during the balance of the war. There's where I differ from him. The war may last several years, or it may only last a few months, and it is not dignified on the part of the Government to secure holus bolus—I shall not say the benefit of the war because it confers no benefits—but during the continuance of the war, unknown as its duration may be, a huge sum of money. I appeal again to my hon. friend to consider the matter very seriously, and to amend his resolution so as to declare that the Government will only expend the $50,000,000 in the one year. Next year he can apply to Parliament again, and he will be as liberally and generously treated as he has been this year.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman asked me a question with respect to branch lines in New Brunswick.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had reference to those that had not been acquired by the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: There are six or seven of them?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is one also in Gaspé.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, there is one in Gaspé, but all of these railway companies stated last fall that they had not sufficient equipment and were in trouble. I issued instructions at that time to General Manager Hayes to give them all the equipment and assistance they needed at any

time to keep their lines in operation, and the railways in question received that assistance during the whole winter. If these railways wanted the use of our cars we would charge them a certain amount for the privilege, if they wanted to purchase any of our equipment we would let them have it; but really the amount they required altogether was very small. We deal with them as we do with the Canadian Government railways, and they are given engines or cars as they may require them, an arrangement which is perfectly satisfactory, I think, so far as they are concerned.

Now with reference to the resolution, two questions have been raised. One was as to the amount. That was answered several minutes ago, when I moved the amendment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no objection to that.

Mr. J. D. REID: The other question raised is as to the period being for an unlimited time. I stated some time ago that it was for the duration of the war and one year after. I said that when we got into committee I would consider the matter at that time. The Bill, of course, could not go further without being again in committee. However, if it be the wish to insert it in the Bill before the Bill has been introduced—I have the Bill here printed and ready—I am willing to limit it to the fiscal year. I do not want to do anything other than what I think is fair. Therefore I would ask that the resolution be made to read as follows:

That it is expedient to provide that during the present fiscal year the Minister of Railways and Canals, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may acquire engines, cars, rails and other railway equipment and materials to an amount not exceeding fifty million dollars—

And so on. That would limit the time to the present fiscal year and the amount to fifty million dollars. I beg to move:

That the resolution be amended by striking out the words "present war and for one year thereafter"—and substituting therefore the words "present fiscal year."

Mr. CURRIE: Would the minister allow me to make a suggestion? Occasionally, Mr. Chairman, it is the custom, in the case of large public buildings, to grant a total sum, and then vote a certain proportion of that per annum. Might we not provide in this resolution a sum not exceeding $200,000,000 during this present war, and that fifty millions would be voted for the present fiscal year?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. CURRIE: That has been the custom. For instance, the parliament buildings estimate was fixed at five million dollars, and half a million appropriated from year to year.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a different question.

Mr. CURRIE: Parliament is not voting that amount at all, but it specifies some sum which may possibly be voted. That was what the minister felt in the first place, that he could not put the omnibus amount in. If he wishes to amend it to fifty millions annually as he has done now, I am quite willing to accede to it.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the Minister of Railways and Canals:

That the resolution be amended by striking out in the first and second lines thereof the words "war and for one year thereafter," and substituting therefor the words 'fiscal year," and by adding in the fourth line of the said resolution, after the word "materials," the words "to an amount not exceeding fifty million dollars."

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Mr. FAFARD: Might I ask the hon. minister if it is the intention of the Governmen to increase the number of cars in the section between Levis and the east, including the counties of Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska? That section is a farming country, and I noticed last year that the farmers and lumbermen could not get the cars they required.

Mr. J. D. REID: I took up with the general manager a short time ago the question of providing cars in the very district mentioned, and he promised me that he would do his very best, and stated that he expected to relieve that situation within a very short time.

Mr. DAVIS: May I ask the minister whether the calculation he has made includes the necessary equipment for the completion of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, that is not in this item.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Following the example of the hon. member of L'Islet (Mr. Farfard), I would like to say a few words regarding conditions in the district of Abitibi. Reading La Presse the other day, I came across an article headed "Colonization in the Abitibi," in which it was stated that there is practically a crisis in that region, that colonization and agriculture cannot be carried on for lack of means of transportation.

I know of a lumber company which has a great deal of lumber and pulpwood ready for shipment, thousands of cords of pulpwood are ready for delivery, which cannot be sent to the United States, or to the wharves and harbours in this country, for the reason that there is no means of transporting it. I would like to ask the minister if it is his intention to remedy that situation.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have had that question up with the board of railway commissioners and with the national defence association, and we have been doing our best to relieve that situation. As I stated a few moments ago, the whole trouble is that if we send our Canadian cars to the United States we do not get them back, so we are then unable to transport the pulpwood to the mills in Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: Abitibi is in the northern part of the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I asked a moment ago if the hon. minister could remedy the situation which existed last winter owing to our cars not being returned promptly from the United States. The exporters of Canada were really in a very difficult position on account of the shortage of cars. The United States keep our cars, and I do not know whether it is that the demurrage is not high enough, but they do not seem to care about returning them promptly. Is there not an arrangement between the interstate commerce commission and the railway commission by which such a state of things can be remedied?

Mr. J. D. REID: I may say to the hon. member that it is an impossibility to do more than we have been doing during the last winter. The board of railway commissioners, and the several railway companies have been doing everything possible to remedy the situation. They have had special men in the United States looking up the cars. We have had our representative Mr. Lloyd Harris, doing his utmost with the American Government. I have personally sent message after message to Mr. McAdoo, urging him to assist us in getting what we claim to be our just rights. So that the influence of this Government, of the railways and of the railway commission, has been exerted to the utmost to remedy the situation. As a result, as I said before, we have lately been able to reduce the number of cars held in the United States from twenty-five thousand to eleven thousand.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Hon. J. D. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 42, to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, $212,500.

Major General MEWBURN: The amount of these estimates for the Department of Militia and Defence is so insignificant compared with the amount that we have just been discussing—$50,000,000—that it will not require very much explanation. It is my intention when, at a very early date, the war estimates are brought before the House, to give a detailed statement of the war policy of the Government, including such information regarding our troops in France, England, and Canada as it is advisable to give from a public standpoint. I do not purpose, therefore, to make a full statement to-night in connection with these estimates, but I shall take advantage of the opportunity of doing so when the war estimates are brought down by the Prime Minister.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the minister please fix a date, say next Tuesday, for this debate?

Major General MEWBURN: The Prime Minister told me yesterday that he hoped to bring down the war estimates to-morrow, if that would suit the convenience of the House.

Mr. DEVLIN: When may we expect the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report, containing details of the war expenditure?

Major General MEWBURN: I thought it had been laid on the Table.

Mr. MURPHY: May I suggest to the Minister of Militia, whom I am glad to see in the House this session for the first time, that he follow the practice that has been followed for the last few years of presenting to the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of money voted for war purposes? During two or three previous sessions—in fact, ever since the war began—a special publication has been issued and distributed among the members giving in detail the expenditure of the war appropriation. Without that information it is impossible to discuss intelligently either the expenditure that has been made or the appropriation of $500,000,000 that is asked for

this session. I therefore urge upon my hon. friend the necessity of submitting that information to the committee as soon as possible.

Major-General MEWBURN: The report of the Militia Council is in press now, but the purchases of the Militia Department were made through the war purchasing commission, whose report is soon to be laid on the Table. I fancy that is what the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. MURPHY: No, not altogether. It is necessary to find what expenditure is made under war appropriation, for instance, whether the cost of certain commissions, of certain boards, of certain offices that have been established, relate to the war appropriation. My reason for pressing this request to-night is that upon searching through the Auditor General's report for information regarding this expenditure—information which would ordinarily be found in that report—I discovered that it was not there. It is impossible, therefore, to ascertain the character of the expenditure under this war appropriation unless this information be given. I have not in mind particular contracts or purchases made through the war purchasing commission, but other expenditures, information regarding which apparently is not available in any other quarter to which I and some of my friends on this side of the House have had access.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would call the minister's attention to the fact that the only details we have as to war expenditure are to be found in the public accounts under war accounts. The details of the war expenditure by the Militia Department are given from 1st April, 1916, to 31st March, 1917. Further than that, we have absolutely no details as to the war expenditures and no way of finding them out, so that we are hardly in a position to vote any estimates until we have fuller information.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I realise what my hon. friends are asking for. During the last three years there has been issued a memorandum which is supplementary to the report of the Auditor General. That memorandum, as I understand it, has not been issued this year, the reason being that practically everything that heretofore appeared in the memorandum will now appear in the report of the war purchasing commission. The Minister of Militia, therefore, is not able to give that information to-night. I would suggest that perhaps we might confine our discussion to-night to Civil Government, which is the item under discussion, and I am sure the minister, when the matter comes up on the next occasion, will be able to give the House all the necessary information.

Mr. MURPHY: I agree with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) that to-night the discussion, on which we have not yet entered, should be confined to the proposed appropriation immediately before the Committee. But might I also point out that a statement of the transactions carried out by the war purchasing commission will not give the House information as to what has been paid for salaries, for instance, for salaries in connection with the board of food control or in connection with the central appeal judge's office and matters of that kind which I understand are taken out en bloc of this war appropriation? It is items of that kind, in regard to which it has been found difficult to get information.

Mr. CARVELL: That is quite true, and the House is certainly entitled to all that information. That, of course, would not appear in the report of the war purchasing commission, which would give only the actual purchases. There will however be another way of getting at it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Militia will find no difficulty with his estimates, if, after discussion with his deputy minister, he gets that detailed statement for which, since the beginning of the war, we have been accustomed to ask. The affairs of the Militia Department have increased so much that the estimates which are before the House are not sufficiently explicit for hon. members. I may say to the minister that he will find no difficulty in having his estimates passed, because he has the good will of the House and has always, since the opening of the session, answered very willingly and generously the requests made to him. But to facilitate the work of the Committee, we certainly require this detailed statement, which the minister's predecessor used to distribute each time his estimates came up before the House. I agree that as regards Civil Government, this statement is not so much needed.

Major General MEWBURN: I can assure the hon. member that that statement will be forthcoming. It is probably due to ignorance on my part that it has not been distributed. As to the memorandum published last year, all purchases of the Militia Department which have been made by the war purchasing commission will be included in its report, which is in process of preparation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When will it be ready?

Major General MEWBURN: We have every day been asking the war purchasing commission to expedite it. As regards salaries and expenses paid in connection with the tribunals under the Military Service Act, no money had been paid out by the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the operation of that Act. Except as regards any military representation who may have attended the tribunals. The whole administration and operation of that Act has been in the Department of Justice, and the Minister of Justice has had full and absolute control of its administration. So far as the Militia Department is concerned, we have had nothing to do with the Military Service Act until such period as we have been notified that the individual man has been refused exemption, and he is a soldier when he is handed over to us.

Mr. BUREAU: As the Minister of Public Works has suggested, if we are to consider anything this evening, it should be the salaries, and the only source of information is the Auditor General's Report. We have had the estimates of the other departments before us; we have not yet had the estimates of the Militia Department. I have, however, no objection to offer to that. I see a note I took the other night while we were putting through the estimates of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Naval Service. At that time a remark was addressed to the Minister of Militia by his predecessor. I am rather afraid to embarrass somebody else by keeping the promise I made to the ex-Minister of Militia that night. The note asks this question: Why should not the Deputy Minister of Militia receive the same salary as the Deputy Minister of Agriculture or the Deputy Minister of Naval Service?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Or the Deputy Minister of Justice?

Mr. BUREAU: The Deputy Minister of Justice receives eight or nine thousand dollars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: More than that.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to make any remarks as I know I should embarrass the Deputy Minister of Militia who is present to-night, but I want to make a reservation for myself and ask the Minister of Militia's permission to come back on the subject later on, although we may not be discussing the question of salaries, so that I may keep the promise I made to the former Minister of Militia and also follow the dictates of my heart. I want to impress upon the Minister of Militia that this is a true demand we are making. I know nothing about the operation of the Department of Militia, but I am told that the Deputy Minister of Militia is also vice-president, or occupies a prominent position in the Militia Council, and I have been informed that this Militia Council holds meetings, if not daily, two or three times a week, and that it involves extra work. If I speak now, it is just to get a reservation and to ask the minister's permission to come back to this subject, as I have something else to add, and I am in a very peculiar position, having to make the statement before the deputy minister himself.

Major-General MEWBURN: Of course, the hon. member is free to ask any questions and I shall endeavour to answer them, but if he does not wish to ask them to-night, he will have another opportunity. What was the question he wished to ask?

Mr. BUREAU: I wish to make a plea in favour of an increase in salary to the deputy minister. The Deputy Minister of Immigration receives a salary of $6,000; the Deputy Minister of Naval Service receives a salary of $6,000; the Deputy Minister of Justice receives a salary of $10,000, and I understand that the largest and heaviest burden of administration in civil government falls upon the shoulders of the Minister of Militia and his deputy.

Major-General MEWBURN: As regards salaries of deputy ministers, I do not hesitate to say that in the short time I have been administering the Militia Department and, from the knowledge I have of some of the other departments, I think the deputy ministers are very much underpaid for their services. I am a great believer in trying to get efficiency from a business standpoint, and I know that in private concerns you could not get a man for twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars a year to assume the same responsibilities and carry out the same work that are put upon the shoulders of deputy ministers. From my personal knowledge since I have been in the Militia Department and from my intimate connection with it for years past, I know that not only the deputy minister but some of the other officials have not worked by the clock but have worked until all hours of the night in order to cope with the burdens laid upon their shoulders.

Mr. BUREAU: I may take that as an intimation that my request will be granted without any further remarks on my part?

Major-General MEWBURN: I certainly will be pleased to concur in that, if I can get it done.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain the increase in the salaries of these two officials. One of them is apparently in the first division.

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, in subdivision A of the first division. There are three statutory increases of $100 each. Mr. Brown has gone up as chief accountant, and the other is Mr. Lewis, who appears here as assistant secretary of the militia council, with a salary of $2,800. He was formerly in subdivision B of the first division at the same salary.

Contingencies—Sundries, $11,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What does this item include?

Major-General MEWBURN: Telegraph and telephone communications from different parts, cablegrams, etc. I have not the details here, but I can get them for my hon. friend if he desires.

Progress reported.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. F. B. Carvell (Minister of Public Works), Bill No. 40, to amend the Public Works Act, was read the second time.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT.

Hon. F. B. Carvell (Minister of Public Works) moved the second reading of Bill No. 41, to amend Navigable Waters Protection Act. He said: I had intended to ask for the second reading of this Bill, but if my hon. friends think it is time to adjourn I will not press it.

Mr. BUREAU: We do not object to giving the Bill its second reading provided it is distinctly understood that if we object to the principle of the Bill, we can discuss the principle in Committee.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. member can discuss anything in Committee. I could not keep him from discussing it if I wanted to.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister flatters me, but I should like that distinctly understood, because the other day we had understood the Prime Minister to aquiesce in a similar request, he objected to the principle of a Bill being discussed in Committee. If, therefore, it is distinctly understood that we can discuss the principle of this Bill in Committee, if we so desire, we shall have no objection to agreeing to the second reading.

Mr. CARVELL: I am perfectly willing to agree to that proposal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Wednesday, April 10, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 43, an Act to incorporate The Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill No. 44, an Act respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 45, an Act respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 46, an Act respecting United Grain Growers, Limited, formerly The Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 47, an Act to confirm an agreement made between Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Crowe.

VACANCY IN ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF LANARK.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Lanark by the decease of Adelbert E. Hanna, Esquire. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

PROPOSAL BY Mr. SPEAKER TOWARDS EFFECTING ECONOMY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the extremely severe financial pressure due to the present war, I have thought it proper to endeavour to effect such economies in con-

nection with the management of the business of the House as may be secured without injuriously affecting its prompt and efficient conduct. To this end I appointed a committee of three of the senior officers of the House to look into the question of the parliamentary printing. This committee has made a report recommending that the Votes and Proceedings and the Journals should be consolidated. The committee believes that in this way, while a full and proper record of the proceedings of the House would be preserved, that a very large saving would result. I beg to suggest, therefore, that the House appoint a small committee of three experienced members to consider whether this proposal should be adopted. It is not intended to make any change this session, but during the coming recess to work out the details of the scheme, and to begin the new arrangement next session.

I may also inform the House that I purpose, myself, to immediately make a very full inquiry into the duties and organization of the staff of the House, the result of which I shall communicate to the House in due course.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In accordance with the proposal which has just been made by Mr. Speaker I move, seconded by Sir George Foster, that a committee composed of Messrs. Pardee, Nickle, and Lemieux, be appointed to consider and report upon the question of consolidating the Votes and Proceedings and Journals of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The committee as proposed is quite acceptable, but I would suggest that the name of Mr. Currie, of Simcoe, be added. That hon. gentleman presented a very valuable report upon a similar question last session, which perhaps did not receive the consideration it merited. Doubtless the new committee will find a good deal of information in the report referred to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall be very glad to add Mr. Currie's name.

Motion as amended agreed to

MILITIA COUNCIL REPORT.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I lay on the table of the House the report of the militia council for the year ended 31st March, 1917. Also a memorandum prepared by the Department of Militia and Defence covering the year 1916. I ascertained that this memorandum was not brought down last year, and while it contains the same information with respect to the establishment and organization of the department that would be available now, an additional memorandum has been prepared which is not yet printed, but which will be distributed as soon as completed.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING BANKRUPTCY.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has been suggested that the second reading of the Bill respecting Bankruptcy should be taken pro forma in order that it may be referred to a special committee for the purpose of studying it. The second reading of the Bill under such conditions will not commit the House to the principle of the measure, or to any particular provision of it, but will afford an opportunity for the special committee to study the Bill and make their report with regard to it, and for the House to consider that report during the present session should time permit.

Mr S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I beg to move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move, seconded by Sir George Foster, that Bill No. 25 respecting bankruptcy be referred to a special committee to be composed of Messrs. Guthrie, Nesbitt, Cockshutt, Redman, Mowat, Henders, Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Nickle, Green, Jacobs, McMaster, Ross, Lapointe (Kamouraska). Leduc and Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysboro) with power to report from time to time, and that the said committee have leave to sit during the time that the House in in session.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the House do now return to Motions.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the House do now proceed to Notices of Motion.

Motion agreed to.

THE WAR.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Order No. 13 has been on the Order Paper for some time, and embodies a proposal which I think it would be very well for the House to adopt. In the absence of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I beg to move on his behalf that the motion be passed in the

following terms, leaving out some unnecessary words in order to make it effective:

That a Special Committee be appointed to consider and report upon the Pension Board, the Pension Regulations and the sufficiency or otherwise of the relief afforded thereunder, the Pension lists in force in Canada for disabled and other soldiers and the dependents of those killed while on active service, and any other matters relating thereto or connected therewith, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the House do now return to Motions.

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 48, to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Explain.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: The proposed amendment will not affect the principle of the Act at all, but it has been found, in administering the Act, that it might be made materially more useful if some amendment were made touching the procedure under it. There are quite a number of such changes, and I do not suppose the House desires me at this stage to go into all the details.

Mr. MURPHY: Will they call for an increased staff?

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

ENROLMENTS AND EXEMPTIONS.

Mr. MacNUTT:

1. What is the total number of "draftees" under the "Military Service Act," up to 1st February, 1918?
2. How many were exempted for farm work?
3. How many were declared "medically unfit?"
4. What disposition has been made of the "medically unfit?"

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to define his question a little more clearly. It is difficult to determine what he contemplates by "draftees." Does he contemplate men eligible for service and ordered to report, or men who have been actually enrolled? It makes a difference not only as to the first question, but as to what is apparently contemplated by the other questions. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would let me know exactly what he wants.

LEASES OF PROPERTY AT QUEBEC.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Department of Justice leased any property in Quebec for the purposes of the Military Service Act since the first of July, 1917?
2. If so, what rental is being paid, from whom was such property leased, and on whose recommendation?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. 209 John street, from Berlinquette Estate, on rental of $115 per month; lease expires 1st May prox. 217 John street, from Joseph Vincent of the Cummings Estate; leased by the late District Military Representative and taken over by the Deputy Registrar at Quebec and used as Police Headquarters: rental $50 per month; lease expires 1st May prox. The Auditorium, leased from the Auditorium Company, Limited, at a rental of $375 per month, from the 1st February, 1918: lease terminated 30th ultimo, as the premises were gutted by fire started by rioters and are wholly uninhabitable. Early in January it was found that the John street properties were wholly inadequate for the working requirements and the proper housing of the staff, and it was then arranged to move into larger quarters in the Auditorium building. On Tuesday, the 2nd April, temporary quarters were secured from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the new wing of the Chateau Frontenac on the seventh and eighth floors, at a rental of $1,000 per month. The John street properties were leased by the Deputy Registrar at Quebec, Mr. A. Gobeil, K.C.; the Auditorium on the authority of the Military Service Council and the Chateau Frontenac on the recommendation of the Director of the Military Service Branch.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Has the Military Service Act, respecting medical examinations, been amended by Order in Council?
2. If not, is the medical examination sworn to and made by the family physician, still given the same consideration under the Act, as if said examination were made by a military medical officer?
3. Is the Government aware that, in many cases, no consideration is given to the medical certificate of a family physician, and that in

most all cases said certificates are given only a minor consideration by the Military Medical Boards?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to check such abuses, and concede the consideration which a responsible medical profession deserves?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. Where difference arises between report of Military Medical Board and other physicians, the Exemption Tribunals may refer the case to a Board of Revision composed of civilian and military physicians.

3. No.

4. The Government is not aware that any abuse exists.

PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS OF EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. What is causing delay in the payment of amounts due members of local Exemption Tribunals?

2. What amount is paid citizens who filled such offices, and on what basis?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Their large number and the numerous cases where unjustified charges are made, necessitating careful checking and delay in adjustment.

2. Five dollars a day each day's sitting up to 7th day of January, where remuneration is asked for, plus reasonable expense.

BRITISH EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. SMITH:

Is it the intention of the Government to urge the repeal of the Act of 1896 so that Canadian cattle will be allowed into Great Britain?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information called for by this question is set forth in the following extract from a discussion on the subject which took place at the Imperial War Conference on the 26th day of April, 1917. This discussion was embodied in a return laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom in September last, and also laid before the Parliament of Canada at the last session, and which reads:

Imperial War Conference, 1917.

Extracts from Discussions at the Imperial War Conference on the Admission of Canadian Cattle into the United Kingdom.

NOTE.—The discussion took place on the Fourteenth Day, Thursday, 26th April 1917. (*See* p. 113 of Minutes of Proceedings in [Cd 8566.].)

Mr. Rogers: Mr. Chairman, yesterday, when the Resolution presented by Sir Albert Stanley from the Board of Trade came before this Conference, a Resolution which was, in my judgment, very proper and very desirable from all points of view, he was able to make no mention of beef imported from the Dominion of Canada, and my purpose in bringing the matter up is to draw attention to the fact that this was entirely due to the action on the part of the Board of Agriculture in placing an embargo as against Canadian cattle because of alleged pleuro-pneumonia in a shipment of Canadian cattle to England in the year 1892. Now, as I understand, it was shown conclusively that the allegation was erroneous, and that it was irregular to create the embargo and to put it in force; but later it was made statutory. Since that date I may say, for the information of the Conference, that over 3,000,000 head of cattle have been shipped from Canada and slaughtered on arrival in Great Britain, and no single case of disease has been discovered. Now you can understand that this is a condition which we complain of very seriously, and we have made several appeals with respect to it. Later on we got an answer through his Excellency the Governor General of that day, Lord Grey, giving us a copy of a letter from the Board of Agriculture, in which it was stated that the experience of foreign countries had shown how suddenly and unexpectedly foot-and-mouth disease made its appearance, irrespective of an efficient veterinary organisation.* That goes to show that the Board of Agriculture were not able to support the ground upon which they placed an embargo against all Canadian cattle originally, and shifted their ground in making this statement that in foreign countries experience went to show that very suddenly and unexpectedly foot-and-mouth disease could develop. This has had a very detrimental effect in Canada. This, of course, intensifies the feeling that a great injustice has been done by the Board of Agriculture as against the Dominion of Canada in respect of the cattle industry, and when this Resolution was presented by Sir Albert Stanley, we felt that it was an opportune moment to bring this matter to the attention of the Conference, in order to see if it would be possible for us to have redress. I may say that our Minister of Agriculture, in a letter on the question, states that our cattle are as healthy as any cattle in the world, and during the three outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, which have occurred since the embargo was placed, Canada has been able to maintain her herds absolutely free from infection. From the point of view of disease, therefore, I feel very strongly that there is every justification for the removal of this embargo. Of course, we naturally argue that this embargo has been placed as a matter of policy by the Board of Agriculture for the purpose of the development of the British live cattle industry. If the Board of Agriculture conceive it to be their duty and to be in the public interest of Great Britain to have a policy of protection of their live cattle industry, then we would have no complaint and offer no objection; but we do seriously complain in that an embargo is placed against our cattle which supplies this protection and carries with it the stigma that they are liable to have pleuro-pneumonia, and, therefore we suffer not only in this market but more or less in the markets of the United States. I think it is due to Canada—and I think this is the proper time when we should ask this Conference—to take some definite action in order that this wrong may be remedied, so that our Canadian cattle shall have the same consideration and be received in Great Britain without having to go through the embargo that has been placed upon them by the action of the Board of Agriculture.

You, Mr. Long, were good enough to suggest that you would like to see present here a representative of the Board of Agriculture when the matter came up, and the discussion on the point was adjourned from yesterday for that purpose. I am glad that the representatives of that Department are here to-day, and if they have any explanation to offer, or any reason why this embargo should be continued in the future, then of course we would like to know it and to understand it in order that we may be able to explain it, at all events, when we go back to Canada, because it is a very very very live question and one in which our people take the very deepest interest. Probably you will remember, Mr. Long, that I had this matter up with you some days ago, and you sent me a letter to say "Mr. Prothero suggests, therefore, that further discussion on the matter should be deferred until after the War, when the representations of the Canadian Government can be brought forward for reconsideration." But we do not like to feel that we are misunderstood or that our cattle industry is suffering from a reputation that never did exist, and a stigma which never ought to have been attached. Therefore, if there is any explanation to be given on the part of the Board of Agriculture, we shall be very glad indeed to hear it.

Mr. Prothero: Of course you know in this country we are very panicky about outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, and you quite correctly state that the case on which the policy was founded dates right back to 1892. I had up the papers which relate to the alleged outbreak in 1892, and as far as I could see it was not a case of pleuro-pneumonia at all. The case upon which this embargo was founded—it is not quite correctly stated as an embargo, because cattle are allowed to be landed provided they are slaughtered at the landing—dates right back to 1892. As I say, I had the papers up before me this morning, and I think the papers show that the alleged case on which the embargo was founded is extremely doubtful as to its being pleuro-pneumonia. I also believe that at the present moment and for many years past, as far as I can make out, Canada has been free from the disease, and on those grounds therefore we should receive the present suggestion for the removal of the embargo very sympathetically. As far as I personally am concerned, and so far as the English Board of Agriculture is concerned, after the War is over, of course, because it is not an economical mode of bringing meat to this country during the War to bring over live animals, we should, I consider, be wise to remove the embargo, and I think for this reason in the main: The home demand for store cattle in the eastern counties has been rather imperfectly met for many years past. On the other hand, there has been a considerable increase in breeding in this country; but if we have, what I think we shall have, a large extension of the arable farming in this country, we shall want to increase our reservoir for store cattle. Of course, your Canadian cattle will come over as what we call "stores," that is to say, they are to be fed and fattened here in England. We shall want a great many more store cattle if we have this great extension of arable farming; we shall want more animals to trample the straw and eat the root crops. At the same time there are signs that we shall not get the same number of store cattle from Ireland as heretofore.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

You will understand—I do not know whether there is a representative of the Irish Department here—that the main opposition, at least one strong line of opposition, to the introduction of Canadian stores is that the Irishman is afraid that it is going to cut into his trade in store cattle with this country. Well, Ireland is advancing most rapidly in its agricultural development. If we get cattle from Ireland they will increasingly come over here in the form of finished, fully fed cattle. Therefore the supply of Irish store cattle is likely to diminish, and in that case again the fact that we can turn to Canada for store cattle will be of great advantage to us, and I can assure you that so far as the English Board of Agriculture is concerned, we are in favour of the removal of the embargo. We do not believe that there is now, or has been for a good many years past, the slightest ground to exclude Canadian cattle on the score of disease. I do not know—I am afraid you know a great deal better than I do—but any statistics I have seen as to disease in Canada show me that you have been remarkably free from it. That is so, is it not?

Sir Robert Borden: That is absolutely so.

Mr. Prothero: Therefore, that is the answer that I would like to make you. I am afraid I ought to consult the Irish Department, because they may make difficulties, but I do not think they will, because, as I say, the whole development of Irish farming is in favour of the breaking up of these great grass ranches on which the store cattle were grazed, and from which they were sent over. Instead of that they are adopting the finishing system, upon which, of course, there is very much more money to be made and much more profit agriculturally in other ways to the farmer.

Sir Robert Borden: Mr. Prothero, may I ask a question purely for information: Is the statute or the regulation which constitutes the so-called embargo applicable to all countries or is it only applicable to certain countries?

Mr. Prothero: It is applicable to all countries. I believe it was passed by Mr. Walter Long in 1896.

Chairman: It was.

Mr. Rogers: Are you quite sure, Mr. Prothero, that it applies to all countries?

Mr. Prothero: It does. I mean that it is a broad general principle, but we can admit animals in exceptional cases from time to time. I think that is the case.

Sir Robert Borden: We appreciate very much your sympathetic attitude with regard to the matter, Mr. Prothero. As to postponing it until after the end of the War, I am not so much impressed by the consideration put forward, because, assuming the absence of tonnage, nothing would come forward in any case until that shortage is relieved. As far as Canada is concerned, I do not want it understood that we desire to interfere in any way with the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom. If it is thought desirable here that the cattle industry should be protected, whether in Ireland, or England, or Scotland, or Wales, that is a matter of domestic concern for the United Kingdom, about which we do not desire to make any suggestion; but what has been felt in Canada, whether rightly or wrongly, is this, that under the guise of a sanitary regulation you have succeeded in carrying out a fiscal policy—

Chairman; It was said just now that I was responsible for this policy, for advising the

Government. It certainly was not that at all, nor did we accept the view (which my friend Mr. Prothero has said obtained twenty years afterwards) that we had not abundant evidence. There was a difference of opinion between your scientific people and ours. Our people held a strong view about it. There was a great agitation in this country about disease, particularly pleuro-pneumonia, and our scientific people differed from yours.

Mr. Rogers: A Commission was appointed to go into the facts of the whole case, and they decided that there was no ground for the action which was taken.

Chairman: Your people held one view and ours the other.

Sir Robert Borden: I think Mr. Prothero has put it very moderately when he says that it was at least a doubtful case. I should say there was not any substantial evidence at all of disease in Canada. There was only one instance adduced, and the experts were divided upon that. We sought an independent investigation outside Canada, and that investigation convinced us that there was absolutely nothing in it, and from that time up to the present not a single case has developed in Canada so far as I am aware, whereas numerous instances of disease have developed in the United Kingdom during that time. As far as sanitary regulations are concerned, there would be far more reason for us to put an embargo against British cattle coming to Canada than there would for Great Britain to impose an embargo upon Canadian cattle coming here. Whether rightly or wrongly, the impression does exist in Canada, that it was more the carrying out of a fiscal policy than the enforcement of a sanitary regulation. I know that view impressed itself upon the members of the late Administration, and we are not free from it ourselves.

Chairman: Sir Charles Tupper held that view.

Sir Robert Borden: Yes, and the members of the late Administration held that view; the Canadian Minister of Agriculture I am quite sure held that view. If it is desired to protect the cattle industry in the United Kingdom, let it be done; that is a matter of domestic concern; but do not accomplish it by the enforcement of a regulation which casts an undeserved slur upon conditions in Canada.

I am sure we are all very much obliged to Mr. Prothero for the sympathetic consideration he has given to the subject, and, as it is a matter of sentiment with us as well as a matter of material consideration, I hope it may be possible for him to reach the conclusion that it is not necessary to await the termination of hostilities before taking action for this purpose; but that, of course, is for him to decide. I only offer a strong suggestion along that line.

Chairman: Of course you could get publicity given to the thing by having a question asked in the House of Commons, without passing any statute. As far as I am concerned, as my name has been brought into it I can only say that I entirely agree with Mr. Prothero's policy. I think the time that has elapsed has shown that Canada has had a complete and clean bill of health during that time. I am not concerned to defend my share of the policy, though I was personally responsible as Minister, but it is fair to my advisers at that time—I am sorry to say I am afraid they are no longer alive even—to say that they disagreed with the advisers of the Canadian Government. Sir Charles Tupper was Minister for Agriculture, I think.

Mr. Rogers: No, he was the High Commissioner.

Chairman: Perhaps I mean his son.

Mr. Rogers: He was never Minister of Agriculture. It was Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, who took the matter up and took a deep interest in it.

Chairman: That is our old friend who died the other day.

Mr. Rogers: Yes.

Chairman: No, I mean another Tupper, one of the sons. I thought he was Minister for Agriculture. He came over here, saw Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary for the Colonies, and then came to see me. There was a difference between the technical experts on both sides. In Canada they held that there was no justification; whereas our experts took the opposite view, and they held further that as it was possible for cattle to pass from the United States of America into Canada and they frequently did pass, and as in the United States there was risk of disease, they ought to be fortified here. That was the view that prevailed, and it was really a case for the experts, who were not fiscal reformers at all; they differed, and we followed our experts. I think, however, subsequent experience has shown that Canada has an absolutely clean bill of health.

Mr. Rogers: Yes, and we had it even in that case. They slaughter them now at the dock immediately they arrive.

Mr. Prothero: There is one point I might mention. I think, if I might use a slang phrase, we were rather "jumpy" at that time about cattle plague, because just before 1896, when this new legislation was made, we had been bringing in cattle from Argentina, and on the voyage a whole shipload of cattle were discovered to be actually suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. That was no doubt one of the reasons why we made this more drastic alteration, but we could, not by legislation but merely by an order of the Board of Agriculture, put Canada into the free list to-day.

Mr. Rogers: Then for Heaven's sake why do not they do it?

Chairman: I think that is not so. I have not looked into this thing for twenty years, and I think that that was exactly the sin I committed from the point of view of Canada. I think before the passing of the Act of 1896, to which we are now referring, you could do this by Order in Council. At that time, as Mr. Prothero has said, there was the gravest apprehension here with regard to our cattle industry. It was extremely important to our English cattle-breeders to increase the number of cattle in the country. We had from the year 1865 or 1866, right away down to the nineties, a succession of outbreaks of various diseases, foot-and-mouth and pleuro-pneumonia, and the demand of the cattle-breeders in this country was that they should be protected against disease, however slight the risk might be. That was a demand which was backed by experts. That was the real history of it. I think that removed from the Board of Agriculture the power to put countries on the free list. I think you will find that you will have to repeal the Act of Parliament, but I speak subject to correction.

Mr. Prothero: I am afraid I have not looked at the Act on this specific point. I was not quite sure what point I was supposed to

address myself to, but I will look into it, and if we do take any action I do not see why it should not be taken at once, especially if we cannot put it into operation until after the war is over.

Mr. Rogers: How do you mean, you cannot put it into operation?

Mr. Prothero: Because there are no ships.

Mr. Rogers: We do not object to that, but remove the stigma against us from which we are suffering.

Chairman: Now the position is that the restriction is to be removed, and the Board of Agriculture will take such steps as are necessary for this purpose, but upon the understanding that, there being no tonnage, there cannot be any arrivals.

Mr. Rogers: I do not want to have any understanding about it. If there is no tonnage, that follows.

Chairman: No, I do not want it to be a misunderstanding.

Sir Robert Borden: It cannot become effective because there is no tonnage.

Chairman: We cannot do it; I am quite sure that the Shipping Controller would stop it at once, and he would say, "We cannot let live cattle come because they take up too much room."

Sir Robert Borden: We perfectly understand that.

Mr. Rogers: Yes, but still, we do not want to be placed in a false position. This is an old sore and an old grievance, and now is the proper time to have it cured, because the facts are all in our favour.

Chairman: The Minister of Agriculture has undertaken to do it.

Mr. Rogers: Do not you think we should have a Resolution about it?

Chairman: You do not want a Resolution, do you—or if you like you can simply move that the embargo on Canadian cattle be removed as speedily as possible.

Mr. Rogers: I beg to move that.

Chairman: Mr. Prothero accepts that, and there is an end of it.

Mr. Hazen: I think as we have a statement from the President of the Board of Agriculture that this restriction will be removed, and that he does not see why it should not be done at once, we might leave it there.

Mr. Massey: Does this embargo apply to Canada only, or to all overseas countries?

Chairman: All overseas countries.

Mr. Hazen: You do not ship cattle from New Zealand; it is too far.

Mr. Massey: They did ship cattle from Australia, but we never ship them from New Zealand.

MATTAWIN RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. What is the cost of the dredging operations in the Mattawin River at St. Michel des Saints, in the county of Berthier?

2. What is the cost of the wharves or ice-breakers constructed by the Government on the Cypres River opposite the public highway at St. Michel des Saints?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. No dredging done by the Department of Public Works.

2. $1,501.83.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. GERALD DILLON.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is there an employee of the Justice Department named Gerald Dillon? If so, what is his position and salary?

2. Does he draw a salary from any other Department? If so, how much and under what right?

3. Is he in any way connected with the Militia Department?

4. What was the total amount drawn by this gentleman during the calendar year 1917?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes. Purchasing agent, present salary $3,300 per annum. He is also supply officer of internment operations and for his services as such he receives the pay attached to his rank of captain in the Canadian militia.

2. No.

3. No.

4. From penitentiaries vote, salary as purchasing agent, $3,175; salary and allowances equivalent to the pay of captain, under authority of a special Order in Council, $1,881.75.

CANAL EMPLOYEES AT FARRAN'S POINT.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Government employed Albert Hodgins, Richard Brown, Henry Alexander, Joseph Donnelly, Edward Markell, A. Anderson and William Daley, on the canal at or near Farran's Point?

2. If so, is the Government aware that the usual occupation of the said employees is that of farming?

3. Will the Government insist that the said employees engage in farming during the continuance of the war?

4. If so, are the positions heretofore held by the said employees to be given to returned soldiers?

Hon. J. D. REID:

The following is the information in so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned:

1. Yes; Albert Hodgins, Richard Brown, Henry Alexander, Joseph Donnelly, Edward Markell and William Daley. A. Anderson is not known to canal officials and has not been employed on the canal.

2. Albert Hodgins, employed since July 16, 1917, as lockmaster. Upon inquiry owns farm rented, but no work done by him.

Richard Brown, lock labourer, has a rented farm worked entirely by his family.

Henry Alexander, lockman, owns a farm which is leased to a farmer.

Joseph Donnelly, lock labourer, has a rented farm worked entirely by his family.

Edward Markell, lockman, is a labourer, who is not known to own any property.

William Daley, lockman, is a labourer, who owns a house in the village.

3. Will insist on their doing the work for which they are employed so long as in the Government employ.

4. Answered by No. 3.

PROTECTION DYKE ST. BARTHELEMI ROAD.

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. What is the nature of the works performed by the Government in the road leading to the St. Lawrence River, and with which is connected the Concession of le Grand Nord, in the parish of St. Barthelemi, in the county of Berthier?

2. What is the cost of said work?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Material was supplied by the Government to build a protection dyke, and the labour was supplied and paid for by the municipality.

2. $1,668.15.

NAVAL PATROL BOATS AND MINE SWEEPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many naval patrol boats and mine sweepers of all classes were ordered on Government account in 1916 and 1917?

2. How many have been delivered to date?

3. What is the speed of these boats? If various, specify?

4. Are they constructed of wood or steel?

5. What service are they intended for?

6. What has been the total expenditure to date?

7. How many officers and men are employed in this branch of the service?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. As the information asked by these questions is of a confidential nature it is not considered advisable in the public interest, to publish it.

DETENTION OF FREIGHT CARS IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware of the fact that a number of cars belonging to the different railways in Canada are being detained by the American authorities?

2. Has the Government any statement of the number of said cars so detained, and the length of time they have been held?

3. Has the Government taken any steps in order to obtain from the American authorities release of the said cars? If so, when, and how many cars have been thus returned to Canada?

4. Is the Government to take any further steps for the immediate return of the remainder of said cars in the United States?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Government is aware of the fact that a number of Canadian owned cars have been detained for a considerable length of time in the United States.

2. The Government has not got any information showing how long each car has been in the United States and it would be a very heavy matter to have each Canadian railroad prepare such information, but it does know that some of the cars have been detained in the United States for a considerable length of time.

On March 15, 1918, stood as follows:

	Due Canadian Rys.	Due U.S. Rys.
Box cars	18,146	
Auto, refrigerator, flat and stock cars.....	5,531	
Open top cars		9,407

Approximately 4,500 of the open top cars cannot be used for loading, as they came in with coal under an arrangement that they would be returned to the United States just as soon as made empty.

3. The Minister of Railways and Canals has had the matter up on several occasions with the Director General of the United States railways; the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence has also had the matter up on several occasions with the Regional Director of the United States railways as well as with the Car Service Section of the United States railways. The secretary of the Canadian Railway Association for National Defence interviewed the Regional Director of the United States railways in New York on Friday last and was promised that a movement of empty cars to Canada would be immediately arranged. For some considerable time there has not been much change in the standing of the interchange balance.

4. The matter will not be allowed to drop and every means taken to obtain the desired end.

QUEBEC MILITARY SERVICE OFFICIALS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Who represented the Federal authorities in the City and District of Quebec since the Federal Government began their search for draftees under the Military Service Act, 1917.

2. What is the name of each and every officer employed by the Federal Government in the City and District of Quebec for this purpose?

3. What position did these men formerly occupy?

4. What was the fee, if any, paid to said officers for each draftee arrested?

Major-General MEWBURN: In so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, there is no officer specially employed in connection with the Military Service Act.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What are the officers' names in the County of Levis who are employed by the military authorities to enlist, search for, and inform against, or apprehend, men under the provisions of the Military Service Act?

2. Have said officers employed any other person or persons to assist them in the County of Levis in so doing? If so, what is the name of each of said persons?

3. What remuneration does each of said officers and assistants receive per month or per day, or for each conscripted man so informed against or apprehended?

Major-General MEWBURN: So far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, no officer is specially employed in connection with the Military Service Act. It is, however, part of the duties of the Acting Provost Marshal and his military police to assist in the apprehension of defaulters under the Act.

ROYALTIES ON COAL.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

Is it the intention of the Government to remove the royalties on coal mines in the Dominion of Canada, other than those removed from the Yukon coal mines by Order in Council of the 17th day of March, 1918?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has no proposal for the removal of the royalties on coal. The Order in Council of March 17 provided merely for the continuance of a practice that has been in force for five years.

PRIVATE SECRETARY.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is Mr. Main Johnson employed in the Privy Council Office, or in some other Government Department?

2. If so, was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission after competitive examination?

3. What was the date of his appointment, what are his duties, and what salary does he receive?

4. What were his occupation, duties and salary immediately prior to his appointment in the service of the Dominion Government?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes. In the Privy Council office as Private Secretary to the President of the Council.

2. Is graduate of the University of Toronto and his appointment was made in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

3. October 12, 1917; $2,800, plus $600 private secretary's allowance.

4. Private secretary to Mr. N. W. Rowell, K.C.; $3,500.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

CANADIAN FREIGHT CARS IN U.S.

*Mr. PARENT:

1. Has the Government, by itself or through the agency of a Commission or some party, taken steps for the return to Canada of freight cars in the United States at the present time, belonging to Canadian railways? If so, what steps have been taken?

2. Through whom, and to whom, have representations been made?

3. What has been the result?

4. Has the Government provided that in future the freight cars owned by Canadian railways shall not be unduly detained in the United States to be used in the operation of railways in that country?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes. The matter has been taken up by the Minister of Railways with the Hon. Mr. McAdoo, Director General of the United States Railways; the Regional Director of the United States Railways and the Car Service Section of the United States Railways; with the Canadian War Board at Washington, the Canadian Railway National Defence Association, and the railways have been doing all they could of their own initiative.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. We have not yet secured the return of sufficient Canadian cars or of the delivery of enough United States equipment to offset the Canadian cars.

4. There is no way by which the Government can exercise any jurisdiction over Canadian cars when they are in the United States. In order to prevent any further number getting away from Canada, some time ago all Canadian railways refused to allow their cars to be loaded for United States points, except in case of great emergency.

CANADIAN NORTHERN PHYSICAL ASSETS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Has any inventory been made of the physical assets of the Canadian Northern railway of Canada since the month of September, 1917, or within a year prior thereto?

2. If so, who made the inventory and when was it made?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to have one made in the near future? If not, why?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. An inventory was made of the physical assets of Canadian Northern railway by Professor Swain and is dated March 10, 1917. Full copy of report is included in Report of Royal Commission to Inquire into Railways and Transportation, and which was laid on the Table of the House.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. An announcement will be made in due course after report of Arbitration Board has been received.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. How many buildings have been rented by the Government in the City of Ottawa since February 1, 1915?
2. Who are the owners of the said buildings?
3. Where are said buildings situated?
4. What rent per annum is paid for each building or part of building?
5. For what time or term are said buildings rented?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers concerning the merger of the Bank of British North America with the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence concerning the resignation of W. F. O'Connor, K.C., as Cost of Living Commissioner.

WAR GRANT, $500,000,000.

THE PRIME MINISTER GIVES DETAILS OF WAR EXPENDITURE AND MAJOR GENERAL MEWBURN EXPLAINS MILITARY ESTIMATES.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 38 for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I proposed the second reading of a Bill very much the same as this in February, 1917, and I had then great hope that it would never be necessary to propose in this House a vote for war purposes of so large an amount. Unfortunately, the duration of the war has greatly exceeded the anticipations we had at that time, and the present is a moment when the greatest effort of the nation seems to be required.

It is not necessary, I hope, for me to say anything in support of the principle which this Bill embodies. It is, however, most desirable—indeed, absolutely necessary—that full information as to expenditure during the past year and estimates for the coming year should be afforded to the House in order that they may consider whether or not the Bill in its present form should be approved. It is precisely in the same form as the Bill which passed this House last year. I propose, therefore, if it meets the view of hon. gentlemen opposite and of the House in general, that the House go into committee on the Bill, whereupon I shall give such information as is available with regard to the expenditure of the past and the estimate for the future. I shall endeavour to have that information placed upon Hansard in a form which will be quite intelligible. After I have discharged that duty, the Minister of Militia and Defence will give a statement to the committee setting forth information more especially upon the military side of the questions that are involved. We shall then be very glad to have suggestions from hon. gentlemen as to any further information that may be desired. I would then propose that the committee should rise and report progress, in order that the information thus spread upon the pages of Hansard may be taken into account with a view to further consideration of the Bill in committee on another day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The suggestion of the Prime Minister, in so far as the method of giving information to the House is concerned, is quite acceptable. In order to facilitate business, the information which is usually conveyed to the House in a resolution was postponed until the second reading of the Bill. We on this side of the House shall reserve our right to criticise the main features of the Bill, after the information promised has been received, when the Bill comes up again for discussion.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the chair.

On Section 1—short title:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before the Bill is considered section by section, it is desirable that I shall set forth, so far as it is available, the information to which I alluded in speaking upon the motion for the second reading. It is important that the committee should be informed of the war expenditures from the commencement so far as the returns have been received. Hon. gentlemen will, of course, realize that full particulars and details as to expenditures overseas are not available for some months after the expenditure has taken place.

The expenditure overseas has, naturally and necessarily, been under the direct supervision of the Auditor General. I think about two years ago we conferred with the Auditor General as to the desirability of his having special officers on the spot in England to audit the expenditures over there. We gave him an absolutely free hand. We told him to appoint for that purpose officers who should be resident overseas, and, if necessary, to establish a branch of his office in

London for that work. He did send an officer or officers overseas, who remained there for some months, but I believe they have since returned, as he did not think it necessary that they should remain there during the past winter. Thus, all the expenditure that has taken place in the United Kingdom and France has been very directly and thoroughly under the supervision of the Auditor General in that way.

The total expenditure, on account of the war during the fiscal year 1914-15, the fiscal year 1915-16, the fiscal year 1916-17, and the fiscal year 1917-18, is detailed in a statement which I have under my hand and which has been approved by the Deputy Minister of Finance. In order that it may appear upon Hansard for the information of the members of the committee, I shall read it. It is in four columns, giving the department and the year, and also setting forth the expenditure of each department in each year.

EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF WAR.

Department.	1914-15	1915-16	1516-17	To April 8, 1917-18
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Militia & Defence	53,176,613 55	160,433,416 42	298,291,030 66	279,636,290 79
Justice	254,945 85	2,287,693 41	1,248,415 60	1,673,801 76
Dominion Police	132,763 89	201,708 04	159,380 55	184,602 64
Public Works	12,865 45	94,344 04	142,750 96	98,433 60
External Affairs	4,214 14	11,211 06	11,119 29	34,164 09
Naval Service	3,096,125 35	3,274,019 94	3,806,329 19	10,026,030 22
Post Office	110,097 80	349,672 00	634,824 59	
Railways & Canals	178,845 20	313,740 73	299,934 09	223,273 28
Indian Affairs	81 72	5,688 83	5,836 93	50,000 00
Governor General's Secretary's Office	4,330 93	9,108 81	8,118 63	8,163 80
Secretary of State	16,192 66	21,667 98	54,486 47	66,354 32
Privy Council	13,637 91	17,346 91	24,063 34	20,276 00
Inland Revenue		6,733 40	782 50	780 80
Trade & Commerce	3,003,005 06	14,795 40	23,391 30	83,475 86
War Purchasing Commission		29,413 39	33,077 69	24,599 12
Finance	149,630 09	73,671 16	54,472 22	6,024 02
Audit Office		4,439 17	21,254 01	33,121 08
Labour		1,071 19	85,980 86	
Agriculture		5,077 79	12,432 41	21,579 22
Marine		1,529 77	2,157 68	267,030 00
Legislation (Library)		270 00		
Interior		41,346 18	57.455 11	
Royal Northwest Mounted Police	597,126 44			
Military Hospitals Commission			1,378,078 43	9,303,396 28
Public Archives			1,462 42	11,083 58
Shell Commission			8,550 00	
Canadian Munition Resources Commission			11,123 21	
National Service Commission			111,759 89	117,777 07
Insurance			541 60	1,174 74
Food Control Board				189,253 73
Mines				14,983 09
Immigration & Colonisation				22,718 30
Reconstruction of Halifax (Railway & Canals)				339,206 89
News Print Commission				22,003 86
Public Information				3,569 41
Customs				5,199 50
				302,547,366 35
Less Post Office refund				149 85
Less Labour Department refund				14,232 12
	60,750,476 01	166,197,755 47	306,488,814 63	302,532,974 38

It should be borne in mind, however, that it is only possible to give for the present year the totals of the items which have passed through the books of the Department of Finance up to date. Very large items chargeable to the past fiscal year, especially with regard to the overseas forces, may be expected to come in for a considerable time, yet, even as late as the end of June.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the details of the expenditure for the year 1917-18 be available to the committee?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will make them available as far as we can. Of course, my hon. friend understands that the Auditor General's Report has not yet been prepared. We will give all information that is presently available.

Mr. MURPHY: Will it be possible to supplement that by a statement, such as was afforded us last year and the year before, of the expenditure in addition to the information contained in the Auditor-General's Report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We did give some such statement as that to which my hon. friend alludes. I have some of that information now in connection with the estimates for the coming year. A very careful estimate has been made which I shall give to the committee in a few moments and that contains pretty full information as to the character of the expenditure which has been incurred during the past and previous years and which will have to be incurred during the year upon which we have just entered. I am just reminded by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence that the report of the Militia Council, which has just been laid on the Table, and which will be distributed at once, contains information up to the 31st of March, 1917. As far as it is possible to supplement that in regard to the expenditure during the past fiscal year we shall give the information, of course.

Now, with respect to the character of the expenditure of the various departments during the past fiscal year and the estimated expenditure for the fiscal year upon which we have entered, it will be possible for me to make a statement in tabulated form. I hope hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that with respect to the expenditure during the past year there may be some discrepancy between the report which is given to me from the several departments and the report which I have just read from the Department of Finance because some of the items which have been paid may not yet have gone through the books of the Finance Department. The report from the Department of Agriculture is as follows:

EXPENDITURE BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

	1917-18	1918-19
Expenditure	$63,001 10	
Estimated Expenditure		$317,000 00

The items of the expenditure of $63,001.10, as presented to me by the Department of Agriculture are as follows:

Exemption representatives, expenditure	$11,155 38	
Unpaid accounts	3,260 00	
Total		$14,415 38
Bacon-hog Campaign, expenditure	23,763 60	
Unpaid accounts	2,135 35	
Total		25,898 51
Salaries of substitutes, expenditure		16,644 76
Representatives at Leave-of-Absence Boards, expenditure	542 45	
Unpaid accounts	5,500 00	
Total		6,042 45
Grand total		$63,001 10

The estimated amount required by the Department of Agriculture for 1919 shows an increase of $280,000, consisting of allowance for substitutes, $17,000; representatives at leave of absence board, $20,000, or a total of $317,000.

The next item is Canada registration board. The estimate for the expenditure of that board is $1,000,000. The minister in charge, Hon. G. D. Robertson, informs me that voluntary service may reduce this amount by one-third, and he hopes it will be so reduced.

The next item is Customs. The expenditure during the past year was $10,000; the estimate for the coming year is $10,000, and it comprises salaries and expenses of certain officers employed to enforce the prohibiting orders respecting exports and imports under the War Measures Act.

The next item is for the Department of External Affairs. The expenditure for the past year, as reported to me, is $19,914.46. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $35,000, and the increase is due to the transfer of the Prime Minister's office from the Privy Council to External Affairs.

The Department of Finance is next. The expenditure during the past year reported to me is $38,847. The estimate for the coming year is $60,000, and the increase is largely attributable to the newsprint commission.

The next item is with regard to immigration and colonization. The expenditure during the past fiscal year is, roughly speaking, $30,000. The estimate for the present fiscal

year is $35,470. The actual expenditure from May 24 to February 28 last
4 p.m. was $22,228.64. The increased expenditure has been occasioned by closer inspection at the American border, under Order in Council number 1433, to prevent men eligible for military duty from leaving the country.

Department of the Interior. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was $96,670, and the estimate for the present fiscal year is $100,000, or about the same amount. The expenditure is altogether, or nearly altogether, in the payment of substitutes for men who would have enlisted and gone overseas.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Can the hon. gentleman tell me what is meant by "substitutes?" I have a statement of expenditure before me, and the figures do not correspond. I see an item, "Interior, salaries for substitutes," $1,100,000 for this year and for the past year the estimate is larger. I have before me the paper the right hon. gentleman sent to me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Possibly I may have been reading the wrong column. The figures are a little out of line. I see, on looking at the items, that the right hon. leader of the Opposition is reading the wrong column. With reference to his question, I may say that when men applied for leave of absence to enlist and go overseas it was necessary to provide temporary substitutes to do their work in a great many cases, and this amount in connection with the Department of the Interior is for that purpose, because a very large number of men, from both the inside and outside service went over.

The Department of Justice. The expenditure for the past year was $1,470,000 and the estimate for the present fiscal year is $1,100,000. The cost of internment operations has been reduced from an annual charge of $1,230,000 to about $600,000. There are a few increases in other items of that department, but on the whole there is a net estimated decrease of $370,000.

Department of Labour. The expenditure during the past year is $39,480.22. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $75,000. The increase is due to the increased staff required for investigations.

Department of Marine and Fisheries. The expenditure during the past year was $569,297.98. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $34,735,470. The increase is due altogether to the shipbuilding programme, which is being paid for out of the war appropriation.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Department of Naval Service. The expenditure during the past year was $10,662,981.91. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $19,000,000, and the increase is due to a large increase in all directions of naval activities which have been considered absolutely necessary, after a very careful study, and very many conferences with the British Admiralty and very high naval authorities, who have been sent to this country for the purpose of such conference.

Post Office Department. The expenditure during the past year was $900,000. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $600,000. The explanation of that decrease is that an amount of $300,000, which was asked for to cover salaries of substitutes for men who might enlist, will not be required, as no salaries have been paid to men who have enlisted or been drafted since the Military Service Act was passed.

Privy Council. The expenditure during the past year was roughly speaking $30,000. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $15,000, and the reduction is due to the transfer of the Prime Minister's staff from the Privy Council to External Affairs.

Department of Public Works. The expenditure during the past year was $217,500. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $3,664,000. This is due almost altogether to the necessity of further buildings for military hospital accommodation. Those buildings are being constructed by the Department of Public Works. It it also due, to some extent, to the repairs to Government property, damaged or destroyed by the explosion at Halifax.

Department of Railways and Canals. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was $1,150,000, and the estimate for the present fiscal year is $700,000. The difference is accounted for by the fact that an item of $450,000 had to be appropriated to make good the damage to the railway by the Halifax explosion. That item will not be necessary for the present fiscal year.

Department of the Secretary of State. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was $82,106.05. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $60,000. There is a decrease of about $29,000 in printing and stationery, and some slight increases in other items, which together account for the difference.

Department of the Archives. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was $13,435, and the estimate for the fiscal year is $10,000. The expenditure is in relation to the War Archives Survey Commission and the War Trophy Exhibitions.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The expenditure during the past year in respect of matters that are now under the direction and control of that department was $9,303,294.80. The estimate for the present fiscal year is $12,000,000. A note which has been placed before me states that the expenditure of the military hospitals commission for eleven months ended February 28 was the amount that I have mentioned, $9,303,294.80. Of this amount $5,678,749 will not recur owing to the transfer, under Order in Council No. 433 passed on February 21 last, of certain branches of the Military Hospitals Commission, to the Departments of Militia and Defence and Public Works. The note further states that the expenditure for the coming year is difficult to estimate as a great deal depends upon casualties overseas, the rate of return of wounded and invalided soldiers until final discharge, and the number of men who may require re-education. However, the very best estimate that has been made is $1,000,000 a month, or $12,000,000 altogether.

Department of Trade and Commerce. The expenditure last year was $121,861.77, and the estimated expenditure for the present year is $286,864.29. The increased expenditure thus estimated is due to the establishment of the war trade board and the performance of the duties which it has undertaken, and also to larger expenditure by the fuel controller in the present fiscal year.

I come to the principal item, the expenditure by the Department of Militia and Defence, and I shall give to the Committee such information as I have available with regard to the expenditures both in this country and overseas in connection with the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that the Hospitals Commission is henceforward to be under the Militia Department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. What has been accomplished is this: The care and treatment of returned soldiers up to the time of their discharge, whether in hospital or otherwise, is now undertaken by the Department of Militia and Defence; but the care and treatment after their discharge, and many of them require care and treatment after discharge, is undertaken by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission, which is under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. The estimates that have been placed before me divide the proposed expenditure into that which will be incurred in Canada, and that which will be incurred overseas. In making this estimate the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence has looked to the enrolment during the year of one hundred thousand men in Canada for the purpose of supplying reinforcements to the forces at the front. The estimate which has been placed in my hands, and which I have discussed with him, is as follows:

WAR ESTIMATES 1918-1919.
Canada and Overseas.

		Estimated Expenditure in Canada.	Estimated Expenditure Overseas.	Estimated Total Expenditure.
Pay of 110,000 troops in Canada and 290,000 in England and France		$ 50,187,500	$132,312,500	$182,500,000
Less Assigned Pay paid in Canada	$54,000,000		62,000,000	62,000,000
Less estimated increase, Deferred Pay	8,000,000		70,312,500	120,500,000
Assigned Pay, Overseas troops		54,000,000		54,000,000
Separation Allowance		21,750,000	6,000,000	27,750,000
Rations, etc., 110,000 troops in Canada at 50 cents each per day and 150,000 in England at 38½ cents		20,075,000	21,000,000	41,075,000
Clothing and Necessaries:—				
First issue to 100,000 men at $64,00 each	$6,400,000			
Half-yearly to 100,000 men at $29.00 each	2,900,000			
Accoutrements to 100,000 men at $5.00 each (haversack, waist-belt and water bottle)	500,000			
Upkeep of clothing 160,000 men in Canada and England at $58 each $9,280,000		19,080,000		19,080,000
Outfit Allowances to officers, nursing sisters and warrant officers		1,000,000	700,000	1,700,000
Equipment—including harness and saddlery, vehicles of all kinds, tents, blankets and all equipments, except rifles, machine guns, small arms ammunition and clothing		20,000,000		20,000,000
Ordnance Services—including all expenses in connection with Ordnance Stores			1,800,000	1,800,000

WAR ESTIMATES 1918-1919. Canada and Overseas.	Estimated Expenditure in Canada.	Estimated Expenditure Overseas.	Estimated Total Expenditure.
Medical Services—including medical equipment, drugs, etc and special diets		2,800,000	2,800,000
Ammunition—Dominion and Lindsay Arsenals and Dominion Cartridge Co.	5,000,000		5,000,000
Machine Guns	2,000,000		2,000,000
Ocean Transport	4,612,500		4,612,500
Railway Transport	11,062,500	450,000	11,512,500
Forage	450,000		450,000
Veterinary Services—including purchase of remounts, cost of forage etc.		3,000,000	3,000,000
Engineer Works, housing of troops etc.	2,750,000	1,250,000	4,000,000
Civilian Employees	2,920,000	750,000	3,670,000
Sundry—including recruiting expenses, telegrams, printing and stationery, pay of censors, customs dues, funeral expenses, drugs, etc (in Canada)	3,000,000		3,000,000
Printing and Stationery (Overseas)		300,000	300,000
General Expenses (Overseas) including all miscellaneous expenditure not chargeable elsewhere, expenses in connection with Mechanical Transport, horse transport, Engineer Services (other than new buildings) damage claims, cost of funerals, exchange etc.		1,800,000	1,800,000
Maintenance of troops in France at 9/4 each per day		115,000,000	115,000,000
	$217,887,500	$225,162,500	$443,050,000

It might be well to place before the committee, so that hon. gentlemen may have the opportunity of studying it, the explanatory note upon the estimate which I have just read.

The estimates of 1918-19 are based on the assumption that the operation of the Military Service Act will increase the number of troops raised in Canada to a total of 500,000, accounted for as follows:

First Draft, Military Service Act	100,000
Home Defence Force	10,000
In England	150,000
In France	140,000
Discharged after service at the front Killed, died of wounds, &c.	100,000
	500,000

The estimate of 150,000 troops in Great Britain might, perhaps, be misunderstood, if I did not explain the view set forth to me by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence. It must be borne in mind that the troops in Great Britain comprise, in the first place, the Forestry Corps, which is carrying on important work in the United Kingdom; there is a considerable force of that corps doing such work in the United Kingdom. In the second place, it comprises all the wounded men who are in hospitals in various parts of the United Kingdom. In the third place, it also includes the men who, having become convalescent in the hospitals, are sent to the various camps in the United Kingdom in order that they may be trained again for service at the front. And, lastly, it includes all the troops that from time to time are sent from this country to Great Britain in order that they may be available as reinforcements for the front. It includes also a considerable number of men who are detained in Great Britain for the purpose of doing necessary work around the hospitals and the camps and for various purposes of that character, and so the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence has made his estimate based on these considerations.

The note goes on to say that the proposed expenditure in Canada amounts to $217,887,500, and it is estimated that $225,162,500 will be expended overseas, making a total of $443,050,000, which works out to an average of $1,107.62 per man. I recollect that, in the early days of the war, the statement was made to the House that the probable expenditure for keeping each man in the field for a year would be about one thousand dollars. This estimate is slightly in excess of that. The memorandum proceeds:

DETAILS.

Pay.—The average cost works out at $1.25 each per day for all ranks; deducting 100,000 for casualties as above, the daily cost for the 400,000 remaining on pay would be $500,000 or a total of $182,500,000 for a year. The increase in the amount of deferred pay for the troops Overseas is estimated at $8,000,000.

As men return in increasing numbers from the front, of course, deferred pay will become payable to them in increasing volume, and arrangements are under consideration by the Department of Militia and Defence as to the best manner in which that payment can be carried out so as to

ensure that the deferred pay thus handed over will be employed by the men for some useful purpose. The memorandum proceeds:

The net amount required for pay would, therefore, be $174,500,000, of which $50,187,500 would be paid in Canada, in addition to $54,000,000 assigned pay of troops Overseas, and $70,312,500 would be paid in England.

Separation Allowance.—There are at present about 71,000 dependents in Canada receiving separation allowance. The allowance has been extended to dependent sisters and invalid fathers during the past year, and increased for rank and file from $20.00 to $25.00, making an average of about $26.75 a month for all ranks—This would amount to about $19,000,000 for the year, and allowance is being made in the estimate for possible increase in numbers.

There are also a number of soldiers' dependents in receipt of separation allowance who reside in the British Isles and are paid by the Chief Paymaster, Canadian Overseas Expeditionary Force. It is estimated that about $6,000,000 will be paid out by him on that account during 1918-19.

Rations.—This includes the allowance in lieu of rations and rations in kind. The average cost in Canada is 50 cents per day for each man, the average having increased by 15 cents over last year's estimate. For the troops in England the average cost of rations, billeting etc., is estimated at about 1/7 (38½ cents) per diem each for 150,000 men only, as 140,000 at least will be in France and rationed by the British Government.

Clothing, Necessaries, Accoutrements.—The estimate is for the outfitting of 100,000 troops at $64.00 each for clothing and necessaries, at $5 each for waist belt, water bottle and haversack to be supplied in Canada, and upkeep at $29 each for the first renewal after 6 months; and for the upkeep of clothing for the year of the remaining 160,000 men in Canada and England. Accoutrements, other than the three articles enumerated are supplied in England and in all probability will not be paid for until the end of the war. The upkeep of clothing for the troops in France is covered by the payment to the British Government of 9/4 a day each for their maintenance.

The arrangement made with the British Government in the autumn of 1916 was for a considerably less amount than nine shillings four pence each; I mentioned this to the House last year. After that arrangement had been in force some time, however, the British Government desired that it might be reopened, under an understanding which had been made when it was first entered into. The grounds upon which they based their request seemed to be reasonable, and I believe that the request has since been acceded to by the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand. The ground was this: at the time the arrangement was made no one had any conception of the tremendous expenditure for ammunition, especially ammunition for the field guns; there was no adequate conception of the number of shells that would be used in the tremendous battles that have since been waged. They gave us quite satisfactory evidence that some readjustment ought to be made of the amount of six shillings or thereabouts that had been first decided upon. I am not quite sure whether or not we have yet acceded to the proposal. It was thought when I was in England about a year ago that some further inquiry should be made and the most exact information procured before we should give our final assent to any change in an arrangement which had been made after very careful study and consideration. As I say, however, the other dominions have agreed to the change, and unless there is some good reason to the contrary—I know of none at the moment—it would appear desirable and even necessary that this country should adopt the course which has been adopted in Australia and New Zealand in that regard. When I went over this memorandum with the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, the question occurred to me as to why the cost here is greater than in England. He tells me that the rations of the troops in Canada are issued on a very generous scale, and include some articles that cannot possibly be provided in the United Kingdom. On that account—really on account of the food conditions in the United Kingdom and France—the ration with which the soldier is provided there costs less than the very ample ration which is provided in this country.

The memorandum continues:

It is estimated that $1,000,000 will be required to pay the proportion of the outfit allowance issued in Canada to officers, nursing sisters, and warrant officers, and that a further sum of $700,000 will be paid out by the Chief Paymaster, Overseas.

Equipment. This includes everything in the way of requirements in the field except what is provided for under other heads. This is based on previous expenditure but may or may not all be expended, depending on whether payment will be required by the British Government for articles supplied in England.

Ordnance Services (Overseas). This is to cover the upkeep of ordnance stores for the C.E.F. and all expenses connected with their purchase and distribution.

Medical Services (Overseas). For the purchase of medical equipment for hospitals and the upkeep of existing hospitals, field ambulances and clearing stations, with all incidental expenses such as bandages, drugs and special diets.

Ammunition. The estimate is for quantities manufactured by the Dominion and Lindsay Arsenals and purchased from the trade, the former being based on estimates from the respective superintendents and the latter on previous expenditure.

Machine Guns. The estimate of $2,000,000 is based on past expenditure.

Transport. The estimate of $15,675,000 is for the railway and ocean transport of 100,000 men eastbound and for 25,000 invalids westbound at $125.40 each. In addition to this sum it is estimated that $450,000 will be required by the Chief Paymaster Overseas for the payment of the travelling expenses of officers, N.C. officers and men on duty in the British Isles.

Railway transport of troops in England and ocean transport from England to the continent is provided by the British Government and will in all probability not be repaid them until the end of the war.

Forage. There are 2429 horses with the C.E. F. in Canada at the present time. Forage for these at the estimated rate of $180 each will cost $437,220 leaving a margin of $12,780 for any addition to the above number which may be made during the year.

Veterinary Services (Overseas). This estimate of $3,000,000 is for the purchase of remounts, cost of forage, and all expenses of a veterinary nature.

Engineer Works and Housing of troops. This includes the estimate of the M.G.O. for Canada with a slight increase for incidental services and $1,000,000 for rent, water, fuel and light. The estimate of $1,250,000 for Overseas includes $1,000,000 for rent, water, fuel, light, etc., and $250,000 for the erection of any new buildings which may be required for the accommodation of the troops.

Civilian Employees. There are 4,000 civilians, including clerks, paid from War Appropriation in Canada. The expenditure overseas under this head in 1916-17 was $473,553.43. The number of employees is now considerably increased, and some further increase may be expected in the coming year.

Sundry (Canada). This is to provide for the pay of censors, recruiting expenses, telegrams, cables, postage, printing and stationery, customs duty, funeral expenses, drugs, and all other expenditure not included under other heads.

Printing and Stationery (Overseas). For the purchase of office equipment and stationery and the printing of forms, books, etc.

General Expenses (Overseas). For the payment of all miscellaneous expenses not chargeable elsewhere, including expenditure in connection with mechanical transport, horse transport, Engineer services (other than new buildings) damage claims, cost of funerals, exchange, etc.

Maintenance of troops in France. This is to repay the British Government for the maintenance of 140,000 troops in France at the stipulated rate of 9/4 each per day.

I have already explained that the stipulated amount in the first instance was six shillings per day, but we have been asked to increase it to nine shillings four pence per day, for the reason already mentioned.

That is all the information with which I think I need trouble the committee at the moment. The Minister of Militia and Defence will follow me with a statement more directly connected with the military features of the situation, and afterwards we shall be glad indeed to have any inquiries from hon. gentlemen regarding any further available information which they may desire to have placed before the committee.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I feel somewhat diffident in appearing before the House to give an explanation of the war policy of the Government, because I realize fully the magnitude of the task, and I would, therefore, bespeak for myself the usual generous indulgence extended to a new member. This is the fifth occasion since the war began on which war estimates have been presented to the House. In dealing with the whole situation, I should like, if possible, to transfer the minds and imagination of hon. members to our troops in France. On what is known as the western front there is a Canadian army of not far short of 150,000 men. The existence of that army is the reason for my being here to-day. Its presence there gives us a high status among the nations of the world even at this early date in the history of our young country. It is our business and it is our pride as a nation to maintain that army. I venture to suggest that, in all our thoughts about our policy, we should keep our army constantly first in mind. Its efficiency should be the standard at which we should aim, and by keeping its wellbeing ever in mind, we shall preserve a sense of proportion in weighing the details of our national effort. The heroic deeds of the Canadian Expeditionary Force are a sacred pride to every true Canadian.

I think I am justified in giving to the committee an outline of our organization in France, and I ask that the committee do not require certain detail which it would not be advisable in the allied interest to give.

The Canadian Army Corps, as it exists in France, as hon. members are all well aware, is under the immediate command of Lieut.-General Sir Arthur Currie. It consists of four divisions, comprising an establishment of about 78,000 men and corps troops, largely artillery, amounting to about 11,000 more.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How many men are there actually in a division?

Major-General MEWBURN: We have approximately 90,000 men in the whole four divisions—ninety thousand is the maximum; but the number is not usually as large as that. The army corps thus has a total not far short of 90,000, including the artillery. I may mention that this is the standard large formation in the British army. At the opening of the war the normal European army corps was composed of two divisions. Experience has proved that

the division is the standard fighting unit, but it has also been shown that, for the larger purposes of the war, divisions can with profit be grouped into these large army corps. In the British army the corps comprises from three to six divisions, the most usual and convenient number being four. Thus Canada is maintaining a standard large unit of the British army in France. I may further remark that it would be well for hon. members to bear in mind that the Canadian forces in France are far more numerous than those I have already mentioned. For instance, we have some fifty or sixty thousand more troops there—and at times the number may exceed that—than are in the actual Canadian Army corps. These extra corps have rendered most valuable services, for which recognition must be given. I refer to our Railway Construction Corps, Forestry Battalions, and so forth. My right hon. friend asked what was the size of the divisions. It is well known that in the German army and in the armies of some of the other European nations in the last six months, the whole composition of the divisions has been changed for military reasons. Some have been considerably enlarged and others considerably reduced.

During 1917 the Canadian troops in France steadily added to their efficiency and their fame. Our army corps placed on their escutcheon the ever memorable names of Vimy, Lens and Passchendaele, whilst the Cavalry Brigade bore a part in Sir Julian Byng's victory at Cambrai, and in the past ten days our cavalry have taken a very prominent part in the recent operations. I may say that our Cavalry Brigade, ever since they have been in France, have been attached to the Imperial Cavalry Brigade. Their exploits during the fighting that has been going on in the last two weeks have, as most hon. members know, been marvellous. I regret to say that the casualties in our Cavalry Brigade within the last few days have been very heavy, particularly amongst the officers. It is not necessary for me to say much in praise of our troops; their fame is too secure and too widespread to make eulogy necessary in this House.

I should like to mention one or two considerations which bear upon their efficiency. One is that we have, up to the present, been able to provide reinforcements so as to keep our ranks in France up to full strength. Apart from the obvious fact that the more soldiers one has the stronger one is, there is the fact that the soldiers fight better under encouraging influences, and it is a great encouragement to the individual soldier to go " Over the Top " with his regiment up to strength. If his platoon is up to full strength his own tasks are the lighter. Moreover, he sees, so far as he is concerned, that the army system is working smoothly. It has been remarked by non-Canadian observers that part of the high morale of our army corps is due to the punctuality and promptness with which drafts reinforce the men in the trenches.

Another matter of interest is the remarkable and progressive firmness of discipline which has marked the history of the Canadian Army Corps. This impulse of it has come from within the corps. It has accompanied its growth in effectiveness. Prowess and discipline have gone hand in hand. The Canadian army in France now is a very highly disciplined body of men, and it is to be hoped that the arduous, but beneficial lessons of the trenches will follow all ranks on their return to Canada, and their merging into civil life, so that Canada, as a whole, will be the gainer through the hardening of the moral fibre and the strengthening of the self-restraint of our soldiers overseas.

As regards our troops in England, I should like to give a short resumé of what we have done and what we are doing in England. Behind the Canadian army in France are our forces in England. Their business in a large way is to prepare reinforcements for France and to take charge of those who for one reason or another return from France to England. The Prime Minister, in presenting the estimates, spoke of the approximate number of men in England, how they were utilized and what they were doing there. We have there our various reserve units or battalions, including not only infantry, but cavalry, artillery, engineers, machine gunners, Army Service corps, Army Medical corps, Canadian Forestry corps, Canadian Railway Construction troops, etc. Into these reserve units all the reinforcements sent from Canada go to continue and carry on their training as reinforcements for the front. Until a short time ago we had distributed throughout the various camps in England what were known as the reserve units. Those reserve units include the various units of the service, and include men in the various categories which are technically known as " A," " B," " D " and " E." There have been a large number of men in those various reserve units of the different branches of the service who have not been immediately fit for the front as reinforcements. In those

reserve units are also included men in hospitals; that is, when a man is evacuated from France as a wounded man, he is immediately taken off the strength of the base in France and taken on the strength of his reserve battalion or unit in England. He is shown as either in hospital undergoing treatment, or in a convalescent home, or in one of the reserve units which he may join after his convalescence is over. We have, therefore, those men in the various categories, and at one time what was known as category "A" was down to a very low ebb, particularly after the battle of Passchendaele, when the casualties were very heavy. Our men go from one category to another, and when they work up to category "A," they become available for reinforcement.

We also had the Fifth Division which was at first intact, but which it unfortunately became necessary to break up in order to ensure a steady flow of reinforcements for the other divisions in France.

That was one of the most highly trained divisions we ever had since the commencement of the war. But it was conceded, and it must be conceded, the way recruitment is, that Canada could not maintain and keep up more than four divisions at the front. It was believed to be far better that we should maintain four divisions up to strength than attempt to maintain five divisions that were only partly up to strength. Therefore, for military reasons, sad and disappointing as it was to the officers, it was conceded to be essential that the divisions should be broken up and the men put into the various reserves whilst gradually flowing on to France.

In addition, we have what is known as the administrative units which take in all the business end of the organization in England, training schools, Canadian Army Service Corps, Canadian Army Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Ordnance and Pay Corps, Record, Discharge, General and Command Depots. These various establishments in England are most important connecting links between our army in the field and our efforts here. In addition to that there are the hospitals.

There are several training reports coming in from time to time in connection with the overseas work in France which show what is being done from month to month. There is not much information in these reports that I can give the House as they are purely matters of detail in regard to the training but there are one or two reports which I think may be interesting and if I may digress for a moment I would like to quote them to show, for instance, what is being done by the chaplain services in France, I read:

FRANCE: The Chaplains of the Canadian Corps have continued to prosecute their work with unabated loyalty and devotion. An estimate of the service they have set themselves to accomplish may be gained from the programme carried out by the Chaplains of the First Division during a recent offensive.

These officers have had considerable experience at the front and promptly seized the opportunity for service which they realized a sharp engagement made possible. Knowing the nature of the operations to be carried out by the Division they made preliminary arrangements for the establishments of soup kitchens and coffee stalls in the most strategic places close to the front line in order that they and their helpers might minister to the wounded and also to the weary men going to, and coming from the battle-front. This work was carefully planned to the last detail. One of the Chaplains reporting on the four days activities states:

"We worked hard all day and most of the night serving the wounded and others. We carried hot coffee, tea and soup in petrol tins to the roadside where we distributed it together with biscuits and cigarettes. Infantry men, artillery men, tunnellers, engineers, Royal Flying Corps men, anti-aircraft personnel, stretcher bearers, and others were ministered to in large numbers."

It is estimated by the Chaplain in charge that in the four days twelve thousand were in some way served. Thousands of cigarettes were given away and great quantities of coffee and other refreshments were served out.

Another bright spot in connection with the chaplain work in France is disclosed by a report to the senior chaplain. In a report to the senior chaplain by an officer commanding one of the units of the Third Division, the following comment is made on the work of the chaplain:

In a report to the Senior Chaplain by an officer commanding one of the units of the 3rd Division, the following comment is made on the work of the Chaplain "He was tireless in his efforts to evacuate wounded and bury dead. It was mainly through his efforts that we were able to hand over our quarter of the battlefield cleared of both our own, and enemy dead. Since then his work has been most excellent. During our last tour of the trenches although under continuous observation and shell-fire he has succeeded in obtaining proper burial of 46 British dead as well as a number of the enemy." What is therein stated concerning one Chaplain can be applied with equal truth to the zeal and devotion of most of the Chaplains of the Corps.

I am just reading these extracts to show how that work is carried on by those splendid men at the front.

I now come to Canada with which I am more familiar. I can probably speak with a greater degree of certainty of our efforts here to procure men, to equip them and to get them overseas as soon as possible. Within the last nine months we have

thought it wise to give up any attempt to go into any detailed training. Our chief aim and obligation has been to get men over to England as soon as the ships are available and when they get over, their organization and training are completed.

Speaking generally, our efforts in Canada are to procure men, equip them, give them their preliminary organization and such an amount of training as is possible, and despatch them to England as ships are available. The Overseas authorities complete their organization and training and forward them to France. Conversely, the Overseas department sends back unfit or superfluous men and the Militia Department to-day are confronted with the large and serious task of evacuating our wounded and sick from England, the treatment and care thereof, and carrying out their discharge from the army. Up to a year ago we were enthused by the large number of recruits coming forward and the task that was undertaken by the citizens as a whole. It was a pleasant task to provide positions for the men going overseas, but we are now confronted with the most serious aspect of the war, viz., the return of our magnificent men, many maimed and injured for life, broken down in health, and with shattered nerves. In other words, we are to-day confronted with the enormous task of demobilization and all that it means, of which I will speak later.

I would like to speak for a moment of the change in organization here. What I am about to say is not at all by way of criticism because when we look back and see the wonderful results that we have accomplished we cannot have any feeling other than that of admiration, but in the very large number of battalions that we have raised, and which were authorized, and which it must have been known could never get to the front, we find the reason for the very large number of surplus officers of whom I am going to speak later.

Last year it became necessary to re-organize our method of supplying reinforcements for overseas. Up to the fall of 1916, and in the early spring of 1917, we were still raising complete overseas units. It was conceded by many of those who were vitally interested in recruiting, that complete units could not all get to the front and in the judgment of many officers, who had devoted a great deal of time and energy, that instead of raising so many C. E. F. Battalions, it might have been better, from the first, had the old militia units, through whom the first, second and third divisions were raised, been able to retain their old numerical numbers, thereby keeping up the esprit-de-corps of the old Canadian militia units and sending forward reinforcements for the battalions that would have then been at the front. There is, of course, a great deal to be said for the system of raising complete battalions, as it was done voluntarily and it was by this means that the large number of volunteers were obtained. When the policy of sending complete units overseas, ceased, it was then necessary to organize within Canada, Depot Battalions throughout the various military districts, into which recruits were taken, and from these Depot Battalions, organized on the Territorial system and linked up with the Territorial system in vogue in England and the front, our men are forwarded in drafts to England.

The soldier to-day begins his military career in the Depot Battalion in his district in Canada. After he has gone through the preliminary training, medical examination, inoculation and vaccination, he proceeds to England with a draft and is taken on the strength of the same territorial regiment or battalion there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How long after being enlisted?

Major-General MEWBURN: Just as quickly as we can get him over. Ordinarily speaking, it would be much more preferable if a man could be trained here for some months before he left. To-day, within two or three weeks after the recruit is enlisted, vaccinated and inoculated, he should proceed overseas, not that it is desirable that he should do so, but because it is a question of ships. When we can get ships we feel that we should get our men into England as rapidly as possible for the sake of getting them over and getting them trained there.

Eventually the man finds himself in France still in the same regiment which he first joined. This system has replaced the earlier method of raising battalions. For instance, we have the first and second Quebec regiment, and the first and second Ontario regiment, and so on. They are organized territorically by provinces, as well as could be done, although it was rather late to do it, and it has not worked out as well as we hoped it would have, because there are many men to-day from all over Canada who are in different regiments at the front. There are men from Manitoba who are in Quebec regiments, men from Ontario in New Brunswick regiments, and so forth. It could not help but be so. It is simply a case of filling

up from reinforcements as casualties occur. That earlier method had its advantages, and under it many officers put forth efforts and made sacrifices which merit the highest praise and the most generous recognition. I shall refer to their cases later on in my remarks. But it had this disadvantage, in that it involved a great waste of regimental loyalty; a battalion would go through all the difficulties of recruiting and training and would cultivate esprit-de-corps, only to disappear, and its members would have to form new associations and to cultivate a new corps loyalty. The new system conserves much energy in this respect, and has many other advantages; I do not mean to enumerate these advantages; what I am concerned now to do is to present to you how it has affected our whole organization in a very far-reaching manner. You can conceive of an officer who has been authorized to raise a battalion, who gave up his time, his money and energy and the best that was in him, in Canada, and,

5 p.m. through the assistance of his friends and the public generally, he raised a large number of men, obtained officers that were approved, formed a large battalion up to the standard, and proceeded to England. No sooner did he set his foot in England than all his officers were taken, his battalion broken up, and distributed among different reserve battalions. You can imagine the feeling of humiliation those officers felt when this occurred, but military exigencies have to govern. The foregoing remarks have been designed to place in proper perspective the work done by the Militia Department and to indicate the great change in our fighting organization which has affected a large proportion of the work in Canada.

Up to last year we had all these numerous battalions. We also had complete units of military infantry, army service corps, and so forth. Now we have got the permanent depot battalion organized in each military district in Canada which is permanent here, composed of officers of whom a very large percentage are officers who have returned from the front, unfit for service there. These depot battalions take the men that are coming in under the Military Service Act, also the volunteers. Their documents and papers are completed, what little training can be given them before they go is given, and as these men proceed overseas they then go on to the reserve battalion in England, and these depot battalions we have organized in Canada will be retained and are being utilized to carry out the big

programme of demobilization of which I will speak later on.

An example of the change in policy which has been carried out during the year is to be found in regard to training. Up to the end of 1916, no less than 200 battalions of infantry were organized. At the beginning of 1917, no less than 58 additional battalions were organized, or in process of organization in Canada, in addition to a certain number of draft-giving units which had been formed to furnish re-inforcements to certain battalions. Many of these late battalions were unable to recruit anywhere near up to strength and it is well known that in the fall of 1916 voluntary recruiting began to wane. It, therefore, became necessary, as already stated, to organize the various Depot Battalions of the Territorial Regiments, in the manner already described. In addition to the above, there were Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, Machine Gun Corps, Army Service Corps, Army Medical Corps, Forestry and Railway Construction Corps. The Staffs of these Depot Units in Canada, both as regards Officers and N.C.O's, have been selected, as far as possible, from officers and men who have been overseas. You can conceive the condition of affairs, if you will recognize that at the front we will not have more than 50 or 52 infantry battalions. I am not speaking now of the Railway Corps, Forestry Battalions, and other troops, but I refer to infantry battalions. If we raised 258 battalions, and have only got from 50 to 55 battalions, the number of battalions which have been broken up accounts for the large number of surplus officers.

As the urgent need of re-inforcements became apparent, it was found impossible to waste any time on training men in Canada, and it was felt that it was incumbent on us to get men to England as speedily as possible, and as ships were available. The very fact of having re-inforcements in England and closer to the field of operations would be a tremendous source of encouragement to our sorely tried men in France. Another advantage of the re-inforcements being in England is the specialist training which is available and which is overwhelmingly important in this war.

A large number of specialist schools are established in England, some of which are: Musketry, Lewis Gun, Sniping, P.T. & B.F., Trench Warfare, Anti-Gas, Bombing, Entrenching, Artillery, Cavalry, Engineers, Signals, Canadian Machine Gun Depot, Canadian Pioneer School.

This war has become one of specialists. The soldier, now, must have several accomplishments, and a battalion is a wonderful organization of numerous and diverse specialists. It is needless to say that it is easier to manage and adjust this complicated machinery a hundred miles from the firing line than three thousand miles from it. All these branches of training have been carefully co-related as between Canada and Great Britain. The Canadien troops have shown most remarkable progress and ingenuity in the various specialist branches of training. For instance, in a test on Rapid Wire Training a special demonstration was given for the Imperial Inspector General of Infantry, Major General Sir Francis Howard, on the 16th of January, consisting of one N.C.O. and ten men, supported by a carrying party of the same number. The team erected a double apron fence, 100 yards long, in 16 minutes, 26 seconds. The time allowed for the erection of 50 yards double apron fence is 40 minutes.

Another interesting item in the training reports from overseas, is from the musketry training, to which a great deal of attention is paid. The latest report speaks of the good results obtained by the French Canadian section, under the charge of Sergeant-Instructor Robitaille, which was the outstanding feature of the course. In the P. T. & B. F. course at Aldershot, it is noted that the Canadian candidates headed the list, having obtained 21.93 points above the average.

There is one aspect in which the new system conduces to the happiness of the recruit. No doubt, the majority of the hon. gentlemen present are familiar with the phenomenon which was often to be seen in the days of voluntary enlistment. A battalion would be authorized, officers would be appointed, recruiting would start with a rush, and the first four or five hundred men would be secured very quickly. Then the stream would begin to dry up, and it would take months to get the last five or six hundred. The first effect to notice is that the men who enlisted early in the history of the regiment would remain in Canada an inordinately long time, while the laggards might embark a week or two after enlisting. This was not satisfactory. A second effect many times to be observed was that the men would conclude that the fate of the regiment, on arriving in England, would be to be broken up for drafts. Forthwith all loyalty to the regiment they had joined, and which had first taught them to be soldiers, would disappear, and their anxiety would be to see the last of it. It is hard for the men to merge into other battalions to make new chums, and naturally it is rather disconcerting and disheartening to the men. This killing of esprit-de-corps was very undesirable. Of the fate of the officers in a regiment having this experience, I shall speak a little later.

Under a system of regular drafts, with intensive training in a carefully organized system of specialist schools, it is found, now that a recruit can be passed into an experienced, well-trained, war-tried battalion after 14 weeks' training. This does not mean that a whole battalion could be trained in three or four months; it takes longer to train a battalion than to train a single man among experienced soldiers, and it is essential to the plan I am describing that the drafts should be small and the veteran battalion to which they are sent should be fairly strong; the new men then are quickly absorbed, and in turn they quickly absorb the older soldiers' steadiness and resourcefulness. It is obvious that such a method is much more economical of the man's time and of the nation's money; while for the individual soldier it is far more interesting to push rapidly and steadily through his instruction, with no waste of time, than to spend months in barracks on preliminary training.

In other words, our men upon arriving in England are taken through specialist courses—and I might say that they are now classified according to the different occupations they have followed in Canada and the technical knowledge they possess in order to ascertain what branch of the forces they have aptitude for, a policy which should have been adopted from the very beginning—and after undergoing a training of fourteen weeks, a remarkably short course, and assigned to their respective battalions, they are pronounced fit for service in France.

What I have said regarding training leads to an important reorganization of the troops in Canada. What is aimed at is to cause all units in the country to fall into three types. First, we have the depots I have been dealing with; recruiting and training units of all arms and services, existing to recruit, outfit and despatch troops. Secondly, we have certain garrison troops, required to garrison and guard certain important points. The strength of these troops is being gradually reduced, and all possible economy is being exercised. I aim in having in this latter class no men who are fit for the trenches; and of the men fit for garrison or guard duty we will employ only

those really necessary. Thirdly, we have depot units for the reception, administration and disposal of returned soldiers who are to return to civil life. These last mentioned units are absolutely essential for the purpose of carrying on demobilization, and every man before being discharged must have his documents and records completed and a final medical examination held before final discharge.

This question of training presupposes the procuring of men. The past year has been the introduction of the Military Service Act. I wish to make it very clear here that the Military Service Act is administered by the Department of Justice. The task of approaching the civil population and selecting therefrom a proper number of men to be recruits is committed, very properly in my opinion, to a civil department. When the Department of Justice has made the selection, has decided that it is equitable and advantageous, considering alike the interests of the nation and the circumstances of the individual, that a given man should serve the country, we in the Militia Department receive him, outfit him, train him and send him overseas.

The business of tribunals and exemptions is very largely outside of our sphere, although we naturally have a deep interest in the matter, and our administration touches that of the Military Service Act at numerous points. Our interest in the matter, indeed, is so strong that I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion there must be a decided speeding up of the tribunals. In view of the recent events, the need for men is more apparent than ever. Canada must produce the men; she must bear her part in the great work set before civilization. The Military Service Act has produced, so far, recruits enough to keep our splendid divisions up to strength, but in order to maintain them it must produce more.

As is well known, the Military Service Act provided for the raising of one hundred thousand reinforcements. I had no part in bringing into operation the Military Service Act. I have felt, and still feel, that we have got to get reinforcements overseas. I realize there are difficulties to be overcome, and in that connection I was much interested in the debate which took place here the other night with respect to the unfortunate occurences in the province of Quebec. Nevertheless I have always felt, and I still feel, that the province of Quebec will do its duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Major-General MEWBURN: I may be wrong, I hope I am not, and I regret as deeply as one can regret the events that took place in the city of Quebec, but I feel satisfied that that province will yield her quota to keep up the number of Quebec battalions at the front. It must be known to hon. gentlemen that in the forces in France there are several battalions that are known as Quebec battalions, just as there are battalions which are known as Ontario, or Manitoba battalions, as the case may be. One or two first class battalions that went from Quebec were not altogether English-speaking battalions. I know of one battalion having representatives of both nationalities in its ranks that had to be broken up because there were not reinforcements.

Beyond question the men who are at the front should be supported and supported by soldiers from their own provinces. The city from which I come has sent overseas more than ten thousand men, and we have not got a single representative battalion at the front. That is a cause of soreness, but we do not care so long as we are contributing to the good of the country as a whole. I feel that every province should maintain its own units at the front, and while my hon. friend, the former Minister of Militia, may not agree with me, I honestly and frankly say that I believe that had the provinces been authorized in the early stage of the war to raise distinct and complete divisions, such divisions would have been raised and maintained by those provinces. I may be wrong but that is my own conception. As far as the Military Service Act is concerned, I sincerely hope the tribunals will be speeded up, and that we will get our flow of reinforcements to keep the men of our four divisions up to strength.

The Military Service Act is not the only source from which we have been obtaining recruits. We have in the United States what is known as the British-Canadian Recruiting Mission. Before the United States entered the war their Government consented to the Imperial authorities recruiting men within the Union. At first the idea was to get men for the British Expeditionary Force. Afterwards we were asked to join them and endeavour to secure recruits for the Canadian Expeditionary Force. We did so in a very small way, but gradually the movement grew. The officers we have sent down there were all returned officers who had seen service at the front.

We do not obtain all our recruits from the Military Service Act. Up to a short time ago, voluntary recruiting was per-

mitted to continue and a considerable number of men were obtained for technical services. A large number of young men, who had not attained the age of legal obligation, joined the Royal Flying Corps; youth being a great asset in this new and strange way of fighting.

I wish to utter a word of appreciation of the activities of the Royal Flying Corps in the Dominion. As is well known, it is an Imperial organization. Canada having followed the policy of assisting in every way possible this organization, everything has been done by the Government, and by my department in particular, to assist the officers of the Royal Flying Corps in their arduous undertaking. Some five thousand Canadians, the flower of our youth, have joined this corps. Much glory has come to Canada through its contribution. On the other hand, the officers of the Royal Flying Corps have maintained correct and congenial relation with the Canadian military authorities. It is thought by some Canadians that we should have started, and should start even now, a flying corps of our own, but in my opinion that would be a mistake for more reasons than one. Some gentlemen also think that Canada should contribute certain squadrons to the Royal Flying Corps. Whether or not such a thing is advisable is a question to be considered. It is known that the Imperial Government have established throughout Canada a tremendous organization, and, as I have already stated, some five thousand of our young men have joined the Royal Flying Corps, and we all know what a name they have made for themselves. In one of our camps, Camp Borden, the work that was accomplished by that Flying Corps last year was wonderful. Camp Borden is recognized as one of the best Flying Corps camps in the world. The young Canadians who received their initial training there and passed through the various courses of instruction, were considered fit to go to the front, I am advised, as technically qualified Flying Corps officers after a very short period of further training in England. They have done so, and have made a name for themselves.

The British Canadian Recruiting Mission, as I have already said, assisted in obtaining recruits for the Imperial and Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the Royal Flying Corps. That Mission is in charge of Brigadier-General White, an Imperial officer. His second in command is Colonel J. S. Dennis, a well known Canadian, who for months has worked untiringly throughout the United States, and who has given his services gratis to the Canadian Government. For this mission we have furnished a considerable number of officers and n. c. o's., who have been returned from the front, wounded and unfit for further service overseas. They have done wonderful work in the United States. Through their efforts we have succeeded in obtaining, up to and including the 30th March, 1918, 17,553 British subjects residing in the United States for the Canadian Expeditionary Force. In adition to these, a large number of men have been obtained for the British Expeditionary Force as well as for the Royal Flying Corps.

Mr. MURPHY: Has Col. Dennis seen active service?

Major-General MEWBURN: Not in this war. Colonel Dennis is beyond the age limit; I am afraid he is nearer sixty than fifty. He did see service in the Northwest Rebellion. But he has loaned his time, without any expense to the Government, to assist in this undertaking over there, and he has been a tremendous asset to us. All the young men who have been over there are officers or non-commissioned officers who have done splendid work overseas, several of whom have received honours. The young officers who have been in the United States have carried out a wonderful mission in that country. They have not only succeeded in getting a large number of first-class recruits, a large majority of whom are already overseas, but they have accomplished another and far-reaching object, namely, to foster a splendid feeling between all classes in the United States and Canada, which I venture to say will have a lasting effect. I do not know whether my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will concur in that statement, as in the early days of the session he accused members on this side of the House of trucking with the Yankees. We have been trucking with the Yankees, so far as that mission is concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Major General MEWBURN: And we are delighted to do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I approve of it, and compliment my hon. friend. We can stand some more of it, especially in the matter of trading.

Major-General MEWBURN: Now, regarding the transports. As soon as we can raise our troops and equip them, and with what little training we can give them, it is our

duty to get them overseas. So transportation by rail and ocean has been one of our great activities. Within the twelve months between April 1, 1917, and the 31st of March this year, we have sent overseas reinforcements to the number of 66,733 men. That includes all branches. In addition to that there has been a rather interesting work undertaken by our Quartermaster General's Branch, which, of course, has acted in conjunction with one of the big railroads. We have transported across this continent overseas about 85,000 Chinese coolies, who are serving in certain special labour corps in France behind the lines.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are they from Hong Kong?

Major-General MEWBURN: From northern China. Some have just passed through here.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have seen them.

Major-General MEWBURN: To move such a large number of men naturally, at a time like the present, greatly added to the difficulties of those officers entrusted with transportation duties. During the past winter unusual obstacles have had to be overcome. We had to cope with a large number of outbreaks of infectious disease; these were successfully dealt with but, of course, they caused delays and gave trouble. It is hardly necessary to speak of the bad weather. It hampered the movement of troops as it did every other species of traffic on this continent. The Halifax disaster interfered for a month with embarkations at Halifax. It is only fair to add that the railways had trouble as well as we. Not only was the weather outrageous, not only was there an alarming shortage of coal, but they had to contend with two special disadvantages. One was that they were and are shorthanded, for we have made heavy drafts upon the skilled railway workers of Canada to serve the strategic railways of France—and brave and effective service they are rendering Another is the lack of rails. This is coming to be severely felt in Canada. Our own troubles, it is well to bear in mind, are not in excess of those which others have to bear.

Now, regarding transports. We are up against this situation, not only as regards transports for troops going overseas, but we are now face to face with the problem of invalids coming back, and also of men unfit for further service at the front being brought back. There have been some complaints, probably some of them just and many unjust, as to the transports coming back. We are not responsible here for bringing the troops back to Canada so far as berthing and arranging for ships is concerned. That is entirely under the Admiralty. So many troops, who are collected at the Buxton Discharge Depot, where they undergo their examination, and the returned and hospital cases, are notified on very short notice to proceed to the embarkation point and get on board ship. So far, the Canadian Government have been unable to charter a complete ship, and men complained, in some instances, that berths were empty, and that they were not permitted to use those berths. An investigation is going on now. Some time ago an officer proceeded overseas to see if some better co-ordination could be brought about. The steamship companies sold passages and berths in England to civilians, and in some instances the berths were not occupied. Canada was paying so much per capita for the transport of the men, and when the ship sailed with empty staterooms, there was complaint by a few of the men; but the majority realized the difficulty about transports, and that there was bound to be a little trouble. But I think it has practically all passed away and better and more definite arrangements are being made. Probably we will be able to charter complete ships, and bring our men back as troops and not as civilians. It is a difficult thing to handle men coming back when they are not organized as units but as individuals, collected on short notice. For instance, I have known of men hurried down to the port of embarkation, and held twelve and fourteen days before they were allowed to leave. These conditions have arisen and will arise in the future, but arrangements have been made that will gradually and effectually overcome all of these little annoyances. After all, as many officers and men have told me, these are only petty annoyances and discomforts, and they realize that there is a war on, and that they must put up with some discomforts.

I would like to speak, if I may take up the time of the House for a few minutes, regarding the surplus officers returned to Canada. I feel it is my duty to say something in regard to that, and I would like to call to the attention of hon. gentlemen, who may not have seen or read it, an article which appeared a short time ago in the Military Gazette entitled "Mental Crucifixion of Officers." I shall not wade through the whole article, but I think hon. members will appreciate it if an explanation is made, and some of these unfortunate offi-

ers will have more decent consideration than they have had in the past:

It is about time that the indignities and mental torture endured by officers ordered back to Canada, because of age and senior rank, were put an end to by a strong and clear announcement from the Militia Department, published, at advertising rates, if necessary in every single paper, great and small, in the country.

Owing to the system of recruiting by means of county and district corps, so long in vogue, and so wonderfully fruitful in result, a very large number of senior officers found themselves in England, without a chance to serve with their rank in France, and with but little chance, even in the lower grade, to see service there. These gentlemen had enlisted in perfectly good faith, fully expecting to accompany their respective corps to the front, only to find on crossing the seas that the exigencies of war required the battalion to be broken up for reinforcements, with the result that their connection with it was severed forever. Now, there is in England very useful employment for a great many officers. All the reserve battalions need them, to say nothing of such big departments as the Pay Corps, the Records Office, and a dozen minor ones. These various positions absorbed many officers or disbanded units, who thus did useful work, releasing younger men for the front.

But as the war went on, and the number of returned wounded officers increased, it was felt that these men who had suffered much should be given these positions in England, their vacated posts in France being filled, wherever possible, by men from the ranks who had seen much service there.

With this plan surely no one can quarrel. As a result a gradual displacement has taken place, so hundreds of officers, of the county corps class, have been superseded by returned casualties, and find themselves without employment. What could these unfortunates then do? IF BELOW FORTY YEARS OF AGE they could revert to a lieutenancy and go to the front. Hundreds have done so, but hundreds of others, in fact, nearly all of the rank of Major and Lt.-Colonel, with many Captains, too, were above the age limit, and could not be used in this way.

I may say that that age limit has since been reduced from forty to thirty-five years.

The writer has known many who have fairly gone on their knees to headquarters to be excepted from the general rule, and allowed to go over, though past forty. Naturally, headquarters has been deaf to these appeals, for to open the door to one would make trouble with scores of others.

Nor could an officer "grab up a rifle and rush to the front," as some melodramatic people at home have recommended. War is no longer a "rush to the front," but a highly organized business in which headquarters has the say as to who shall and shall not "rush" there.

As an officer said to me: "This is an awful war. It takes an awful long time to get to it." He had been in England for a year and a half. The article continues:

And so in due course, an officer who has sacrificed much in helping to raise a corps, who has given up a lucrative profession or business, who has done his best to go and fight, and has not been allowed to do so, finds himself ordered back to Canada, and at home once more.

And then the horrible thing happens, at least it has often happened, and may again. His fellow citizens actually send a committee to ask him to apologize for not having been killed. The bitter humiliation of such a visitation can only be appreciated by one who has had to endure it.

I regret that there is a good deal of truth in what the writer of this article says. The whole trouble experienced in connection with returned surplus officers is simply the by-product of voluntary recruiting. Two hundred and fifty-eight battalions were raised, each having from thirty-six to forty officers, senior and otherwise. Many of these officers had given years of their lives to training; others had joined the forces only since the outbreak of war. With very little financial assistance from the Government, they raised these battalions and took them overseas. I know one man not many miles from Ottawa who was asked to raise a battalion and assured that he would be allowed to take command of it at the front. He sacrificed his business, raised the battalion, and went over to England. There his unit was broken up and ultimately he was returned as a surplus officer. There have been many such cases, but it is difficult to know what to do under circumstances like that. In these various battalions there were some three or four thousand officers; what was to become of them? Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that as we were accumulating this mass of officers in England, officers without war experience and war testing, the divisions in France were advancing men who had shown ability and leadership on the field of battle. Much is to be said in favour of making promotion in war time depend upon war service. But what of our officers fresh from Canada? The easy reply is, "Let them revert." For the younger men this is possible to some extent, though only to some extent; for there is a limit to the number of lieutenants needed, and the battalions at the front have many deserving non-commissioned officers of proved worth whom they desire to promote. For older men reversion becomes very difficult. When a man is past 40 he is not likely to make a very good platoon leader. That is a young man's job. Then an order was issued that no officer over 35 years of age could revert. I put it to every honourable member: if he were colonel of a battalion in the trenches and had his choice for the leadership of one of his platoons between a man of 45 who has never been in action, who was formerly a major or a colonel, and a young man of

22 who had risen from the ranks, who had had a couple of years of fighting, who had proved himself able to command men in billets and to lead them in battle, who, perhaps, had won the D.C.M. for exceptional valour and skill in action—which would he choose? He almost certainly would choose the younger man. But, is that the fault of the older man? And is it not hard on him? Is not the failure of the senior officer to get to France, in most cases, merely his misfortune? And if that is so, can any injustice be more galling than for the stay-at-homes, the protected, and those who have sacrificed little, to insult the man who had made many sacrifices, had worked hard, had given up two or three years of his life, at a time when years count—to insult him on the express ground that he has had bad fortune, has met with disappointment? There may be cases of unworthy men, but I think the majority are in the other class.

It is my view that the Dominion of Canada owes a debt of gratitude to these officers who came forward in an emergency and sacrificed all in order to raise battalions; who did so in good faith, in expectation of going to the front, and who were not fakirs, funkers or slackers. When they come back to Canada, they ought to receive the consideration that the country owes them.

Now comes the question of the employment of returned officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, which has caused no little anxiety in my department. It is a difficult problem to deal with. It is an absolute impossibility for the Militia Department to absorb all returned soldiers, and give them permanent employment, or even temporary employment. Some people have an idea that everybody now employed by the Militia Department, who has not been overseas, should be dismissed and returned soldiers given the jobs. This is all right in theory, but it does not work out in practice. If this principle is to be adopted, then every employee, in every department of the Government, who has not been overseas, should be peremptorily dismissed, and returned soldiers given their jobs.

On this subject of finding employment for returned officers, I wish to utter one word of caution. Occasionally we are urged to dismiss all officers in Canada who have not been overseas and replace them with men from the trenches. Certain cases will arise when replacements can advantageously be made; in such cases they will be made. But I would remind the House that our first object is to carry on the war and to employ in each post the man best suited to fill it. Consideration for individuals must yield to consideration of the public interest. Suitability is partly a matter of intrinsic fitness and partly a matter of training and experience. It would be poor business to dismiss a man who was managing a technical post with conspicuous success and who is intimately acquainted with every aspect of the work and replace him with a new man who would have to be trained to fill it. We should be fair and just in this matter. There is no doubt that in the Militia Department we have a large number of officers who have not been overseas—and I refer to them in the same way that I referred to the surplus officers who have been sent back from England. Since the war started a large number of officers, some of military age, others medically unfit, have been prevented from going overseas because of their being held here by superior authority—and rightly so. Theirs has been drudgery; they expected to go overseas in due course and take their place in the firing line. As time went on, however, it became apparent that there was little chance for those men getting overseas who had been held in administrative offices and in training positions. They have faithfully and conscientiously performed an important work in Canada; their task has not been a pleasant one, and it is manifestly unfair to criticize them now and simply say: get off the grass; let a returned soldier take your position; you are no longer wanted; go back and do something else. Certain branches of the Militia Department are very technical in their nature and the man who has a thorough training in military matters, administrative and otherwise, may be more valuable than six or seven who have not. Where returned soldiers can be placed, they are being placed; so far as I am concerned the returned soldier will in every case get the preference, having due regard to efficiency. Aside from that, it is obvious that we should endeavour to be just to every one.

Just a word with regard to the Military Hospitals Commission, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the Invalided Soldiers Commission. Up to a few months ago the Military Hospitals Commission were handling the returned soldiers. That commission was founded in good faith and was absolutely necessary in the early stages of the war in the work of looking after the returned soldier. It must be conceded by every person who understands military work that a soldier must be controlled by the military authorities so long as he is a soldier, but the minute he ceases to be a soldier he passes to civilian life. If he requires further medical or other

assistance, he is placed under the direction of some other department. We have, therefore, organized depot battalions—a chart is being prepared and will be presented to members who desire to see it—for the purpose of handling our returned soldiers. When men who require hospital treatment, or who are among the many sad cases of tubercular trouble, insanity or epilepsy, return from England with all their necessary documents, they go to their district headquarters and are taken on the strength of the depot battalions. If they require further medical treatment, they immediately enter one of the military hospitals, and if they are suffering from tuberculosis or such other diseases as I have mentioned, they are at once put under observation. If they are found to be suffering from tubercular trouble, they will be immediately discharged as soldiers, go on full pension and go into one of the sanitaria for treatment. If a man goes into a hospital, while undergoing treatment, he may, at his bedside, commence vocational training, working in conjunction with the Invalid Soldiers' Commission. Subsequently to that, he is discharged; he then goes on to his pension, and continues his vocational training under the direction of the new department. He then ceases to be a soldier. Before we discharge a man, however, we must give him and insist upon his having a final medical examination in Canada. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that that is right. Formerly, a man was examined in England at Buxton before he left that country; he was examined again at one of the discharge depots at Halifax or Quebec; then he came back and had a third medical examination. That was irritating to the men. My reason for insisting on the final medical examination is for the protection of the man and of the country. In regard to every man who is discharged, there should be in the hands of the Militia Department or of the commission evidence of the man's physical condition at the time of his discharge. It is well-known that the United States are paying millions of dollars in pensions in connection with the Civil War for men who were never near it. There will, therefore, be hundreds and thousands of cases of men discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Force who, after their return to Canada and discharge, are not entitled to pensions, but who will later on claim pensions on account of physical disability which they will allege is due to their military service. That is why the evidence should be in the possession of the Government to protect the man and the country. Therefore, the Military Hospitals Commission are now carrying on another function, and the Militia Department are taking care of the military hospitals for the care and treatment of our men while they are soldiers so as to have them discharged as speedily as possible.

Another question I would like to mention is that of demobilization, with which we are now confronted. Demobilization is now going on in a very small way. It will grow apace, and I may say for the information of hon. members that should demobilization commence to-morrow, it is estimated it will take some eighteen months to convey our troops back from France. We have to consider all the paraphernalia and impedimenta of the troops and services properly belonging to them in England. The United States' troops have also to be brought back. The troops from Australia and New Zealand have to be brought back. It is estimated by the War Office that at least thirty to forty thousand troops would proceed per day across the channel from France. The problem, therefore, is large. We are working on a scheme of demobilization which is almost complete; and we hope to have a perfect organization, so that when demobilization takes place there will be a complete decentralization by military districts, so that we shall be able to carry out demobilization effectively.

Most hon. members are familiar with the Militia Headquarters. We have at Militia Headquarters what is known as the Militia Council, composed of the deputy minister, the Chief of the General Staff, the Adjutant-General, the Quartermaster-General, the Master-General of the Ordnance, and the Paymaster-General. Associated with them are the Director General of Medical Services, and the Judge Advocate-General. That Council meets at least once a week, if not oftener, when all matters concerning each branch are brought before it. Important matters are discussed and policies settled, subject always to final approval by the Governor General in Council. It is a business organization, which is as complete as it is possible to have it, and business records are kept.

Mr. COPP: How long has the Militia Council been in existence?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think since 1904. Since the war started, the scope of the Militia Council has been greatly enlarged, and one can imagine that the work of the council is very much greater than

it has ever been before. It is an advisory council, matters of a very technical nature come before it, and before decisions are given, reports are made to it by the heads of the different branches of the Militia Department.

Mr. VIEN: There is no longer a Parliamentary Secretary.

Major-General MEWBURN: No, I wish sometimes there were two or three of them. I should like to bear testimony to the very efficient work of several of the officers who have carried on this burden since the war started. In the first place there is my deputy minister who is present now. I shall not say what I think of him at the present time, but certainly his long experience of both military and administrative work, his military services in South Africa, and his faithful and unceasing work, not only before the war but since, are wonderful, and he is deserving of the greatest possible credit. There is another officer of whom I should like to speak, and I do so with the greatest admiration and respect. I refer to the Chief of the General Staff, Major-General W. G. Gwatkin, who has been directly responsible for all the training and military operations of the troops. He has also had numerous other responsibilites thrust upon his shoulders. The public do not and probably never will realize the magnificent work that has been performed by this hard-working, patient and faithful officer. He has been responsible for all the confidential correspondence and cables with the War Office and has been directly in touch with the Admiralty on naval matters in connection with the war, as far as my department is concerned. The country owes a heavy debt to both General Fiset and General Gwatkin for their faithful and efficient work performed since the war started. There are other officers who are working day and night in that department. I wish to tell the hon. gentlemen present that the Militia Department is overworked. It has no complaints to make. The only regret we had when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) brought in the Daylight Saving Bill was that he could not increase the number of hours per day to twenty-four so that we might probably have heavier production. The duties of the Adjutant-General which are now performed by Major-General Ashton, are tremendous. Under the Adjutant General the following officers have shown wonderful ability and have devoted all their best efforts to the prosecution of the war; I refer particularly to Brigadier-General Gwynne, in charge of mobilization, Colonel C. S. MacInnes, in charge of organization, Colonel A. Z. Palmer and Major S. T Blackwood, and others, who have worked night and day faithfully and honestly, not for the small pay which they have been receiving, but simply for the honour and glory of doing something for their country.

The organization of the department has been undergoing certain changes. My hon. friend asked me last night if I had the details of it; I have a draft of it here but I shall not burden the House with the details. But the organization in the different departments is under the Minister of Militia, the deputy minister, the chief of the general staff, the Adjutant General, the Quartermaster General, the Master General of the Ordnance, who goes into all the technical work of the branches and the whole service generally, and who has a much heavier task than many hon. gentlemen realize. Then we have, under the Adjutant General, what is known as the Record Office which has developed since the war started. That office is responsible for all the documents and information pertaining to every officer, non-commissioned officer and man who has gone overseas or who has returned from overseas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Both officers and men?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes. Of course, the records of all officers are also in the militia headquarters. The Record Office in London, England, has grown to an enormous extent. It has a large staff which is responsible for getting out all the returns, the statistics relating to every individual man and all the casualty lists. As the casualties come forward, one can realize the heavy strain on that department. I have been endeavouring to make some changes in various departments, and while I am not boasting in any way, within the last few months I have, by reorganization undertaken by a very efficient man who came from overseas, who has seen service at the front, and who is familiar with that work, succeeded in reducing the staff by over 400 and in showing a saving of over $250,000 in that one department alone. There has I understand been criticism in the press and elsewhere in regard to the dismissals of employees in the record office.

There has been no person peremptorily dismissed. I want, if I can accomplish it, to get the highest efficiency and economy in my department. I do not ever expect to reach that objective, but I am endeavouring

to do so. It is necessary in my judgment, if you are running a department, to get an efficient head, put the responsibility on that head and make him live up to it. If you do that, you will accomplish something. There will be no dismissals except for cause. In the Record Office the correspondence and the magnitude of the work is enormous. There are over two thousand five hundred telegrams and letters coming in daily that the branch has to deal with. Every time there is a casualty the Record Branch deals with it and conveys the news to the next of kin promptly.

One of the largest departments under the Paymaster General is the Assigned Pay and Separation Allowance Branch. When I took charge of the department I found the work of that branch to be something in the nature of an enormous financial transaction and I made up my mind to put it on a proper financial basis. I succeeded in getting an officer who had been at the front and who simply loaned his services until he got it running smoothly. Then, he went back to civil life. I have been assisted by financial men who have voluntarily given their services, with the result that I think I am getting the efficiency in that department that I am getting in many others.

I would like to give a few facts relating to the Separation and Assigned Pay Branch in order that hon. members may realize the magnitude of work carried on there. During the year 1917, the average number of cheques issued each month was 254,400. Since the Separation and Assigned Pay accounts have been consolidated, the average number of combined cheques is about 180,000 monthly, although, of course, action has to be taken on 265,000 accounts. To write out the cheques for one month would take an average clerk, working full working hours, over four years. With the new printing machinery which is now being installed in the Separation Allowance and Assigned Pay Branch, it would be possible, if necessary, to write these cheques in two and one-half days. This new equipment also automatically prepares the mailing list for the post office and the Return for the Auditor General. The average number of letters received and replied to during the year 1917 was about 425,000, or about 1,350 per working day. Some days the correspondence received is as high as 5,000 letters.

So you can realize when some hon. member writes to know why one of his constituents has not received her separation allowance why the devil he does not get a reply by next mail that it is very difficult to comply with every request of this kind as speedily as otherwise might be possible.

During the year 1917, 18,000 new Separation Allowance accounts and 56,000 Assigned Pay accounts were opened. During the same period 14,000 Separation Allowance accounts and 26,000 Assigned Pay accounts were closed. Also, 8,000 soldiers changed the amount of their assignment, through the Chief Paymaster, overseas. Change of address has been one of the great troubles.

The number of clerks employed in the branch is 872. The total expenditure during the year 1917 was $59,561,299, or an average of almost $5,000,000 per month. It is difficult to realize the work which is done by the S. A. & A. P. Branch, unless one visits their office and makes a close inspection.

During the year 1917 almost every one of the 80,000 separation allowance accounts has been investigated to see that the separation allowance was being properly paid. The enormous amount of work entailed can only be imagined. The dependents live from coast to coast, and each investigation had to be carried on in the locality in which the dependent resided. This, of course, was only rendered possible by the co-operation of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. Such investigation was necessary, as no business firm would think of paying out money unless they knew that the payee was entitled to it.

The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) has been instrumental in rendering the greatest possible assistance, through the Patriotic Fund, to the Militia Department in getting information regarding these thousands of accounts.

Every payment of assigned pay from the S. A. & A. P. Branch amounting to some 170,000 accounts each month, has been checked over with deductions made in the Chief Paymaster's Office, London, England, and the organization is now so perfect that a casualty in the field affecting a soldier's assigned pay is acted on in the S. A. & A. P. Branch within seven days from the date of casualty being reported. I think we are improving, and that probably in a short time the department will be working more smoothly and without much cause for complaint.

The country, as far as the Militia Department is concerned, is divided into eleven military districts, the division not in all cases being in conformity with provincial boundaries. The districts are as follows:

No. 1, Western Ontario, Brigadier-General L. W. Shannon; No. 2, Central Ontario, Major-General W. A. Logie; No. 3, Eastern Ontario, Brigadier-General T. D. R. Hemming;

No. 4, Western Quebec, Major-General E. W. Wilson; No. 5, Eastern Quebec, Brigadier-General J. P. Landry; No. 6, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, Major-General F. L. Lessard; No. 7, New Brunswick, Brigadier-General A. H. Macdonell; No. 10, Manitoba and a portion of New Ontario, Major-General John Hughes; No. 11, British Columbia, Major-General R. G. E. Leckie; No. 12, Saskatchewan, Major-General J. C. MacDougall; No. 13, Alberta, Colonel G. Macdonald.

Each of these districts has a general officer commanding, with the necessary staff. That staff is qualified to perform administration duties as well as to handle all recruits, train and mobilize the same. During the past year these district staffs have disbursed in the neighbourhood of $75,000,000, under the direction and authority of headquarters.

As I said before, I am a great believer in decentralization. With a country the size of Canada, it is absolutely impossible to carry out the enormous amount of work by centralizing at headquarters. As heavier and greater responsibilities have been and will be put on the shoulders of G. O. C.'s of districts, some changes have taken place and other changes will likely be made. No permanent appointments have or will be made at present, as it is recognized as things develop that appointments to these positions will be made by officers who have seen service at the front. In all districts in Canada, there have been officers who have been carrying on the drudgery work since the war started and magnificent service they have performed. I know of no single instance where an officer who has been employed at headquarters has not desired to go overseas. In some instances there have been officers who have been medically unfit and for this reason unable to proceed overseas. There are many other instances of officers, whose hearts have almost been broken with the idea of being held back, but in order to cope with the tremendous situation in Canada it was absolutely essential to retain certain officers in Canada to carry on the work, as Canada is the base and foundation of all our overseas forces.

Just here I wish to bear testimony to the faithful, loyal support and help that has been given by the G. O. C.'s of various military districts and their splendid staffs and I would particularly mention General Shannon at Military District No. 1, General Logie at Military District No. 2, General Hemming at Military District No. 3, General Wilson at Military District No. 4, General Fages at Military District No. 5 (Quebec), General Benson at Military District No. 6, General Ruttan at Military District No. 10 (Winnipeg), Colonel Macdonald at Military District No. 13 (Calgary, Colonel Duff Stuart at Military District No. 11 (Vancouver).

It is a difficult matter to single out any one officer for special recognition, as with very few exceptions all officers employed both at headquarters and at districts are performing and have performed their arduous duties with the greatest satisfaction, and the names I have mentioned are those who are the responsible heads of departments and districts.

It is my intention to carry the idea of decentralization very much further than it has ever been carried before and on the same principle as I have spoken of in regard to some of the other branches. In each military district, a good general officer commanding should be responsible for the whole organization, administration and discipline within his military district. If that is carried out, it is going to save the headquarters from a great deal of labour and it is going to make for greater efficiency because everything that is centralized in headquarters tends to weaken the efficiency of the militia service. It is difficult in a country extending three thousand six hundred miles from Halifax to Esquimalt to administer military affairs from headquarters. It is physically impossible, and the machinery will play out if it is attempted. I hope that in the near future we will have a strengthening of the various military districts by the adoption of a policy of decentralization and everything it means.

There are two branches of the service I would like particularly to bring to the attention of the House. One is the Medical Services.

The devotion of the Canadian Army Medical Corps has been magnificent, both overseas and in Canada. The following extract is from a report made by Mr. McPherson to the House of Commons in England, as to the work of the Army Medical Corps, and is significant:

> In the Napoleonic Wars the percentage of deaths from disease was 97 and from death on the battlefield three. Even as late as the South African Campaign there were 67,000 cases of disease admitted to hospital and over 8,000 deaths. Four times as many men died from disease in South Africa as there were cases in France up to the beginning of November last. Sir W. Cheyne, than whom there was no greater authority, had made it clear how, although in a stationary army epidemics of disease were most liable to break out, skill and medical science, care and forethought had made the incidence of disease in the British Forces in

France less than in the history of any army in the world."

The Canadian Dental Corps has performed marvellous work. During the past eighteen months, 1,042,000 dental operations have been performed, and I am making a conservative estimate when I say that at least forty per cent of the Canadian soldiers now serving in France, would never have been permitted to leave Canada, had it not been for the magnificent service rendered by the Dental Corps.

From the reports from overseas, on the work of the Canadian Army Dental Corps up to the 31st of December, 1917, we learn that the Dental Corps in England and France, performed 1,375,629 different dental operations and treatments.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many men have you in that dental corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is distributed all over. In Military District No. 2, at Camp Borden and at Niagara, the dentists and their assistants have a corps of, I think, not over 35 or 40, and I know, from the figures I checked as A.A.G. of that district, that 10,000 men proceeded overseas to France who would have been rejected had not the Army Dental Corps given their services.

If any further information is desired I will be delighted to give it at any time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is the debate to be adjourned?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will meet at eight o'clock and see if any hon. gentleman desires information.

At six o''clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed in committee at eight o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Militia and Defence this afternoon began his observations by remarking that he was opening his mouth for the first time in this House, and he claimed the indulgence always given to new members. I may tell him that he might have dispensed altogether with any such request. He needed no indulgence, he gave us a very masterly speech, and one which contains a lot of very valuable information; and if he will take it from me, I convey to him the sincere appreciation of his speech from this side, and perhaps I may say from both sides. But the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, as well as the Prime Minister, gave a lot of figures which it is impossible to review at the present time. There are also several details which are yet needed, and I understood from the Prime Minister that he would agree to adjourn the debate to another day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then, if my right hon. friend agrees to the adjournment of the debate we will resume it at some other time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I merely thought we would resume this evening for the purpose of ascertaining if there was any subject which occurred to hon. gentlemen on the other side which has not yet been placed before the Committee, and as to which they desire information. It would be useful to have any suggestions of that kind in order that the information necessary might be prepared and be immediately available. However, as no question seems to arise for the moment, perhaps we had better adjourn the debate forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have one question to ask. Can the Minister of Militia and Defence give us the number of men conscripted in Canada?

Major-General MEWBURN: The number of men that are in Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think it is desirable to give details as to the actual number of troops of the Canadian Expeditionary Force that are in this country, but on the 31st March there were approximately 30,000 troops in Canada, including conscripted men. If my right hon. friend would like to get any further information I will be very glad to give it to him confidentially, because I do not think it is wise to disclose the places where all these troops are. They are, as hon. gentlemen know, moving overseas very rapidly. As I stated this afternoon, we are desirous of getting them there as quickly as possible, or as soon as ships are available. We have distributed in the various military districts both the men who have reported to these depot battalions, and others who have come from the United States as recruits raised by the recruiting mission that has been at work there, and they are categorized in the various branches as infantry, cavalry, artillery, engineers, medical and dental organizations, railway construction corps, veterinary units, and so forth. Those

are not immediately available for duty overseas by any means, unfortunately. A rigorous medical examination is now required. In the first and second years of the war men did go overseas, and broke down under training in England or at the front; they were unable to stand the severe test of the arduous work there. Therefore we have found it necessary that, after the men get into the depot battalions or regiments where we have them now, and before sending them overseas, it is necessary to have a final medical board. It has been found inadvisable to allow men to proceed overseas who are not absolutely in what we call technically class A, and fit for immediate service at the front. I regret to say that under the Military Service Act there have been many cases of men who have been found after re-medical examination, medically unfit. These men have had to be discharged and this has, in some instances, reduced our available reinforcements. Some of the men in question have been placed, even after joining the colours, in the lower B category. They will, we hope in some instances, come back to the higher category. Then, included in the number given are a certain number of men whom we have had on special guard duties within Canada, and whom we have been forced to hold, including the garrisons at Halifax and other points. Approximately the total is as I have stated. Should my right hon. friend desire more details I would be very glad to give them to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Publicly or privately?

Major General MEWBURN: Privately. I do not think it is in the public interest to give detailed information publicly.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): The minister, when speaking this afternoon, said he thought a mistake had been made in the early part of the war in sending over so many battalions officered by such a large number of officers—I think he told us that each battalion had thirty-five or forty officers, if I remember correctly. He said that upon reaching the other side the men were drafted into other battalions and the officers were left in England with practically nothing to do. Now there has been a great deal of talk in the press and elsewhere with regard to this matter. I notice by the press that a large number of these officers have been returned to Canada, but there still must be many on the other side. Would it be possible for the minister to state the approximate number of such officers who are still in England?

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Major General MEWBURN: As regards the surplus officers in England, I am not in a position to give the exact number that are there at the present time. With respect to the regiments or battalions which were raised in the early stages of the war, I did observe that I thought other arrangements might have been made, but there was this to be said with respect to the regiments in question: when these battalions were authorized and organized, in 1915 and 1916 particularly, had it not been for the individual efforts of these officers in raising the battalions in question I do not think we would ever have got the number of men that we did get. Owing to the military situation those battalions went overseas up to their regular establishment, in round figures about 1,150. Each composite battalion had one hundred extra men, but the strength was subsequently reduced to 1,050. I do not think all the officers were struck off, but in many instances when those battalions went overseas the officers were taken away from them. The men were put into one or other of the numerous reserve battalions for training in England, which were then officered by officers who had been in England from the early stages of the war, as well as officers who had been returned wounded from France and could not go back. There were many instances where officers failed to find employment, but in 1916 they were all employed in England and they were employed in taking special courses. A very large number of those officers took various courses, qualifying them for the higher rank, such as field courses, and so on, with the object of giving them the higher training that would enable them to be utilized in France. Subsequently the policy was adopted under which non-commissioned officers and privates who had distinguished themselves in the field and who were recommended by their commanding officers were given commissions. Therefore, there naturally was very little chance of some of the officers in question getting to the front. They had the privilege of reverting to the rank of lieutenant, but in many cases officers who went from Canada did so with the rank of major and had held that rank in the Canadian militia for a long time. They had taken highly technical courses and were in command of double companies when they went to the front. There were many of those who did revert in rank and are to-day serving at the front as lieutenants, and all the more honour to them on that account. There was another class of officers who were over the age of thirty-five, and who, under the

new order, were prohibited from going to the front. There were still others—and I think this is a great compliment to Canada—who accepted positions in the Imperial army. For a time the Imperial army were short of officers, but to-day they have a large surplus of junior officers. In some instances we had officers who were trained in the higher branches of the service who were qualified for conducting open warfare, and who would, under the new order, be struck off and sent back to Canada as surplus. But I am glad to say that I know of two instances where Canadian officers were accepted by the British War Office and are to-day in France in command of British regiments with the rank of lieutenant-colonel. The British Army recognized their ability and were glad to accept their services. A very large number of officers returned to Canada. I am not prepared to give the exact number because I have not the information available. Within the last six or seven months a large number of officers have been returned. A large number have gone back to civilian life; a large number, when they found they could not get over to France, in some cases even offered to go as privates and being refused, returned to Canada. Other officers went immediately off the pay-sheet; they paid their own way back to Canada and have gone back to civil life rather than loaf around. There are other officers who, after being employed temporarily, are being sent back gradually. Take the officers of the Fifth Division. At the time that division was up to full strength, and after the artillery of that division was taken away, there were some 330 officers released to be disposed of. There are something like 2,300 officers employed in administration, and a large percentage, I am informed, employed in these administrative services, are unfit to return to France. In the reserve battalions, I have not the actual figures, but I may say that these officers are being very rapidly returned to Canada, and where they cannot be absorbed here—we cannot give employment to everybody—they are very rapidly returned to civil life. Those to whom we have given preference and priority, having regard to efficiency, are the officers who have served actually at the front and who have been wounded and are not fit to return to the front. I am afraid I cannot give the actual number of officers now in England now unemployed, but my information is that there are very few and they are returning rapidly by every ship.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The principle of taking officers from the ranks dates from the beginning of the war. On one occasion, long before the overseas minister was appointed, we had the honour of taking over two hundred and fifty men in one day from the ranks of the non-commissioned officers and promoting them to be officers. Let me give in detail the plan. The First Division passed over. I can not recall a solitary instance in the First Division where officers were put on from outside sources, the promotions were always from within. Then the Second Division went, taking over very few officers outside of those who had been engaged in raising and training the battalions composing that division. The officers who were qualified in that division were retained. Some we had to replace, but in replacing them, as far as we could we selected officers who had already served in the First Division. In the same way, the new officers held their battalions as far as qualified, which was perfectly right, and each man had to go through a very rigid test to prove whether or not he was qualified to take his position in the battalion. In other words, we did not impose on any division that had already been in the fighting, but we did take the ground that new divisions going in, or new brigades, should as far as possible, retain the officers they had been trained under, provided they were qualified. In cases where an officer had to be replaced, he stepped down and out willingly, but he was always courteously treated, not thrown out like a buccaneer, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) was when he went over with his battalion. When we organized the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Divisions, in large numbers by battalions, every officer was given to understand that unless he measured up, and unless his unit measured up, he must give place to the corps already in the field, and his unit must be broken up. That was distinctly understood by ninety-nine out of every hundred, and if it was not understood it was contrary to orders. They were to go over taking their chances, and if by their efficiency they could merit recognition, they were to be maintained together as far as possible as reserve battalions. There never was any intention I can assure hon. gentlemen but that officers who had given their time and money, as they had done in the years 1915 and 1916—I may say here that there was never anything to equal that system in the history of this or any other country—were entitled to absolutely fair treatment.

It was only when the overseas minister was appointed that these men had their

battalions taken from them and they were thrown out. I never in my life saw anything like the way they were treated. Non-commissioned officers would sometimes take the battalions away from the colonels who had brought them over. In my time they were treated with the utmost courtesy in every solitary instance. It was all right enough to break the battalions up. That could not be avoided, except in some cases where there was favouritism shown, and men were put over the heads of better men, and others were treated discourteously and given no consideration at all.

Mr. COPP: On whose recommendation were these men put over the head of the others?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have not the records. The hon. member will have to get that from the records. It did not occur in my time.

Mr. COPP: In your time? On whose recommendation were these inferior men put over the heads of the others?

Sir SAM HUGHES: There were no inferior men, no junior men, put over the head of the senior, unless the senior were absolutely unqualified, in my time. But later on there were many instances where men were put over excellent officers, their betters in every way, and these had no chance whatever, but were passed over, and then, of course, there was a good deal of trouble. The whole trouble could have been avoided if these men had been courteously relieved of their battalions instead of their being ruthlessly taken from them. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can explain why he was thrown out.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot altogether concur in the last observation of my good friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). I certainly was not, as he puts it, thrown out in England. I endeavoured to raise an overseas battalion of infantry, the 245th Battalion Canadian Grenadier Guards, and with the loyal and enthusiastic assistance of the officers associated with me, and at the expenditure of a respectable sum of money, I succeeded, after great effort, in recruiting a considerable number of men with a splendid organization, but I could not bring my battalion up to strength. The reason for this was that the voluntary system of recruiting had broken down, and notwithstanding the fact that there were plenty of available men in the good city of Montreal, I found it quite impossible to induce them to join up for overseas service. Before I left with my battalion for overseas I was perfectly well aware that it would be broken up shortly after our arrival in England. I knew that my men would be drafted into one of the reserve battalions there, and later, after they had completed their training, sent forward to France. When I arrived in England with my unit I was allowed to retain command for about ten days in Shoreham camp, and then I received orders to turn my unit over to the 23rd Reserve Battalion. I was then ordered by the General Officer Commanding, Shoreham Camp, to report at London. I offered my services to General Turner in any capacity that he considered I could best serve in either in England or in France, but he informed me that my services could not be accepted, for two reasons: First, that only junior officers would be allowed to go to England, men not over 35 years of age, and inasmuch as I was fifty years of age, I could not be permitted to revert to the rank of lieutenant. The second reason was that there was a large number of junior officers in the various camps in England, some fully trained and others training, waiting an opportunity to go to France. I found no fault with the policy prevailing in England, that overseas units arriving there of necessity had to be broken up to maintain up to strength the four divisions of Canadian infantry in France.

Mr. VIEN: That was in May, 1917?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, I admit that there was a large number of Canadian officers in the various camps in England at that time, but that was not surprising. Notwithstanding the training officers and non-commissioned officers and men receive in Canada before they leave for overseas, they have to take a long course of additional training in England. At the present time there are not nearly so many Canadian officers in England as there were when I was there, because owing to the heavy casualties at the front they are being sent over more quickly. I will admit that, like all other commanding officers whose battalions are broken up on arrival in England, I was disappointed. I knew full well, however, before I left that this system would prevail, and I can find no fault with the treatment accorded me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman, on his return from overseas, was one of the most wrathy men I ever met.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Disappointed.

Mr. McMASTER: The remarks of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) may be very interesting, but I would ask him to speak a little louder, so that we all may get the benefit of them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was saying that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), on his return from England was—I will not say the maddest man, but one of the most intensely disappointed men that it has ever been my privilege to meet. I told all whom I met before they left that they must take their chance; that the proficiency or strength of their battalions would be the measure of their chance of being retained in the new divisions. I wish to pay my good friend (Mr. Ballantyne) this tribute: no officer in Canada surpassed him in zeal, in enthusiasm, or in the desire to have a good battalion. For some unaccountable reason—he knows, you know, and others know what the troubles were; I shall not intrude them on the committee now, though I may do so later in the session—recruiting did not measure up as I had hoped. The officers who went over with these battalions knew that it was not possible under the circumstances for every battalion to go to the front as a unit, but what did hurt me was that officers who had given of their time and money to the raising of their battalions should have them taken from them immediately on their arrival in England. To illustrate—I say it advisedly; the facts are as I state them unless officers have misrepresented them, and I do not believe that they have—officers have landed in England, marched their battalions into camp, and have never been allowed to see them again. One member of this House told me that his battalion had been taken from him by a sergeant major and marched off, while he and his officers were left behind. That has been the cause of much dissatisfaction. Many of these officers—all, I think, who were within the age—were desirous of going to the front. At that time there were not, of course, places for all officers. The system of taking non-commissioned officers from the ranks and giving them commissions was not new; it had been in vogue from the beginning of the campaign within each battalion, division, and so on. But when a new division went over it was right that the officers who had raised the units and who had given their time and money to the work should, provided they were qualified, command the battalions, companies and platoons in the field.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has told us that many of these battalions were disposed of rather unceremoniously. He has cited the case of a man whose battalion was marched off by a sergeant-major; was this done at the instance of the Canadian, or of the Imperial, authorities?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The policy had been to keep the battalions there for a time and let them get settled down, the old officers remaining with them until the units were broken up. Later the policy was inaugurated of breaking up the battalions immediately on their arrival in England. That was done by the Canadian local brigadier and officers in command of the unit to which the battalions were assigned. Certainly I had nothing whatever to do with it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Did this come from the Overseas Minister of Militia?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know from whom else it would come. I should hope that it did not come from this side.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The same thing was done before an overseas minister was appointed. The commanding officer of the 189th Battalion, a very fine young man named Piuze—

Sir SAM HUGHES: A fine fellow.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: He recruited his regiment with great success and crossed over in 1916.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What month?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In September or October.

Sir SAM HUGHES: October, I think.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: An officer was waiting on the wharf at Liverpool, and when the regiment disembarked the officer asked for Colonel Piuze. He then told Colonel Piuze that he had orders to take over the command of his regiment, and that fine officer, who had been the most successful recruiting officer in the province of Quebec and who had been assured that his regiment would go to the front as a unit, had not the glory—if it be called a glory—of commanding his own unit on British soil. He had to act as a sort of visitor at the camp for some months. Colonel Piuze, who is a very well qualified officer, is to-day commanding the depot battalion at Quebec. That is what happened in England; I was there at the time, and I know what I am talking about. All the officers of the unit were very angry, and took opportunity to ventilate their grievances. Colonel Piuze himself did not complain.

Sir SAM HUGHES: These are the cases that I complain of. Colonel Piuze was one of the best officers in the service; he took over a very fine battalion. Personally I had nothing to do with the matter; it was after I had the handling of it.

Mr. BUREAU: The other day one of the members inquired regarding an article in the papers about the treatment received by the soldiers returning from overseas. The Minister of Militia and Defence replied that the matter rested with the overseas minister. I must say that I know very little about this overseas minister, and I am anxious to know more. We have in this House a Minister of Militia who is responsible to Parliament for everything that is done in his department, and we are here to criticise him if we have occasion to find fault. But things are done by the Overseas Minister of Militia for which the Minister of Militia who sits in this House is responsible. We cannot criticise those things because we do not know what is going on overseas in regard to them. The question that comes to the ordinary mufti-dressed man is: Why should there be two departments in one, and why should one man, if I may use the expression, wear the harness, draw the cart, be exposed here to all the criticism, and yet have no control over the other man? I do not believe, unless they have private information, there are many members of this House, except those who have been overseas, who know what is being done there. I do not know what is being done nor who is performing what duties. When I look over the statutes and read the authority of the Minister of Militia and Defence, I know exactly what his authority is and what constitutes his department; I know exactly what powers Parliament has vested in him. But when I speak about the Overseas Ministry of Militia, why, I do not even know by what authority it exists, unless it be by Order in Council. I do not know what are the powers of the Overseas Minister of Militia, what duties he is performing overseas or what is under his control. There is no doubt he must be spending a great deal of money in England. If I understand aright the position as it is now, the authorities in England are spending money on our behalf and we are spending money on theirs, but the balance must be drawn some day. If they are equipping and paying for our men, if we on this side are paying for ships or wheat or other commodities, when the day of reckoning comes, there is a balance to be drawn. Who has the supervision of that expenditure on the other side? I do not know. Are we to have any control over it? Are we going to be allowed to criticise the way in which the money is expended? Certainly not, according to the way in which things are being done now. I do not, of course, want to be understood as fault-finding, all I want to know is what control or authority the Overseas Minister of Militia has with reference to the Canadian Forces, and how it is that you can have two or perhaps three departments in one? Does the Overseas Minister of Militia control the expenditure of Canadian moneys or the administration of Canadian forces in France? That is what I should like to have light upon in order to be able to put questions so as to ascertain what condition we are in and what we may expect from this duplicate or triplicate administration of the Department of Militia and Defence. It is most unfair that one man should shoulder in this House the whole burden, and be in this unenviable position of sometimes being unable to give information when that is absolutely not his fault. I do not want the minister to understand that I desire to criticise him. I know he cannot do any better than he is doing. If I had two branches of my business, one being in Montreal, and I could not go to Montreal, nobody could blame me for not knowing anything about my deeds and abstracts there, but the system could be blamed, and people could accuse me of ignorance, or neglect, or recklessness, for which I would be answerable if I were at the head of that office and had the administration of it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall endeavour to relieve, as far as I can, the darkness which, according to my hon. friend, is overspreading him. If he would extend his researches into the statutory law a little further and examine the statutes that were passed last session, he would find there a statue which defines the powers, duties and jurisdiction of the Minister of the Overseas Service. That can be stated in a very few words. The Minister of the Overseas Service is to have, and does have, the same jurisdiction and powers and duties in respect of the troops in Great Britain and France that the Minister of Militia and Defence has in respect of the troops that are raised here before they embark for overseas. So far as the payments overseas are concerned, I have already explained to the committee—I do not know whether my hon. friend was

present or not—that they are under the direct supervision of the Auditor General, who, after consultation with the Government about eighteen months ago, detailed officers of his department for the purpose of examining the system of checking accounts overseas. Officers have gone to England for that purpose and have made any necessary examination. Further than that, my hon. friend does not seem to be aware that the major portion of the expenditure overseas is regulated by statute; that is to say, the pay and allowances of the troops who are serving in Great Britain and in France. That is provided by law; it is not subject to the discretion of any minister or officer. In respect of transport and in respect of the provision of food, expenditures have to be made, and are made in the ordinary way. The maintenance of the troops in France is undertaken by the British Government, and a fixed amount per day for each man serving in France has been agreed upon between the Government of this country and the Government of the United Kingdom. Those are matters of accounting which will be adjusted afterwards.

Mr. VIEN: Can the Prime Minister tell us how much the amount is per man per day?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already stated that this afternoon. I shall state it again. The amount per man in France, as regulated in the first instance, was six shillings, which covered not only the maintenance of the man there, but ammunition for the rifles, shells for the guns, everything that was to be done in France.

Sir SAM HUGHES: But not the pay of the men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But not the pay of the men. I thought, of course, I had made that plain already. It is for the maintenance of the men and not for the pay of the men, so that there is very little left to the discretion or regulation of the overseas minister, but whatever is left has been under the direct supervision of the Auditor General and has been carefully checked by him from time to time. I spoke to the Auditor General to-day before coming into the House, and so far as I could gather from him, the arrangements made in the public interest to superintend those expenditures are entirely to his satisfaction.

Mr. BUREAU: My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) tells me, as one of the explanations to make sunshine in my darkness, that that expenditure is authorized by statute.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The greater part.

Mr. BUREAU: Very well. Even if the whole of it were authorized by statute, that would not be a satisfactory explanation. The expenditure of this Parliament is authorized by statute, and yet my right hon. friend knows how that expenditure is criticised, and he knows that parties in Opposition have found that expenditures, although authorized by statute, are sometimes very badly handled. That is the objection I raise. Even if the expenditure be authorized by statute, the man who has authority to spend the money ought to be in this House or have a representative here; or if you like it better, the minister who is responsible to this House ought to have a representative under his control, and this expenditure ought to be made also under his control. The other explanation given by the right hon. gentleman is rather a surprise to me, namely, that the expenditure is under the immediate control of the Auditor General. The other night we had a discussion in this House, and I addressed the following remarks to the acting Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Finance, I do not know which, as that matter is a little hazy just now: I note that in your estimates you are decreasing the amount which goes to pay the employees of your department. He admitted that. I asked him: How can you do it when your work of auditing is increasing on account of the larger expenditures to which the country is being put as a result of the war? I did not have time to look at Hansard, but what I gathered from his answer was this:

The details of the war expenditure do not go to the Auditor General to be examined and passed upon. His answer seemed to be very reasonable, in view of the objection that I was making, that the staff was decreasing as the work was increasing. It seemed very reasonable to suppose that somebody else must have been assuming a part of the burden. My right hon. friend says that the Auditor General has been there and has examined the accounts. It may be all very well to say that the Auditor General is assuming responsibility, but I contend that the Auditor General is our officer, he is our servant, he is independent of the Government, and for a very good reason. He is the watch dog of the treasury, as we are pleased to call him, but I do not think it is fair that he should delegate his powers to any man over whom he has not immediate supervision. He may find a good man, but I

do not think he should have an assistant auditor or a staff of auditors across the seas to perform work which ought to be performed under his immediate supervision in his office, and for which work he should be open to criticism. It may be that the darkness is very thick, as analyzed by my hon. friend, but that does not account for it, and that does not make me feel satisfied with the audit of the expenditure made overseas by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am sorry if my efforts were so unavailing. I will repeat—

Mr. BUREAU: I understand what you said; you need not repeat.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid my hon. friend did not quite understand it. I said that these expenditures, like all other expenditures of the Government, are under the supervision and control of the Auditor General. They are being made three thousand miles away. It did not seem desirable that they should continue without the Auditor General being brought more closely in touch with the expenditures at the place where they were actually made. After consultation with the Minister of Finance and with the consent and full approval of the Government, the Auditor General went overseas himself and examined the measures taken there to safeguard the public interest. He left over there a representative who continued there for some months or for the space that the Auditor General thought necessary. He afterwards returned to Canada and he is in Canada now, I believe. When the Auditor General thinks the public interest demands that the officer should return in order that he may be brought into close touch with the expenditures in Great Britain and France and that closer supervision may be exercised, he will send him back. Why should that not be left to the discretion of the Auditor General? My hon. friend seems to suggest that he should not send his officer for that purpose.

Mr. BUREAU: I suggest that the expenditures should be controlled here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are controlled here in the same way as other expenditures, by the Auditor General. They are controlled, in the first place, by the fact that they are, for the most part, fixed expenditures. No man can pay anything in excess of the amount fixed by law to any officer, non-commissioned officer or man who serves at the front. They are controlled, in the next place, by the supervision of the Auditor General through himself and his officers here as well as by officers whom he sends overseas.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I presume the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) does not wish to give the wrong impression that the Auditor General brought about any reforms when he went over there?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: On the contrary, he was compelled to report—I do not know whether willingly or against his will—that he found everything correct.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that is correct.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I might point out, to show what the conditions were in England for a while, that when the troops went over there at first they were regarded, not as Canadians, but as British soldiers. I had the honour of going over in 1914, arriving at the same time as the troops, and while speaking with the Acting High Commissioner, Mr. Perley, now Sir George Perley, he said to me: "You do not pretend to have any control of the soldiers here?" I said: "Why not?" "They are British soldiers," he said. I said that I was not aware that I was called upon to offer any explanation, but that I felt, as I was bound to feel, that I was standing by the law. I later on met the Secretary of State for War, who used almost identical language. On the strength of the remarks of the Acting High Commissioner, he said that these troops were British soldiers, and added: "You do not pretend to have any claim upon them?" I said "I make no pretense to anything, but I merely claim what the Army Act allows." Section 177 of the Army Act, to my mind, clearly gives Canada absolute control of her troops except as to military directions in the field. They are subject to the Commander-in-Chief of the British army in the field. That is the line I took. That is the ground I stand on to-day and that is the ground, I am pleased to have to observe, is taken by the Government, although I had a long up-hill fight before I carried my point. A little later I received a message from Canada asking if the Canadians were in action. I replied "No." A cable came back asking if So-and-So had been killed in action, saying

that his wife had been notified by the British War Office that her husband had been killed in Belgium. I made inquiries and I found that a man had been killed in Belgium two weeks before and it did not require a great astuteness to see that there was something wrong. Some one had drawn pay for that man who had been dead for two weeks. I found that the pay of a great many absentees without leave had been drawn by somebody. I presume that the officers did not check the matter up very closely in some cases. I immediately set to work to rectify this and I found that the Pay Department, by somebody's instructions, was under the direction of the British War Office and that we were not supposed to interfere. I let it pass for the time being but I instructed the officers to keep a careful eye on this aspect of the matter. Later on I found out that in order to have anything like a proper control of payments there must be a different system, and after consultation with General Carson, I placed in charge of that department, and made responsible for the correct auditing of the accounts, a very capable officer whose name I forget at the moment. He did willing service and in a short time he reduced the system to a proper basis. We then introduced the system of paying by passbook and carried it out so that we had it down in a short time to as perfect a system as could be established anywhere. Still wishing to strengthen the system, I selected Colonel Ross, of the Royal Highlanders, Montreal, and sent him over with instructions to see that everything was done in an absolutely correct manner. Then the Auditor General, after he had been well worked up by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), in a fit of epilepsy thought things might be going wrong over there and he went over himself. When he got to England he gratefully acknowledged that he found everything in absolute ship-shape. I want to narrate the condition of affairs to the House, to show that every avenue and every loophole for the possibility of fraud, looseness or carelessness had been closed before the Auditor General and his assistants were sent over by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Finance Minister. Perhaps the present Minister of Militia might explain—although I do not charge him for being responsible for anything that has gone wrong—whether the Auditor General has been active in seeing that accounts for separation allowance and assigned pay are kept in proper condition in Canada, or whether there have been any slips and any money lost.

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand the Auditor General has been and is auditing the accounts regularly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And that everything is all right?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no statement from him, but I know that, as a matter of fact, there are a large number of accounts for separation allowance and assigned pay where over-payment has been made, and I think in the early stages of the war, in the years 1914 and 1915 particularly, mistakes were made when the separation allowance and assigned pay were being paid out by military districts, instead of by Headquarters. In many cases where troops have gone overseas there has been over-payment in connection with the separation allowance. Every endeavour, I understand, has been made to recover those payments in some instances, and I imagine quite a number; but I do not think those amounts can be or should be recovered. They are at present, I understand, written off or put in suspense account, and will have to be dealt with by the House at a later date, when they are finally ascertained, but they chiefly were cases where married women received over-payment in connection with separation allowance, and where they have endeavoured to keep up their little homes and families. I think it would be an extreme hardship if they were asked to refund $50 or $100. It was through no fault of theirs that they were overpaid. I am speaking generally, and am not in a position to give figures.

Mr. VIEN: And is there on this side of the ocean any office or any representative of the overseas Department of Militia and Defence?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of the Overseas Service sends regular reports to the Prime Minister and copies of them to the Minister of Militia and Defence. In that way touch between the department and the department here is continually kept up.

9 p.m.

Mr. VIEN: Is the Overseas Minister of Militia and Defence under the control in any shape or form of the Minister of Militia and Defence on this side, or of the Militia Council?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The minister overseas is in the same position as any other minister of the Crown He is a member of the Cabinet, responsible for the administration of the department which has been confided to him.

Mr. VIEN: He has not, as yet, laid upon the table of the House any report of his department overseas, has he?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The report of his department was comprised in statements made upon this appropriation last year. At the commencement of last year the present Minister of the Overseas Service had been in office only a very short time.

Mr. VIEN: I want to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence what system exists in so far as purchasing of war material is concerned? Is the war material purchased for the expeditionary force on this side of the ocean, or in England? I wish to refer specially to general service wagons, for instance water wagons, munition wagons, and also to arms, clothing, equipment and munitions.

Major-General MEWBURN: As far as the Army Service Corps wagons or kitchens, or any equipment of that kind is concerned, none has been purchased in Canada in the last year or two. With regard to arms, the answer is, no. The arms that our force is using at the front are supplied, I understand, by the Imperial army—the same weapon as they use. As regards the clothing, that is contracted for and purchased in Canada, and those purchases are made through the War Purchasing Commission on demand from the Department of Militia and Defence here.

Sir SAM HUGHES: For the soldiers at the front?

Major-General MEWBURN: All the uniforms are sent from here for the troops overseas.

Mr. VIEN: Even for those at the front?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, certainly—made here in Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Since when?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am advised that system is carried on at the present time. They are shipping a certain number of uniforms over regularly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: For troops in England?

Major-General MEWBURN: And the boots for our troops in Canada have been manufactured in Canada, issued to the troops in Canada, and each man going overseas takes two pairs of boots with him.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know what the latest order is, but I might place the facts before the House. In regard to the troops in England, the statement is correct. For the troops going over to France, they take the uniforms on their back, and do not change before they go. They keep the boots on their feet.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the uniforms?

Sir SAM HUGHES: When the uniform was supplied the rule was—and I fought against it—that the troops in France and Belgium should be supplied with a British outfit.

Major-General MEWBURN: Those were replacements, I understand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No; they are supplied to our troops, and the Prime Minister will remember that when the arrangement was made and submitted to me for approval, I drew his attention to the fact that if these uniforms were to be taken from the British stores, the British Government should give to the Canadian manufacturers orders for a similar number of uniforms to those supplied to our troops in France and Belgium from the British store. The hon. Prime Minister will remember that. I understand that has not been done, although we still take uniforms from the British store, but I understand the British Government is not buying from Canadian manufacturers an equivalent amount.

Mr. VIEN: Is a scale of prices arranged for with the British Government, in so far as the equipment arms, and clothing is concerned? Who has control of them?

Mr. TWEEDIE: The minister has just mentioned one fact——

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to obtain an answer? I put a question and the minister will answer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will be patient, he will get his answer.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Militia on the very generous position which I understand he has taken in connection with the overpayment of separation allowance. I feel that his stand will meet with the approval of every member in this House, even though it would mean a loss to the country. A great many cases have come under my personal observation in connection with my work and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) and I were discussing the matter to-night. We find many cases in which a man has been killed, or for some reason his pay should have been suspended and separation allowance stop-

ped. His dependents, however, continue to receive this money. The practice in the past seems to have been to insist rigidly on the repayment of this money by the dependent, but, as the minister has pointed out, in nearly all these cases the dependents are in such circumstances that they are unable to refund the whole or any part of the money, and I think the hon. minister is acting very generously with them if he writes that off and carries his decision into effect by not making any demand on these dependents for the return of the money. That is very good so far as the separation allowance is concerned, but, personally, I feel that every member in this House would like to see that policy carried one step further and made to cover cases arising in connection with assigned pay.

There are a great many dependents who have received Assigned Pay under conditions not entitling them to it, but, as in the case of the separation allowance, it was through no fault of their own and they were ignorant of the fact that they were taking the money improperly. They have received and expended the money, and I think that if the minister will adopt a policy of not demanding the return of either the assigned pay or separation allowance which has been overpaid, he will be adopting a generous policy—a policy which is just to the dependents and will meet with their approval throughout Canada, which will do a great deal to promote comfort in their homes, and I have no doubt will receive the approval of every member of the House.

Mr. VIEN: Would the hon. the minister answer my question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will give the hon. gentleman the answer as far as possible. In the first place, the men go over with their uniforms from here, and with a certain additional supply, with extra boots, for example; and when they leave England for France they are fully equipped with uniforms, boots and everything else which has been supplied to them before they leave this country. It is impossible, of course, to keep up separate depots for the Canadian force in France. That force is part of a very large army, and it is necessary to have depots, commissariat arrangements, and everything of that kind provided for the army as a whole; it is entirely impossible to have separate arrangements for 150,000 men out of perhaps two millions. So, in France, the replacements of uniforms, as I understand it, are made out of the British stores. I am not sure at the moment whether or not any exact arrangement has been made as to the amount which shall be charged for these replacements. If no such arrangement has been made, it will be subject to adjustment at a later date. We have never found any disposition on the part of the British authorities to endeavour to exact from this country a higher price than that which would be just and reasonable for all such supplies.

Mr. VIEN: Yes. But probably the difficulty would arise when the war is over and the readjustment takes place. Would it not be better—and I suggest it with no political intention—that some arrangement should be made right away so that regard should be had to prevailing prices, and no advantage taken of perhaps higher prices at a later date when the readjustment takes place?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When the readjustment takes place, of course, it must be on the basis of the prices at the time the articles were furnished. I do not at all anticipate any such difficulty as my hon. friend suggests. However, inquiry will be made with regard to the matter if he considers it important. There are a good many subjects which will come up for adjustment between the two governments when this war is ended, and, of course, on both sides a complete record is kept of such matters for the purpose of the proposed eventual adjustment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would draw the Prime Minister's attention to the point I raised some time ago. It may seem a small matter, but I know that the British Government is willing to deal fairly in the premises—they told me so personally, and I think the Prime Minister took the matter up also. The manufacture of clothing for 150,000 to 200,000 men is quite a little item. It is of primary importance that our factories should be kept going and employment given to our workers. I drew the Prime Minister's attention, at the time the conference with the British Government was arranged, to the desirability of purchases being made directly through this Government from our manufacturers, or that a quantity of uniforms corresponding to the number which the British Government have supplied to our troops at the front should be replaced from here. In that way the manufacturers would receive orders and the labouring people get employment in the same manner as they would if we were ourselves supplying our own troops with uniforms.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am bearing the hon. gentleman's point in mind. I impressed that consideration upon the British authorities not only by correspondence, but also orally; it formed the subject of some discussion about a year ago. The British Government are desirous of doing anything in that regard that may be practicable, but, of course, we have to take into consideration the difficulties of transport, which are very considerable. They are able to point out to us, as they have pointed out, that if we may be a little short in the supply of uniforms or equipment of any kind, we are very much ahead in the supply of shells, munitions of war and a great many other articles which have been produced in enormous quantities in this country, in very great excess of the requirements of the Canadian troops at the front. So on the whole I think we have not anything to complain of, although we would be very glad, indeed, if an arrangement could be made by which some of the uniforms for the British troops could be purchased in this country.

Mr. JACOBS: The principle which has been enunciated by the Government with regard to the appointment of two cabinet ministers for one position is something which we on this side of the House cannot understand. It is to us subversive of all principles of ministerial responsibility and parliamentary practice. There are other countries at war just now as well as Canada, but I have yet to find that in any of the other governments they have considered it necessary to have two ministers of war. They are satisfied to have one minister on the parliamentary benches, and to have officers who are properly qualified for the position in the trenches. But to have ministers in the trenches and on the benches at the same time is something that does not appeal to us at all. Now the United States are allies of ours, and I have yet to learn that they have two cabinet ministers attending to the War Department, although there would be much more reason for them to have two ministers than ourselves, because their administrative system is entirely different from ours. In the United States there is no ministerial responsibility, the cabinet is in no way responsible to the House; and if a member of the United States cabinet wishes to take a jaunt across the Atlantic to see how matters are going on at the front, the business of the country can go on just the same. I see by the newspapers that Mr. Baker is conferring with the Allies on the other side, but no additional minister, as I understand it, is taking his place even under the American system. The only reason I can suggest why there should be two ministers for Canada—one on the other side of the Atlantic and one on this—is that they should not quarrel, and therefore it is well to have the Atlantic ocean between them. Or, it may be, that the right hon. the Prime Minister, in his desire to see that both parties were properly represented in the Union Government, thought fit to provide that the Conservative Minister of Militia should be on the other sde of the Atlantic, and the Liberal Minister of Militia on this side.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Fifty-fifty.

Mr. JACOBS: This system of providing positions in order to make room for every person, in order to see that every person is happy during these strenuous times, is further exemplified in the division of the functions of the Minister of the Interior. That position has also been divided, and now we have a Minister of the Interior, looking after the Department of the Interior I suppose, and we have a Minister of Immigration and Colonization. At no time in the history of Canada did we less require a Minister of Immigration than at this time when there is not a single immigrant coming into the country, and as for colonization the matter is not to be thought of until after the war is over. And yet it was considered necessary to create a new portfolio only a few months ago, and $7,000 of the people's money accordingly goes to the up-keep of a Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

Then we have also the Ministry of Finance divided, and we find a Conservative Minister of Finance in California three thousand miles away, and at the same time we have a Liberal Minister of Finance in Ottawa, so that every one is satisfied.

So far as I can understand, Mr. Chairman, the position which the Overseas Minister of Militia occupies just now is nothing more or less than that of a glorified paymaster. That is all he is, because we cannot hold him responsible for anything he does. The session will have prorogued before we are able to see the classic lineaments of this gentleman on this side of the Atlantic. This business could be done just as well by a deputy minister, and not by a full-fledged Minister of Militia and Defence, whose duty is to be right here at this particular time to answer all questions that are being put to him. The House had an opportunity the other day of seeing how a minister refused to accept responsibility for

certain acts committed in Quebec. When the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) referred to one department, that gentleman stood from under and put it on the other minister, and then that gentleman tried to absolve himself from responsibility. That is what is going to happen in this case. The Minister of Militia and Defence will say: I have nothing to do with that; the other minister is attending to that. We have no means of checking him up, and in that way the party responsible can escape because of the duplication of the position. It is an endeavour to make some person responsible for the acts of some other person. That is what is being done by the creation of this new position. It may be that I cannot see this matter as well as some hon. gentlemen in the House, but I have always been brought up to believe in personal, individual responsibility, not vicarious sacrifice, and that is probably why it is that I rise to ask some further explanation from the right hon. Prime Minister, or the Government, as to why this position was duplicated at this particular juncture.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid that my hon. friend has not pursued his studies into cabinet responsibility very far, otherwise he would have learned that the Government as a whole is responsible for the acts of every minister. There is not any such individual responsibility as he alleges, apart from the collective responsibility of the whole Cabinet. The minister has his responsibility in the first instance, but the Cabinet as a whole is responsible for the administration of every minister of the Crown. My hon. friend has not pursued his studies far enough, or he would have known what has taken place in Great Britain. One of the first things done in the first six months of the war was to divide up the War Department in Great Britain. Has the hon. member never heard of the Minister of Munitions?

Mr. JACOBS: Is that gentleman who has been created an additional member of the Cabinet following the camp in the same way as our present minister, or is he in London?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is in London, and it would be rather idle to establish a Minister of Overseas Service and have him here when his duties require him to be overseas. My hon. friend seems to think that we have divided up departments for the sake of making positions.

Mr. BUREAU: Of duplicating positions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Let me say that Sir Edward Kemp was not desirous of assuming the duties of Minister of Militia overseas, and it was at my urgent request that he accepted; he is endeavoring to discharge his duties to the best of his ability, and he is discharging them with great ability and diligence. But with regard to the illustration which I gave to my right hon. friend, of the division of department with which he found so much fault——

Mr. McMASTER: Might I interpose a question? Has the Minister of Munitions in Great Britain a seat in the House of Commons? I think he has.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly, he has a seat in the House of Commons, and so has Sir Edward Kemp a seat in this House.

Mr. McMASTER: It is unoccupied.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend imagine that every minister of the Crown must be present in this House all the time?

Mr. McMASTER: Sometimes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does he not know that both in Great Britain and here there are ministers of the Crown who are members of the other House, and their colleagues have to answer for them? And we shall endeavour to answer for the Minister of Militia Overseas. But I can give you hon. friend some more illustrations to indicate to him how imperfectly he has followed up this question in the United Kingdom. After the outbreak of the war, I think about a year and a half after, a Minister of Blockade was established in Great Britain, who undertook duties which formerly were performed by other departments of the Government, and later on a Minister of Shipping was appointed, who undertook certain duties which theretofore had been discharged by the Admiralty. I read a statement in the British Hansard not long ago to the effect that there are at the present time something over ninety members in the British Government, taking ministers, parliamentary secretaries and every one else. So I think that, on the whole, considering that we are at war—and I hope my hon. friend will not forget that,—

Mr. JACOBS: I helped to vote $500,000,000 this afternoon, so I have not forgotten it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought in the course of his observations that he had forgotten it for a moment; I am glad it is always in his mind. We are at war, and there

are very serious duties devolving upon those who sit on the Treasury benches, much more serious and arduous duties than have ever before been placed on any Government in this country. It has been necessary somewhat to enlarge the Government, but not in anything like the same measure as has been found necessary in the United Kingdom. We have established a Ministry of Militia Overseas, and have put a man on the spot, with the idea that he could supervise over there and keep in continual communication with the Minister of Militia here, each one of them having definite and specified duties, and we have also—

Mr. JACOBS: Why could not a deputy minister do that work instead of torturing the Constitution in this way?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will pardon me, I do not propose going over all that debate which took place last session—

Mr. JACOBS: I was not here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: —when a statute was passed which established the Ministry of Militia Overseas. It is perfectly true that my hon. friend was not here, but I might suggest that Hansard is available to him, and it might be worth while to look at that before he takes occasion to discuss this matter. I repeat that, so far as the Minister of Militia Overseas is concerned, we, his colleagues here, will answer for him. In the very nature of things he cannot be here to answer for himself. We shall give all the information with regard to this expenditure that he could supply, and if anything is asked for which the information is not available, we will telegraph for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEMIEUX: I caught the eye of the Chairman.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I shall be delighted to leave it to the Chairman, but I shall not make way unless the Chairman rules the other way.

The CHAIRMAN: I told the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) a few minutes ago that I would see him next.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to revive a corpse, but I would like to ask the Minister of Militia what became of the Ross rifles which were discarded?

Major-General MEWBURN: My information is that very few of them were discarded, but I am not positive. I understand they were disposed of to great advantage in the United Kingdom.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were they transformed?

Major-General MEWBURN: I cannot answer that. The hon. ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) can probably give more information than I can.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question, and I may say, incidentally, that I do not propose entering into a discussion. I am trying to remember that we are at war—although there are ninety members of the British Government, the British are not meeting with any great success at the front at the present time; and bearing that in mind, I shall not enter into a discussion of what is fully in my heart, which might not be just as advisable to discuss at the present time as we might like. I may point out here that the United States Government, having in view the fact that the Canadian Government has multiplied its officers to a very large number, and in view of the fact that the British Government had increased its membership—though I did not know it had reached the number of ninety; God pity the country if they have ninety—refused point blank to have a committee appointed by either branch of the Congress of the United States to advise and consult with either the Secretary for War or for the Navy on matters connected with the war. If I may express an opinion, they did absolutely right.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the United States they have appointed a great many boards and commissions.

Sir SAM HUGHES: All under the Secretary of War.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Each board or commission is under a chairman who is in some association—I do not know precisely the nature of it—with a department of Government. For example, they have a War Industries Board, a War Trade Board, an Ordnance Board, and a great many such bodies. I was informed to-day, though I do not say it authoritatively, that very important additions have been made to the War Department quite recently.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Under the Secretary for War?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) made an inquiry regarding Separation allowance and Assigned Pay, and

I understood the minister to say that in future, in cases where the refund asked for could not be made by the person who had been overpaid, the amount would be written off the books and a report made to the House. I suggest that when the minister makes his report on this subject, he ask Parliament also to vote an appropriation to reimburse the poor women who have already made such payments, and who in many cases have had to borrow money in order to do so.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not treat all alike, and give it also to those who were not overpaid?

Mr. BUREAU: The cases would not be identical. The ex-minister suffers from the same disease as the Prime Minister, who gives an example of the subdividing of departments. I do not object to the subdividing of departments, but I do object to the duplicating of departments and the creating of concurrent jurisdiction. The Minister of Militia Overseas has the same power as the Minister of Militia in Canada. I know that there is solidarity among the ministers, but what I do not know is what the other gentleman is doing overseas. I should like to see him in his seat, the same as the Minister of Militia for Canada, so that we could quiz him when we wanted to find anything out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no doubt that he would like to be here and enjoy the privilege of being quizzed by my hon. friend or by any other hon. gentleman, but in default of his presence, my hon. friend is at liberty to quiz us.

Mr. BUREAU: Why the concurrent jurisdiction?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I pointed out the statute to my hon. friend; it is chapter 35 of the statutes of 1917. He will see that his assertion that these ministers have the same duties is entirely unfounded. Ministers of various departments have to act in conjunction with each other. For example, if any member of the Government desires additional accommodation for his department, say, the erection of a new building, the minister who desires the building erected gets in touch with the Minister of Public Works, under whose direction and by whose officer the construction of the proposed building is carried out. There is nothing very difficult about the situation as regards the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Minister Overseas. One deals with the raising, provision for and equipment of troops here in Canada until they embark for overseas, and when they reach England they come under the immediate jurisdiction of the Minister of Overseas Service.

Major General MEWBURN: In regard to the Separation Allowance, there were many cases of hardship where overpayments on both separation allowance and assigned pay had been made. The officers in charge of the department, asked, and rightly so, for refunds where these overpayments had been made. In cases where the refund would cause hardship, however, the amounts were left in what we call the suspense account, consideration having first been given to the matter by the Auditor General. I had intended, when the adjustments were made, to come to the House and ask permission to write the amounts off. I do not see how we could very well make the provision retroactive, because, as the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) suggests, we might have to pay every one the additional amount.

Mr. VIEN: It is known that these overpayments amount to several hundred thousand dollars?

Major General MEWBURN: I could not give the amount.

Mr. VIEN: Is the minister prepared to admit that they amount to over $100,000?

Major General MEWBURN: I would say that the amount does exceed $100,000, though I could not say by how much.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A great many of our boys transferred from the Canadian Expeditionary Force to the Royal Flying Corps, and in doing so they reverted in rank and were required to take less pay, and there was a great deal of complaint. Has anything been done in this matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If I am not mistaken, an Order in Council was passed some time ago by which it provided that Canadian officers entering the Flying Corps and thereby receiving smaller pay than that of their rank in the Canadian Expeditionary Force should have the difference made good to them. I think that is the case today.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. GLASS: Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN: I promised the member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) that I would see him next. I will recognize the hon. gentleman (Mr. Glass) as soon as the member for Charlevoix has finished.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Minister of Militia stated this afternoon that as quickly as a number of men were ready, they were sent overseas. I wish to find out whether it is the policy of the department to follow that course in the future.

Since the beginning of the war troops have been very well trained and have rendered effective service at the front. The former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) established throughout the country beautiful camps, especially Camp Borden, Niagara Camp and Valcartier. I am surprised to see that those camps are lying idle, and that nothing is being done in this country to train those men here. If those men were trained in this country, the money spent in training and equipping them and providing them with the necessaries of life would be spent in this country, instead of, as under the present circumstances, overseas. Moreover, at this particular time, when there is such a scarcity of foodstuffs in the Mother Country that the inhabitants are being put on fixed rations, it would be better for us to feed, equip and train those men in Canada as long as we can, and then, when they are ready to be sent to the front, send them overseas. We have here experienced colonels, captains, lieutenants, non-commissioned officers, who have seen service at the front and who are competent to give proper training to the men in this country.

Major-General MEWBURN: I should like to remind the hon. gentleman that a very serious war is being waged in France. As regards all the suggestions the hon. member makes as regards the training of men in Canada I shall absolutely agree that we have on this side officers, camps and facilities for giving them perfect training. As regards allowing them to remain here, whereby a considerable amount of money will be spent in Canada while they are undergoing training here, my hon. friend's statement is all very true. But when there is an immediate urgent necessity for men at the front, our duty is to get the men overseas as rapidly as we can. I do not think any other consideration enters into the discussion at the present moment. It would be a good thing if everybody would realize, as I feel some hon. members do not realize, the very urgent necessity for men at the front. Even our Allies, the United States, realize that to-day, and they do not intend to waste any time in training their men in the United States if they can secure ships to transport them to France. I have read it in the press, and I believe it to be true, that the United States Government have decided that for every man who goes on a transport over to France, another man shall take his place in a training camp in the United States. I wish we could say the same as regards Canada. Since the month of December, I have been using my utmost endeavours to get every available man who is fit for service in France, over to England just as quickly as we can get ships to transport them there. I have succeeded so far in filling every ship I could secure to put men on. We are now coming to the stage that we may have a few ships and we may not secure the men we want. I trust my hon. friend will realize the very urgent necessity of getting men to the front as quickly as possible. If he would read Lloyd George's speech which was delivered in England yesterday, he would see the urgent necessity for men, because the British authorities are sending boys of eighteen and nineteen to the front without even giving them time to say goodbye to their parents. That shows how urgent the necessity is.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. GLASS: Reverting to the matter of overpayment in assigned pay and separation allowance, I just wanted to ask the minister whether, under the auditing system which is in force now, there is likely to be any recurrence of those errors. I presume not. In the early stages of the war, several cases of that nature came to my attention in my own district, and I knew of several cases in which it was positively impossible for those who had been recipients of overpay to return the money. It would be a great hardship for them to have to do so. I agree entirely with the hon. members who have stated that the action the minister purposes taking in that matter will meet with the approval of the House. It would be uncharitable to attempt to enforce payment from those unfortunate beneficiaries who have been overpaid through the error of the Government. I have not had my attention personally drawn to any cases of the kind during the last two years, and I presume the system of accounting will prevent the recurrence of the mistakes made at the beginning of the war.

Major-General MEWBURN: I think I can honestly and safely say that there have been no mistakes of that nature under the present system of accounting. In the early stages of the war those accounts were all paid out by military districts where the troops were raised. There was no oversight,

and that is how the mistakes occurred. Many mistakes were made during the first two months of the war.

Mr. LEDUC: I think all hon. members understand the requirements of our men overseas, but my opinion is that the men who are required at the front are trained men, and as soon as the men are trained, we are as willing and ready as the Minister of Militia and Defence to send them overseas. But while we have the food here for them, we would not like to send them overseas until they are fully trained. Why should we send them to England to be trained, when we can look after them better than they can be looked after on the other side where there is such a scarcity of food? Last week, I was asked this question by a gentleman who has a son a prisoner in Germany: "Is the Minister of Militia aware that the fathers of prisoners in Germany are sending overseas equipment, boots and everything else they require? Are we supposed to leave those men there without any equipment whatever or are we supposed to look after them?"

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House this afternoon or not, but I shall endeavour to make myself very clear in regard to the training of troops. In the first place, I believe I am supported in my view by everybody who is vitally interested in this war and who realizes the urgent need of reinforcements. The fact of having our men in England even untrained is a great source of relief and comfort to our troops in France, because they feel that those men are only a hundred miles away from the firing line instead of three thousand miles. Our men going to England now are being given what is known as intensified training in all branches. An individual soldier can, with fourteen weeks of a syllabus of intensified training, be fitted for service in France, and no man who goes over to England is allowed to cross over to France until he has gone through that course.

As regards prisoners in Germany, I think I am right in saying that every possible measure has been and is being taken to see that our men get the proper and necessary supplies and money there through the various missions. I know whereof I speak because one of my cousins has been a prisoner in Germany since the battle of St. Julien in June, 1915, and I understand they are getting everything that is necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand the policy of the Minister of Militia is to use as little as possible the camps that have been built in this country, such as Camp Borden, Valcartier and Petawawa, and to send the men as soon as possible to Europe?

Major-General MEWBURN: It would give me the greatest amount of satisfaction and pleasure if we could use Valcartier and some of those other large camps. As far as Camp Borden is concerned, that camp will be utilized, I think, to the full extent, by the Royal Flying Corps. I am in hopes that we will be able to get sufficient men under the Military Service Act this spring to enable us to have troops for training at Valcartier and at some of the camps in the West. I had hoped that we could have forwarded overseas reinforcements at the rate of about ten thousand per month and always hold sufficient in hand for our training here. But our flow began to drop off and it would not be possible to open some of the camps unless we got an increased number of men.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The minister will only be able to send a certain number overseas because he has not the ships available to send too many. Undoubtedly there will be such a rush to camp in the spring, and with the impetus given by the Union Government, and all that sort of thing, that our camps will be more than filled and we will not have room enough for the thirty or forty thousand men in the camps all over the country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Let us hope so.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says that it gives courage to the boys in the trenches to see the other fellows beside them. But I do not see any reason why the minister should speak in a loud voice or accuse us of ignoring that there is a war on, or treat us with suspicion when we ask honest questions. When it is suggested that the scarcity of food on the other side might be regarded as a ground for training some of our men here, consuming the food here and dispensing with the necessity of finding transportation for it, that is no reason why the minister should impute motives to gentlemen on this side of the House. If the minister is going to get angry when we ask a question we will not get any farther. He will not scare us by talking in a loud voice. I do not intend to have any motives imputed to me, and I do not propose to refrain from asking questions because the minister gets impatient. He had better remain

patient and give us answers to the questions we ask without imputing motives.

Major-General MEWBURN: The hon. gentleman has misunderstood my motives. If I talk in a loud voice it is probably my misfortune and not my fault. I did not intend to convey any idea of resentment. Probably I may be feeling very deeply and very sincerely in my desire to get troops overseas. If the hon. gentleman had seen some of the cables that have come into my possession in the last three months, and if he had known how necessary it was to get troops over there, he would probably have felt as keenly as I do. But I want to assure my hon. friend, and every hon. member on the other side of the House, that I had no thought of answering anybody in the way my hon. friend has suggested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The men have to be trained on this side of the water or on the other side, and my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asked a very pertinent question and even made the suggestion that it would be better to have them trained in this country where there is a sufficient provision of food, rather than in England. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence in answer to that, said the men should be in England as soon as possible, because we were at war, and the troops got comfort and courage because they saw these men beside them. That may be true, but the question was one that was perhaps not answered as it should have been.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall endeavour to make myself a little clearer. My first object was to rush quite a number over to England as quickly as possible, if we could get the ships to take them over. It all came down to a question of ships. Secondly, they have various training schools at which these men are trained. A cable we received last week spoke of some of the men who had gone over under the Military Service Act, and said that they had made marvellous progress and had become expert in various lines of training. This cable also spoke of the great effect upon the morale of our troops which had been caused by the fact that these men had gone over.

Mr. McGIBBON: Might I suggest, as one who has been over there and has known the conditions, that there are such things as emergencies in war. We do know that the casualties in battle in any army, even the Canadian army, can count up very rapidly, even in the space of a few hours, and that the reserves which I believe were available for trench warfare in England a few weeks ago would hardly last any time at all. I think every man who knows anything about conditions, who knows the crisis that is existing to-day, who knows how low the Canadian reserves have been, must congratulate the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence on the methods he has taken to get men across the Atlantic. I was over there in the days before conscription was introduced into England. My regiment often was down to two hundred, two hundred and fifty or three hundred men in place of a thousand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do you mean a Canadian regiment?

Mr. McGIBBON: No, I was in the Imperials. Many a time we got recruits over from England with only three or four weeks' training. We were glad to get them. We found them very useful, because after all, the best training you can get in this war is the training the boys get in actual work in the trenches.

Progress reported.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 12, respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Short title:

Mr BUREAU: So that there may not be the same misunderstanding as there was in regard to the last measure before the House, I desire to get an explanation. I observe this Bill is in the name of the Prime Minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I should like to know what department will be shorn of any of its prerogatives by the creation of the new department of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Bill speaks for itself as to the duties imposed upon the minister, and as to his powers.

Mr. BUREAU: How are they being performed, and by whom? Or is this measure just for future emergencies?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The House has already been informed of the change that is made in remitting to the Department of Militia and Defence certain duties that heretofore have been performed by the Mili-

tary Hospitals Commission. The line of demarcation, I think, is perfectly clear. Until the soldier is discharged his care, whether in hospitals or otherwise, is to remain with the Department of Militia and Defence. If, after returning here from overseas, he requires further treatment in the hospital he will receive that treatment in a hospital which is under the direction and control of the Department of Militia and Defence, and will remain there until he is discharged. If, on the other hand, he requires no treatment in a hospital he is to be returned to a depot home in the militia district.

Mr. BUREAU: There was one point this afternoon which I did not understand. As long as a man is sick, he is under the Department of Militia, but the hon. Minister of Militia stated a case of a man who, for instance, had tuberculosis or a disease which would make him unfit for future work. I did not understand what they were going to do with such a man—the man with articular rheumatism or something that makes him absolutely unfit for future occupation.

Major General MEWBURN: In the case of a tubercular man, our arrangement was that when he came from overseas he left England as a soldier, he arrived in Canada as a soldier, still on the strength of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The intention of the medical service was that that man should be placed under immediate observation in one of the homes, and if it were found that he was suffering from acute tuberculosis, he would immediately have his pay adjusted up to date, would go on full pension, and then go into one of the sanatoria which still remain under the control of the Invalided Soldiers' Commission, which was formerly the Military Hospitals Commission. They are retaining under their control the sanatoria and vocational training camp which will take charge of that man after he has been discharged from the service. He is off our strength, and is given his military pay up to date, and then goes off on full pension. The same might be said of the insane cases. There are, unfortunately, many cases of insane men coming back. Arrangements have been made with the other department, and the old Military Hospitals Commission, through some of the various provinces whereby they will take care of these patients. If that man has a wife or children his pension is paid to them. If he has no wife or child, and he is entitled to a pension, that money is held, and some arrangement is made with the local government about caring for that man while he is in the hospital. There are many cases of epileptic, and possibly nervous cases, which have not reached that stage that will be discharged and go back to their own care, but if they require further medical treatment, this new medical department will look after them, but they are chiefly charged with the vocational training end of it.

10 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The explanations which have just been given by the Prime Minister and Minister of Militia and Defence do not seem to fit. The object sought—

Major General MEWBURN: I was explaining what would happen to a tubercular man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are here dealing with the creation of a department of government—the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. The explanations given by the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Militia do not agree with the object of the Bill, which is stated in clause 5.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was interrupted by a question as I was about to give an explanation.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked a question which had no reference to this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The right hon. gentleman might state the object of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: It is my fault; I plead guilty.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was merely explaining as a preliminary matter that a clear line of demarcation had been fixed between the work of the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the soldiers returned from the front, and the work of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The Department of Militia and Defence has complete control and direction of the men until they are discharged, and if it is necessary that the men receive treatment in hospitals before they are discharged, they receive that treatment in hospitals under the control and direction of the Department of Militia and Defence. While they are in those hospitals, however, they may receive instruction, vocational training and help of that kind, by arrangement between the Department of Militia and Defence and Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That would only be regarding instructors. They would be loaned?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think they would be loaned. They would be permitted to go to the hospitals, and give instruction and vocational training to men before they had been discharged. That training would be given under the direction of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The Minister of Militia and Defence has pointed out that men suffering from diseases on account of which they should be discharged immediately for prolonged treatment, will be discharged, and provision made for their treatment by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department and by the Invalided Soldiers' Commission which is attached to that department in sanatoria and in convalescent homes. But that is only a portion of the work of the department which we are now seeking to establish. In regard to men who do not require hospital treatment when they return to Canada, and who are discharged immediately, the Department of Soldiers' Re-establishment will assume the duty of seeing that those men are provided with any training and any re-education required to fit them for taking up once more their duties in civil life. And further than that the department will have the duty in connection with the authorities of the provinces, in connection with the commissions for that purpose which have been established in every province in Canada, to find employment and means of activity in the life of this country for men who have been so returned from the front. The work of this department is intimately connected with the question of demobilization. If this war should end tomorrow we would have three hundred thousand men or more to be returned to Canada. It would be quite a task to see to it that those men are provided with the opportunity in this country of earning their livelihood, or receiving training or re-education which would better fit them for that purpose.

The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is charged with the duty of solving that problem as best it may. It takes over the soldier who requires treatment in sanatoria, or convalescent homes, or asylums, takes him over and provides for him re-education or vocational training when he is able to receive it. It also takes over all those who do not receive any special care and treatment so far as their physical condition is concerned. And finally, this department, in connection with the commissions which have been established in the various provinces of Canada, is charged with the duty of re-establishing these men once more, of absorbing them into the general activities of the country and bringing about once more the conditions which prevailed before we entered upon this war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What control will this department have over the men,—I will not say soldiers because once they come back they cease to be soldiers—or what means of asserting discipline?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no control in the sense of military control.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the point I have reference to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no such control. They are absolutely free from all military discipline. So long as they are in hospitals I suppose there must be some control, but I do not know precisely how that will be worked out. But the department, the general commission that has been established, the Invalided Soldiers' Commission, and the various commissions in the several provinces of Canada, will be at the service of any man who desires vocational training or re-education, or who desires the assistance of any of these commissions in seeking such employment as he may consider himself fitted for. The department, in short, is charged with the general problem of assisting these men in re-establishing themselves once more in civil activities.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If I might make the suggestion, it would be well to avoid the fault that was committed at the time of the creation of the Military Hospitals Commission, and which resulted in an overlapping of authority, which was largely responsible for its failure.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, I think so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend will pardon me for saying that, in my judgment at all events, and I think the judgment of most of those who sit around me, the explanations which he has given are rather hazy. It is not so much my right hon. friend's fault as it is the fault of the Bill being either ill-digested or not digested at all. If the Bill means anything it means that the Government have created a department to assist men in getting re-established in civil life. It is not proposed that the men who have fought shall always remain in military life; on the contrary, we hope that as soon as possible

they will be returned to civil life, and the object of the Bill, we gather, is that a department is created for the purpose of assisting those men who return from war to take their places once more in civil life. Let me read the section of the Bill which bears upon the point:

> The minister shall have the management and control of all matters relating to the re-establishment in civil life and activities of all persons who have served in the naval or military forces of His Majesty, or any of His Majesty's Allies during the present war, and the dependents of such persons, and the administration of any statutes or of any regulations or orders enacted or made by the Governor in Council for such purpose.

What are the matters here referred to? My right hon. friend has stated that they will relate to the looking after of men who have returned diseased from the war and have to go to a hospital or a sanitorium. That has nothing to do with the establishment of a man in civil life, it is a matter of caring for the man who is diseased, or has been crippled and cannot engage in civil work at all, and who must be a charge upon the country. When I first took the Bill in hand I thought what it was proposed to do was, for example, to seek to help a man who wanted to go into farming, or something of that kind. The object of the Bill may be all right, what is intended may be good, but it seems to me we should have before us a concrete plan of what this department intends to carry out. The whole thing is very hazy, we are left in the dark, and the explanations are very meagre and cannot be otherwise until the Government has arrived at a well considered plan as to what it proposes to do in order to restore the returned soldier to civil life. Perhaps the returned soldier may be without any occupation, or, perhaps, he cannot return to the occupation he formerly followed for some reason or another. In that case the Government should have ready a concrete plan under which they could say: We propose to do this or do that to assist the man into this or that occupation. Certainly there is nothing in the explanations which have been given, or in the Bill itself, which indicates what the Government are going to do. It may be that the department itself should initiate some plan, but at the present time, it seems to me—I speak with all due deference, and not in critical terms, because the object contemplated may be a very good one—we should have more information than we have at the present time to justify the creation of such a department. After the American Civil War in 1865, nearly one million men, perhaps over that number, went back into civil life without any effort at all. Those who were disabled were given a pension, and those who were able to earn their own living with brain or brawn were simply discharged and absorbed in a very short time into civil life. Perhaps it is advisable that the men here should be aided in returning into civil life, but I warn my right hon. friend, and not in any carping manner, that if this Bill establishes a department to assist returned men to go back again into civil life he is preparing for himself a crop of applications which will, perhaps, be very embarrassing. I would rather trust the manhood of the man, if he comes back sound in limb and body, to find his own way into civil life, than depend for that upon the assistance of a paternal government. I would urge my right hon. friend, if he will permit me to say so, to think very seriously before he undertakes to hold out hopes of that kind to the men who come back, but rather to trust to their manhood as far as possible. If they are crippled or disabled then, of course, the country must take care of them, but if they come back sound in body and limb, we had better leave them to their own exertions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There might be some force in what my right hon. friend has observed if these men were coming back sound in limb and body, and, further than that, possessing the capacity for continuous work which they had before they went overseas. But I may tell my right hon. friend—and I think he will realize it—that this is not such a war as ever was in the world before, and even when men do come back apparently sound in body and in limb in every way, I venture to believe that they will require some aid and guidance before they can once more take up their work in the civil life of this country as they had taken it up before they went overseas. I know of what I am speaking from absolute experience among some of these men. No one of us can realize the effect upon a man's temperament and nervous system of two years in that awful warfare at the front. It has a very serious effect sometimes. But, apart from all that, there are thousands and tens of thousands who will not come back sound in body and limb. Some of them are coming back, unfortunately, blinded, some maimed with the loss of an arm or of a leg, or the loss of both arms or both legs. Is it not desirable that we should give these men some assistance so that they can continue, after they return to Canada, to have an interest in

life and to feel that they are performing some honourable service in the ordinary life of the country? I venture to think that we would be derelict to our duty if we did not make some provision for them. The problem is a great one which has been studied in the United Kingdom during the past year very attentively, and we have given consideration to it here. I spoke to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence about this, and he agreed that it would be a cruel thing if we brought these men back and dismissed them from the army and told them to shift for themselves. We could not do it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is what is happening to lots of them already.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not happening so far as I am aware. At all events, I do know that the Military Hospitals Commission and the various commissions which have been established in the several provinces, have been doing a very creditable work in that regard, and I have been trying to keep in very close touch with it. It is valuable and wise work. It may be that, in some cases, men have been overlooked. If so, I am sorry for it. This new department has been created with the general problem placed before it, and one of the duties of the minister at the head of that department will be to consider and to submit to the Government the methods by which he will proceed to carry out what I venture to believe will be regarded by the people of this country as a proper and a necessary purpose. We have not the concrete proposals to submit to the House this evening because the minister has not yet been able to give that study and attention to the general problem which will be absolutely necessary before any matured scheme could be submitted to the Government or presented to Parliament. So we are asking the authority of Parliament for the constitution of this department, realizing, as we do, that a very serious task is imposed upon it and that it will have great scope for usefulness in the immediate future. For these men are coming back in considerable numbers now, and when the war is over we shall have the problem immediately placed upon this department of undertaking work of this character for three or four hundred thousand men as rapidly as they can be returned from overseas.

Sir SAM HUGHES: When the Liberal party came into power in 1896, times were not good in Canada. I may be pardoned for bringing in the name of a gentleman to whom I attribute the good times which followed. It was the Hon. Sir Clifford Sifton who foresaw the opening up of the Northwest and the bringing in of settlers from the United States. That made good times in this country. And without entering into that discussion any further, I have observed that fact very closely, having been engaged in the development of the Northwest two years before the Liberal party came into power, and having been instrumental in directing the attention of that gentleman and his Government to the prospects in the Northwest. In short, the opening up of the Northwest made Canada prosperous for many years after 1896.

Mr. BUREAU: And it made Sifton rich.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was speaking to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) a few minutes ago—and let me suggest here, that, from my point of view, that department can utilize from two hundred and fifty to three hundred thousand men directly and indirectly as soon as they return from the war and millions more who may choose to come in afterwards. That department is required and there is work for it to do now. I think the money we are voting for it will be well spent money. Some one objected to it, but the appropriation should be made. I am satisfied that the whole Northwest of Canada should be surveyed from the viewpoint of drainage, for the provision of main arteries of wagon roads and of railroads. New territories are there only awaiting development, waiting for settlers to come in, and many of these settlers will come from the United States; others with a little money will come from other places, and they will start their homes. They will require furniture, hardware, farming implements, and in order to put up their homes and out-buildings they will require lumber and other building materials. This will bring about a repetition of what occurred from 1896 onwards under the administration of the leader of the Opposition. The consequent stimulation of trade will make eastern Canada feel good, and bring about most harmonious relations between the East and the West. I am satisfied that we would not have any trouble at all in absorbing the great bulk of our returned men. But I can see that there is still room for the work of a commission of this kind to help those who are not in as independent a position as others, and to assist in opening up for those some new avenue of life. I look with great faith and interest to the new Department of Immigration and Colonization to help to ab-

sorb the soldiers on their return, provided there is preparation made in advance for the work they have to do. Millions of acres could be reclaimed by drainage, and tens of thousands of men could be employed in drainage and road building, as well as in the construction of new railroads; and the Government must, to my mind, see to it in advance that these things are done so that when the boys come back they will find avenues of work.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the hon. gentleman any idea, or any warrant for the idea, as to what percentage of the soldiers who return from the front will be suitable for farmers and what percentage will be likely to go into farming?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have no conception. I was not thinking of farming alone, for the farmers may come from any place. Any one familiar with the development of the Northwest knows that in every six miles of settled country there are stores, blacksmith shops, employing men, churches requiring ministers,—

Mr. BUREAU: And Orange lodges.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, thank goodness, Orange lodges, which give men employment in building them. Often the men work as carpenters or at other trades, and in the evening they attend to their adjoining homesteads. In some cases their wives remain on the farms while they step into the towns to carry on their particular work. Thus one development brings on another; the farms and the towns are built up and in that way a development of the whole country is brought about.

Mr. WIGMORE: I look upon this as one of the most important measures that was ever brought before the House. It is only another evidence that the Government intend to carry out their promise to the boys who went overseas. In the constituency which I represent cases have come under my observation of men who, having returned from the front, have been discharged and allowed to drift about, seeking employment here and there, and in many cases not getting it. Those suffering from tuberculosis; those who are otherwise diseased; those who are unfortunate enough to have to be sent to military asylums, are being provided for in some way, while those who do not come within those categories, but are simply unable to seek employment in regular walks of life, are given three months' pay, and the Militia Department has no further interest in them. I have felt for a long time that the Government should take hold of this matter in a more serious way—and I congratulate the minister on bringing it to the attention of the Committee and giving us an opportunity of expressing our views. We have in Canada to-day a number of training camps, and it is my view that after the war, when the soldiers return from the front, instead of being given three months' pay and set adrift they should be mobilized in these camps under military discipline until they are honourably discharged, or until those who wish to employ them go to the Government and request their services. I suggest also that employers give the Government some guarantee that the positions they are offering are permanent and will afford sufficient remuneration to the employees at least to enable them to keep the wolf from the door. The returned soldier should, to say the least, be placed in as good a position as he occupied before enlistment. We owe a debt to these men, and I think we should discharge it to the full. It is not right simply to pay them off when they are unfit for further military service, and leave them on their own resources. We cannot furnish positions to all these men, but we should continue their military pay and keep them under military discipline until they are fit for service in their different walks of life.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that the intention of this Bill?

Mr. WIGMORE: The Bill does not go that far, but I would go further than the Bill does. A number of men who have returned from the front are walking the streets to-day, looking for Government positions. There are not enough of these positions to go round, and these men are criticizing the Government and the Militia Department. This condition should not exist; those of us who are at home should be sufficiently interested in the boys who have fought our battles to see that they are properly looked after.

Mr. NICKLE: I agree with the member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Wigmore), that this is one of the most important measures that have come before the House this year, and probably quite as important as any that will come before the House. I agree with him also that this Bill has not gone far enough, but I view it from a different angle altogether from that from which he regards it. He takes the position that the returned man should be kept in some central depot battalion under military discipline until he is discharged.

Mr. WIGMORE: I mean at the close of the war, when 300,000 or 400,000 men are brought back.

Mr. NICKLE: I misunderstood the hon. gentleman; I thought he meant at the present time. I was going to say that my point of view was diametrically opposed to his. My idea is that this Bill does not go far enough in that it does not make the line of cleavage between the soldier returning to be restored to civil life and the civilian being prepared for the work of a soldier. In my judgment, as soon as a soldier is brought back to Canada, all our energies should be directed to getting him away from what we call military discipline. There should be a cessation of accentuation of his position as a soldier, and accentuation of his duty as a citizen. I agree with the object of the Bill in making the demarcation, but when the man returns to Canada, it being reasonably clear that he never again can be a soldier, he should be taken from under military discipline and put under civil discipline. I believe no man in this House has given closer attention to the problem of the returned soldier than I have. No problem is going to be of greater difficulty of solution, or is apt to cause more heart-burning and sorrow than the position of the returned soldier in the community in the years that are to come. In speaking of the mental position of the returned soldier, I refer to the man who has been to the front; who has been under fire; who has suffered more or less from the nerve strain incidental to actual warfare. His nerve is not altogether broken; his nerves are not altogether gone. I do not know that I can describe his condition any better than a surgeon in Kingston, in one of our military hospitals, described it, when he said that the man was "susceptible to his environment." To-day we are bringing the men back to Canada, we are dividing them, if I understood the Prime Minister correctly, into two classes. One of these classes, such as the tubercular, we are turning over to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. But the ordinary man who comes back wounded, and is not tubercular or affected with a disease that makes it clear that he never again will be useful in any capacity as a military man, is put in one of the large military hospitals and there kept under military discipline. The result is that instead of developing individual initiative in your returned man and accentuating the duties of self-restraint, you continue to emphasize the military system. The man is not taught self-restraint; he is not taught personal responsibility; but it is impressed upon him, as it has been impressed upon him for months, that duty and obedience is something he owes to the man who occupies a higher rank than he does. Instead of stimulating, as I termed it a moment ago, individual initiative, you stamp still further upon him an apathy towards self-responsibility and towards the attitude of mind that makes a man realize that he is going to pay the penalty of his own mistakes, not because some superior authority is going to punish him, but because the inevitable trend of events will be to make his future action unsuccessful. It seems to me the military authorities are carrying this idea of military discipline towards the returned men to ridiculous lengths. I have never been in a military uniform; I have never had to respect what is called superior rank in the army. But when a man issues an order to men in military hospitals that they must salute a military officer, and if their physical condition is such that they are unable to give a salute in the ordinary way, they must turn their heads in the direction of such authority, I say, as a Canadian citizen, that is ridiculous. Such an order was issued a short time ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where?

Mr. NICKLE: It came to Kingston.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do you know the officer?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why did you not report him?

Mr. NICKLE: I am reporting it now. That order came through the Army Medical Service, and I think came through General Fotheringham, at least, he and I discussed it vigorously at one time. The order was that men who had returned from the front had to salute their superior officers, and if they could not give the salute in the ordinary way they had to turn their head in the direction of the officer.

Mr. McMASTER: On their pillows?

Mr. NICKLE: I am not saying that because I do not know, but I assume that it is so, because it was a hospital order. All the nurses in the Army Medical Service hospitals are lieutenants. That makes every nurse in those hospitals the superior officer of the private and the non-commissioned officer, and that carries with it that the nurse must be respected because she is

a superior officer and not because she is a nurse. If you think that is going to develop individual initiative, I do not believe it is going to do anything of the sort. Those hospitals for returned men should all be civilian. We should impress upon the returned men: You owe a duty to yourself to behave yourself. If you behave yourself you will be treated as you will be in any other hospital. A man in that way would be taught that good conduct brought good results, and that bad conduct brought bad results, not because, as I say, some superior authority impressed that on him, but as the actual reward of every day life on his own conduct.

I want to go into another matter. I feel pretty strongly on this returned soldier problem. I do not think any board of doctors who have to determine what a man's pension shall be should be superior in military rank to the man making application for a pension, and they should not be in uniform. A private or non-commissioned officer goes before a medical board to be examined as to his disability. That board has the power of determining to a very large extent what that man's financial status shall be during the rest of his life. Some of them do not approach that man as doctors to decide on his case. I am only speaking of some doctors, and in a case like that we must speak of the case of the man who cannot be heard and who is going to suffer. Some doctors approach his case as a lawyer might cross-examine a witness. They approach him from the point of view that there is an antagonism between the State and the man and not from the point of view that he is a man who has done something for his country and for whom his country wants to do all to which he is entitled. I have been told by men who have gone before these medical boards for pensions that they were asked to tell their condition, how they felt and this, that and the other thing about themselves and that when they had done so, the medical officers who were their superiors in rank said: "That is not so; we do not believe it; that is subjective." When a doctor used the word "subjective," he means: That is your point of view as to your disability, but it is not the true point of view. These men could not contradict the doctors because, according to military etiquette, they cannot contradict a superior officer. When a soldier comes before a medical board to apply for a pension, the soldier should be in mufti and the doctors should be in mufti. It should be a consultation between a medical man who is there to protect the state and a soldier who has done his duty to the state. The soldier should be absolutely at liberty to state his condition and position, but there should be no suppression of the facts and no browbeating of the man by superior authority. Their rights should be equal. That is my view.

In regard to what has been done for the returned soldier, I do not know what has been done in the other provinces, but in Ontario we are doing quite a little as the Soldiers' Aid Commission is assisting in a branch of what was the Military Hospitals work. The provincial legislature, by statute, constituted the Soldiers' Aid Commission for the express purpose of aiding and assisting the returned soldier. The central office is in the city of Toronto where there is an inspector. There is a western inspector in London and an eastern inspector at Kingston. Each of those inspectors has a subordinate officer whose duty it is to make an industrial survey of that part of the country in which they are working, so as to make themselves thoroughly conversant with the positions open in industrial work, and offices have been opened both at Kingston and at London to which the returned soldier may make application for work. The returned soldier goes there and the man in charge will learn from him what work he can do. He then tells the soldier if there is any industrial occupation open to him and he tries to bring employer and employee together. In that way very much good has been done. This is one of the problems that is going to meet us. The returned man particularly the man who has had to undergo the rigours of active service in the front line trenches, while he may appear all right, while in ordinary cases one would say he is a normal man, he really is not, he is affected in his nerves or as I put it a few moments ago, he is "susceptible." You send him to a factory and the very roar of the machinery breaks that man down and he cannot continue. Within the last year while I had the power of recommendation of those who should assist in the care of the convicts in Kingston penitentiary I suggested to the warden the names of nine or ten men who had been overseas, to act as nightkeepers in that institution. The warden co-operated most loyally with me in trying to give the men work. Of the ten men sent there there was only one man I think who lasted two months. Some of them told me they could not stand the mental strain of knowing that the clock was coming round to the hour at which they had to begin their work. All they had to do was to walk

around the grounds and buildings and see that things were all right. Some told me their nervous condition was such that they could not stand the strain and they gave up the job. What are you going to do with such a man? His brain is clear; his eye is bright, but the ordinary man does not understand his real condition. The country has to be taught to understand him and we have to devise ways and means by which the country may be taught to understand him.

I should like to advert to one point which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) brought up. He asked how many men were going to go back on the farms. My inquiries lead me to believe that very few will go back. I doubt very much if you will get ten per cent. You may get five per cent who will take up farming and stick to it. These men have had all the outdoor life—the camp life—they want. They want to go back to the cities and enjoy the comforts of everyday life. I think what we have to plan for is to see that industrial openings are as far as possible made for these men, and in working along that line I would urge on the Government that, while this is a move in the right direction, they give careful consideration to the fact that they have to go farther than the Bill has gone and take every man, when he returns to Canada and whom the militia authorities admit cannot again be a combatant, into a hospital manned by civil doctors and nursed by women in ordinary nurses' uniform, and endeavour to stimulate the sense of personal responsibility and to develop individual initiative.

Mr. WIGMORE: I am afraid that my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) misunderstood me. I meant to say that when the war is over and the troops come home they should be kept in these camps for a while instead of being turned loose. If you took two hundred thousand or three hundred thousand men and turned them loose with nothing to do, even if they were all Presbyterians, they would not turn out very well. What I meant was that they should be put in these camps under military discipline so that they may be looked after until the time arrives when they can get suitable positions throughout the Dominion.

Mr. MANION: I just wish to say a word in reply to the observations of the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in regard to the treatment and attention given these returned soldiers in military hospitals. Did I understand my hon. friend to mention the name of General Fotheringham?

[Mr. Nickle.]

Mr. NICKLE: The hon. ex-Minister of Militia and Defence asked me who had issued a certain order and I said that I thought it had come from General Fotheringham.

Mr. MANION: I have been overseas and I have seen some of the military hospitals; therefore, I may be able to give some reasons for some of the conditions referred to by the hon. member for Kingston. I have the very greatest respect for that hon. gentleman because nobody is in a better position to speak on this subject than he. I remember that during the progress of the battle of Vimy Ridge it was my duty and privilege to dress the wound of the son of the hon. member for Kingston in order that he might return to the firing line and continue the fight, which he did, displaying such gallantry and courage as to win the Military Cross. In some of the remarks which my hon. friend addressed to the committee he was not quite correct. For instance, he spoke of the discipline in military hospitals. I have had a good deal of experience in military hospitals and one of the difficult things to do in a military hospital where soldiers are being handled is to deal with them in such a way as to maintain discipline. I am saying this most respectfully to the soldier because nobody has a greater admiration for the Canadian soldiers than I have. But a certain amount of discipline is necessary in a military hospital or you will find the soldiers over-running all your orders and imposing upon you. The point that my hon. friend made in regard to soldiers being irritable is absolutely correct. A man coming back from the front, after he has been in the firing line for from seven to ten months, is exceedingly irritable although perhaps he is not conscious of it. His nervous system has been subjected to a shock that has upset him. The reason I asked about General Fotheringham was this: I happened to know General Fotheringham very well. I was a student of his fifteen or sixteen years ago in Toronto and he was then, as he is now, my friend. I knew him at the front when he was A.D.M.S. to the Second Canadian Division at the front, and I have had some dealings with him in Canada. I think that the remarks of my hon. friend were an implied charge against Dr. Fotheringham and therefore I wish to say that there is no officer, whether he be in the medical service or in the ordinary military force, who is more conscientious.

more honest, more upright or disinterested in every sense of the word than is General Fotheringham.

Mr. NICKLE: If you can discipline a hundred and fifty or two hundred soldiers suffering from tuberculosis in a civilian hospital as the Prime Minister proposes, why cannot you discipline the same number of other men without military discipline in another hospital?

Mr. MANION: I am not suggesting that military discipline should be carried to the extreme. The point I am making is that a certain amount of military discipline is necessary to get the best results in handling patients in the hospital. I am speaking from personal knowledge. I remember being in a British hospital for some time and it was in charge of a colonel who was a very lax disciplinarian. The result was that the patients were allowed to ignore the officers and it was almost impossible to handle the patients. I think every real military man—not an honorary one such as I am myself—will back me up in saying that no man, including a patient, is expected to salute any superior officer more than once in any one day. If he salutes him once that is sufficient and he does not have to turn his head and salute him the second time. That rule applies in hospitals as well as elsewhere.

An hon. MEMBER: Why should he do it at all?

Mr. MANION: In order to have discipline in military life it is necessary. A man who has never been in touch with military affairs does not realize the necessity for discipline. If you did not have discipline and if you did not have saluting in the army, you would never succeed in getting your men to go over the top and suffer the trials and dangers that are necessary. As I mentioned, yesterday was the anniversay of the battle of Vimy Ridge. The Canadians would celebrate it at the front. I did not hear it mentioned in the House by anybody; I presume it was forgotten. In fact, I had forgotten it myself.

There are no soldiers who have ever gone to the front who have shown themselves to be superior to the Canadian soldiers, and I do not think we can do anything too good to the Canadian soldier on his return from overseas. There is nothing that we can possibly do, no money, no position that we can give him, that will remunerate him for the sacrifice that he has made. Every consideration must be given him. I just offer these suggestions in justice to General Fotheringham. I would like to impress upon the committee the necessity of everybody remembering that the men, when they come back from the front, whether they belong to the ranks, or whether they are officers or non-commissioned officers, are in an irritable condition and must be given special consideration not only by this House, but by the people of the country. I would beg the House to give every consideration to these men.

Major-General MEWBURN: I entirely disagree with the remarks of the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Manion). There is no desire on the part of the military authorities to keep these men under military discipline or control for a moment longer than is absolutely necessary. If the hon. member for Kingston had ever taken an interest in military matters, or if he had ever been in uniform and in personal touch with military affairs, he would probably look at the matter through different spectacles and have a different kind of vision. I think I am quite safe in saying that every European nation, and particularly England, France, and the Allies in the United States, for many years past, have gone into this thing very carefully, and it has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that a soldier should be under a certain amount of military control until he is discharged from the army. This question of saluting and looking up to superior officers, and everything of that kind, to me is all nonsense. You would think from the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston that the officers and nursing sisters were putting themselves on a pedestal away above the soldier. I do not believe that to be the case. Saluting is not a question of paying any particular respect to the individual officer or nurse. It is the amount of respect that is shown throughout the army, not only from the man to the officer, but from the officer to the man. This matter has been very carefully considered. If my hon. friend says you should immediately get the soldier back to civil life, then why should my good civilian friends, who are sincerely and honestly, I believe, endeavouring to help in this matter, wait until the soldiers come back to Canada? Why not go to No Man's Land, and, when the soldier comes from a casualty on the battlefield, take charge of him there? Why wait until he returns to Canada? Why not look

after him from that point before he is discharged from the army?

Mr. NICKLE: Do you think that would be practicable?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, and I do not think the other proposition would be practicable.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is a question of pay. As long as he is under pay of the Militia Department, that department has the right to control him.

Major-General MEWBURN: The man is brought to England and taken to the hospital, then taken from the hospital, and brought back to Canada. All we desire to do—and it is no particular desire, I believe it is our duty and responsibility—is to look after that man up to a certain stage. If that is our duty, we must assume it and live up to it. Why bring in those various classes of men? My hon. friend was speaking of the different classes of men requiring medical treatment, who will go into a military hospital and undergo the treatment required. Working in conjunction with that hospital is the other department where the vocational training may continue as long as the man requires further medical treatment. He is under military pay. He is drawing his pay, and allowances up to the time the medical profession say he should be evacuated from that hospital, where he can no longer do himself any good. He is only taking up room that may be required for another invalid soldier. He evacuates the hospital, and then goes out on to a pension or is paid up in full as a soldier. He goes out of the hospital at the earliest possible moment, as he will not require further military treament. Then he passes into your new department, and if that man is not fit for further work in the civilian line, and requires further treatment, he will then be taken care of as a civilian. I think probably the Bill does not go far enough. I hope in future further attention will be given to this, but I am thoroughly convinced—and I speak not only from my own observation, but from the experience of Great Britain, Italy, France and the United States—that it is a mistake to make some other change, and probably make more mistakes. With reference to General Fotheringham I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). General Fotheringham has had long experience in his profession, and long military experience, and has served with great credit to himself with the Second Division at the front. I do not wish to doubt the statement of the hon. member for Kingston, but I cannot conceive any orders that may have been issued for any man to keep on saluting his superior officers and nursing sisters. If a soldier is in a hospital under discipline he will pay respect to those in charge as any other good soldier will do, and I think I am safe in saying that the majority of these men who have returned from the front would prefer to be under military care up to the time they are discharged from the army.

11 p.m.

Mr. NICKLE: I do not want the hon. Minister of Militia to put words in my mouth, and I will not let him, if I can prevent it. I do not know that I said he should keep on saluting. I used no such language. I simply said that, in my opinion, an order issued that a man in a hospital must turn his head in the direction of a superior officer, provided he was not physically able to salute in the ordinary way, was in my judgment ridiculous, and it would not make the slightest difference to me whether the ex-Minister of Militia and the present Minister of Militia thought differently, I still would think it ridiculous. I stick to my ground on that point. Those hon. members are soldiers; I am not. As the Minister of Militia says, if I had taken an active part in militia affairs, I probably would see eye to eye with them. Probably I would, because I have noticed, from the little experience I have had, that there is a singular contagion in military etiquette in regard to the exercise of authority. I made no reflection on the good intention of General Fotheringham. I made no reflection on his capacity or his medical knowledge. The ex-Minister of Militia asked me from whom that order came. I told him from whom I thought it came. Dr. Fotheringham may be right. He approaches the matter from the point of view of the soldier. When a member is asked a question in this House as to who gave a certain order and he names the man, it cannot be implied that there is anything improper in his motive. I simply say that he issued an order that, in my judgment, was not a wise order. Dr. Fotheringham thinks differently. He is responsible for the administration of the Army Medical Service, and I am responsible to my constituents. He is doing what he thinks is right; I am doing what I think is right, and we will leave the matter there.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No man in Canada, passing along the street and meeting a very

charming lady, takes off his hat with greater grace than the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. NICKLE: Not because I must.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, because the hon. gentleman must. Common courtesy would rise in rebellion in the heart of the hon. gentleman if he did not do that.

Mr. BUREAU: Because it is the weaker sex.

Sir SAM HUGHES: This question which has been brought up is rather a serious matter. I saw the account of it in the paper, and I do not know whether it is true, but if true, I think the officer should be disciplined very severely, who would so far demean himself as to treat a soldier as this officer in Kingston is said to have done. If he did so, it was some mud major, not an honorary colonel—I would guarantee that, because all the honorary colonels are gentlemen—and in place of finding fault with the soldier, they would say: "Well, old boy, how are you? Where did you get your wound? How long will you be in the hospital? When will you get out?" No decent honorary colonel would do otherwise. I saw in the paper that that mud major had brought the soldier up and tongue-thrashed him for his conduct.

Mr. BUREAU: What is a mud major?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know what he is and do not care.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked, what is a mud major.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A bum major. If the soldier knew his business, all he has to do is to write a report, reporting this officer for misconduct, and I am satisfied when the matter came before the proper authorities the officer would be the one who would get the wigging, not the poor soldier. It is not generally understood that the officer owes a salute to the soldier just as much as the soldier owes it to the officer, and as to the question of a soldier lying in his bed and turning his head to an officer as he comes along, it is perfect nonsense. No medical officer ever heard of it being done. The soldier lies there and the officer comes along and always has a kind word for him.

Mr. NICKLE: That order was issued.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Then the officer had no business to issue it.

Mr. NICKLE: We agree there.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, the proper spirit to have in all these things is to shut one's eyes to these little delinquencies. I have had men walk up to me and say "Hello, Sam, how are you, I want to have a talk with you."

The CHAIRMAN: I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to come nearer to the subject matter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And I was only too pleased to acquiesce in his request and have a good talk with him. I may say, Mr. Chairman, I am merely following the lines laid down, and I think it is very important, if we are going to get along with this Bill, that a proper understanding of discipline in this matter should be reached.

I have no hesitation in saying that the man who is going round all the time insisting upon the observance of little points of etiquette and discipline, and wanting himself to be regarded as somebody, is unfit for his job; he should treat these wounded soldiers with every courtesy and consideration. Personally, I have never met many soldiers who would not be inclined in matters of this kind to meet their officers more than half way.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS: Whether a soldier is an inmate of a soldiers' hospital, or whether a man is a civilian and an inmate of a hospital, the moment he goes within the doors of that institution he comes under discipline, and he must do so for his own good. I am very strongly of the opinion that no officer who had seen active service at the front would think of insisting on a wounded private—a man who was wearing blue badges on his sleeve to indicate that he had been wounded—saluting him. If any officer has so far forgotten himself as to insist upon a wounded soldier giving him a salute, I venture to say that officer is a man who perhaps three and a half or four years ago was in civilian life, but who upon the outbreak of the war was given a lieutenancy, and then with only a few days' interval between each stage was jumped up successively to the office of captain, major, and colonel. If you want to get persons who are in sympathy with the returned soldier to determine pensions, or promote his welfare in any other respect, by all means secure the co-operation of men who have been overseas. The man who has never been outside of Military District No. 3, or for that matter any other military district—the man who has never left the shores of Canada, no matter how kindly natured he may be—is in my judgment

absolutely unfit to deal with the question of pensions, or to sit on a medical board in connection with questions of discipline. Because, no matter how genial he may be by inclination I do not think he can have that proper sympathy for the returned soldier that an officer would have who has seen service overseas.

I believe there are plenty of offices in this country occupied by men who have never been oustide of Canada, although they are wearing uniform, men who have jumped very rapidly from one rank to the other. Such men should be relegated back to civil life and their places taken by men from overseas. If that were done, it would be most advantageous all round. I am conversant with the case of one young man who enlisted five days after war was declared, went overseas with the First Contingent and served twenty-six months in France. He had graduated at the Toronto Veterinary College and did good work in France, but came back a broken man and unfitted for further overseas service. His case came before a medical board, not one of whose members had ever been overseas, and they decided that he was unfit to return to the front. On the seventh day of a certain month—mark the day—he received notice that he was only fit for home service if anything could be found for him to do, and on the eighth day of the same month he was notified that no employment could be found for him and that he would be given his discharge. That decision had been arrived at between the seventh and the eighth day of the month, so that there was not very much time spent in ascertaining whether there was anything available for this poor fellow or not. Let me tell the Committee that in Military District No. 3 there are to-day two men acting as veterinary officers. One has been overseas, I believe, but the other was never outside of Military District No. 3. Yet both men are drawing colonel's pay. What, in the name of Heaven, the officer who was never out of the district did to entitle him to be promoted to the rank of colonel, I do not know; it certainly was not the blood that he spilt overseas. I have it on pretty good authority that there was only one sick horse to attend to last winter, out of all the horses that came under the charge of these officers in Kingston, and a year ago last winter there were only three. Yet, for such slight services we have two men drawing colonel's pay, and the man to whom I have referred, and who had served twenty-six months in France, was discharged because there was nothing for him to do. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are thousands of cases in this country of men who were formerly civilians and when the war started donned their uniform, and secured rapid promotion to the rank of major and colonel. I am always glad to hear of the promotion of any man who has gone overseas, whether he went as private or as officer, and nobody will envy his promotion after he gets there, but I do think that thousands and tens of thousands of dollars have been improperly paid out in this way; that men have been advanced in rank without sufficient justification. I refer to men who have never been outside of Canada since this war commenced, who were contented before that to strut around for twelve or fourteen days each year in camp, thrusting out their chests and exposing their gold buttons and gold lace, and all that sort of thing, and who would humbly kowtow to those placed above them in rank. Too many of this type of men have been advanced in rank with a corresponding advance in pay, and in Military District No. 3 at Kingston it has simply come to this, in my humble judgment, that we have practically got a little ring there that they say among themselves: "You boost me and I'll boost you."

In reference to returned soldiers going back on the land, you would think that with three or four hundred thousand men returning, all you had to do was to send them out on the farms and they would take their places there. A great many of the men who enlisted and went overseas came from cities; they do not know a bit more about farming than the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and he would not know which end of a horse to put the halter on if he went on to a farm. These men should not go to the farm simply because, that, theoretically, it would be a nice place to put them; they are going to exercise, the same as other people do, the right of selecting their own job. While I would like to see a great many of these men go on to farms, I don't think you are going to solve the difficulty which has to be met in that way; these men will hunt their own vocations. Some of them will go back on the farms, but a great many will look for positions in the cities and towns.

I would like to add this one word more. Whatever we do, do not be in too great a hurry to get rid of the men, and get them off our hands, when they come from overseas. We might better throw away a few million dollars in overpaying than in underpaying the men who have come back from

the front. There is one thing we cannot afford to have in Canada. When this war is over we cannot afford to have any person pointed out as one who, having served his country is neglected after he returns from overseas.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I agree with nearly every person who has spoken to-night that this is perhaps the most important Bill which will be brought before the House during this session, unless we are to have other Bills which will more clearly define the policy of the Government in regard to the aiding of men after they have come back to this country. In looking over the Bill, which purports to establish a department for the re-establishment in civil life of the returned men, I have no doubt that the exigencies of the case will make it necessary for regulations to be passed by the Council allowing the minister in charge to carry into effect whatever the policy of the Government may be. While this discussion may not come within the terms of the Bill I believe that the members of the Government will be very glad to have had this discussion to-night in order that they may gather the views of members of the Commons from various parts of the country. Personally, I have some very strong views with regard to some points. I come from a district in which a great many men have been enlisted for overseas and a district to which a great many men have returned from the front. Clause 5 of the Bill, setting out the powers of the minister, says:

> The minister shall have the management and control of all matters relating to the re-establishment in civil life and activities of all persons who have served in the naval or military forces of His Majesty or any of His Majesty's allies during the present war, and the dependents of such persons, and the administration of any statutes or of any regulations or orders enacted or made by the Governor in Council for such purpose.

This clause is broad enough to cover all those who return, and the dependents in this country of those who do not return. The first class which will be considered, no doubt, will be the dependents of the men who have been killed at the front or have come back absolutely incapacitated for the performance of any duties in civil life in this country. That class will be dealt with by the Pension Board.

I understand that a special committee is to be appointed for the consideration of the question of pensions. I wish to call attention to one or two facts. Although the Government has made generous increases in the matter of pensions, I still think that further increases can be made. When a man is killed and leaves his wife and children, the Government makes an allowance of only eight dollars for the support, maintenance and education of each child. It is beyond belief that under the present conditions any woman can possibly bring up her children as they should be brought up on such an allowance. If there is any class of people who should receive the consideration of this Government, it is the dependent children, because they are the future citizens of this country, and very great consideration should be given to them. Again, when a man is returned invalided, I have known of some pensions which have been payable at the rate of $2,50 per month. I do not believe, under any circumstances, that there can be any justification for a man found to be entitled to a pension from this country receiving so small a pension as $2.50 per month, and I think that the Government should take into consideration the fixing of a minimum pension which shall be paid, or the adoption of the old bonus system.

The next class to which we come is that of men who have been invalided home and have been confined in hospitals. Every possible means should be adopted in order that these men shall be returned to take their part in civil life, and if it is found that they cannot be returned to such a condition of health, then adequate compensation should be given them by way of pension.

The third class includes the men who return to this country and are physically fit and who wish to embark upon civil life. We must realize that the men who left this country in 1914 and in subsequent years are men who have made great sacrifice. The sacrifice which they have made is the sacrifice of opportunity. While they have been absent from their homes and their work for three or four years, others who have remained at home have made that much advance in their civil life, and in the vast majority of cases have been acquiring a competence to live upon. What should be the attitude with regard to these men when they return? The present system is that when they receive their discharge from the army they get a post-service pay of three months, which simply means that a man, after serving at the front, anywhere from four years to the close of the war, has only three months' pay on which to re-establish himself.

We know of no other provision which has been made by the Government other than the provision made by the Land Settlement Act, about which I shall speak later. I believe that if these men are to be successful in their civil life they should be retained, as

has been suggested here, under military service in so far as their pay is concerned, and that they should receive their pay, and their family should receive separation allowance for a reasonable length of time, even if that should be six months or twelve months, in order that the man himself may look around and view the opportunities which lie before him to enter voluntarily upon some civil employment for the rest of his life. You may attempt to carve out a man's future, when he is between fourteen and eighteen years of age. But when you take a man from twenty-five to forty years of age, his life is so shaped that others cannot carve out for him his future course, and I believe that the responsibility rests upon this Gov- which will be the congenial to him. the opportunity of selecting employment which will be congenial to him. In addition to that, I think the Government is to be congratulated upon the system of education which has been established in connection with the military hospitals, and it should be expanded so that the men, if they so desire, may further equip themselves upon any particular line which they choose.

Now, in regard to the men going upon the land, we have the Land Settlement Act, passed by the House, I believe, last year. But I do not think that Act is in any way a compensation for the soldier. They have the opportunity, if they are farmers, of taking up land and procuring a loan from the Government, but I understand that the man must be a skilled farmer, and must prove himself worthy of the loan, in order to procure it from the Government. In that case we are not doing much more for the soldier than the Federal and provincial governments are doing for civilians. In the provinces of British Columbia Alberta and Saskatchewan, I understand legislation is now in effect whereby they will make loans to any agriculturist on security of his land and chattels. So that the position of soldiers in the matter of land settlement does not differ materially from that of men who come to this country from any other part of the British Empire or, perhaps, from any foreign country.

I do not concur in the view expressed by the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) with regard to the matter of aid to returned soldiers. There is no doubt that the responsibility for the care of these men and their dependents after the war is over rests upon the Federal Government, and the Federal Government alone. It is not in keeping with the dignity of this young and prosperous country that charitable organizations throughout the country should be seeking subscriptions for the purpose of rendering aid to soldiers and their dependents. In the early days of the Patriotic Fund I was an ardent supporter of the voluntary system, but at that time we anticipated that the war would be of short duration and that the enlistments would be small in number. Since then hundreds of thousands of men have gone overseas, and I now believe that all funds of this kind should be financed by the Federal Government and paid out to soldiers and their dependents as a matter of recognition of services rendered, not as a gift from any class of the people. These men enlisted of their own free will; there was no bartering, no trading, no dickering on their part as to what amount they should receive for their services. They left it to the honour of the people at home to see that they were fairly dealt with on their return, and it rests with this Government to make fair and generous provision for these men and their dependents.

Mr. COPP: I am glad that the Government are taking some steps in the matter of looking after the returned soldier when he becomes incapacitated. At different times during the past three years I have approached departments of the Government in regard to these matters. I have asked the Board of Pension Commissioners that justice be done to the dependents of soldiers who had been wounded or killed overseas, and I was met always with an excuse, courteously expressed, of course, but having the effect of bringing no definite result. During last session I had occasion to approach officials of the Government with a view to getting information regarding pensions which I thought should be paid to two mothers of soldiers who had been killed at the front. I was told that while it was just and equitable that these pensions should be granted, it was impossible under the regulations to grant them. Soon after the prorogration of Parliament an election came on, and during the progress of the election, early in December, pensions were granted in respect of the two claims which I had previously brought to the attention of the Board of Pension Commissioners. It is evident, therefore, that though the regulations six or nine months previously prevented the granting of pensions in these cases, there was nothing to prevent their being granted during the early part of December. If this Bill has the effect of creating a department that will

honestly investigate all these matters and decide them equitably and thus bring an advantage to soldiers generally and their dependents, it will have my hearty and undivided support, but if it is the means of bringing about further delay, it will mean a large expenditure with very little resulting good.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Department constituted:

Mr. CANNON: Who is the minister in charge of the new department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Sir James Lougheed.

Mr. BUREAU: This Bill creates a new department and all the machinery and organization necessary for its operation. I realize the importance of this problem, and I have no objection to the Government's taking any step to facilitate the re-establishment of returned soldiers. The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) suggests to me, however, that it would be well, in this or another section of the Bill, to provide a time when this department and the machinery created for its administration shall cease to operate. My object is to have it stated that there shall be a Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for the period of time that the condition of the soldier or the war may require, so that when that time comes, whoever is in power, will not have to face a large number of civil servants in that department who will ask him to let them continue in their positions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend must realize it will be quite impossible to fix a definite time at which this department would become unnecessary and its continuance undesirable. I shall, however, recall to his mind that, in an Act which passed this House a few days ago, power was taken for the Governor in Council to amalgamate departments and also to abolish departments. Under the power which is vested in the Governor in Council by that Act, this department and other departments which have been constituted by reason of the necessities of the war, can be abolished when there is no further occasion for them.

Mr. BUREAU: I realize the position, but I want to point out the difficulty that will confront the Governor in Council as well as Parliament in abolishing a department after it has once been established, while at this particular juncture, when there will be no pressure exercised and no objection offered, we should say: This Act shall be in force for a period of twelve, or fifteen or twenty years, or longer, after the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really think it would be undesirable to fix a definite period. I would hardly assent to that. The power is vested in the Governor in Council. As I have already declared in this House, that power will be exercised as soon as that Act receives the assent of His Excellency the Governor General, by the amalgamation of the Department of Inland Revenue with the Department of Customs. In the same way, at the proper time, this department will cease to exist under a like order of the Governor in Council regarding it. It will be impossible to define the time at present. This department may have to continue in existence for half a dozen years after the war is over. We cannot foresee the conditions at present. There are in the public service at present many people who cannot be continued in the public service after the necessities of the war have ceased. I appreciate entirely what my hon. friend has said. Those are difficulties with which this Government or some future Government will have to deal, and they must be dealt with in the very best way possible with due regard for the public interest in dealing with them.

Mr. CANNON: I understand there are at present twenty-three Cabinet ministers. Am I right?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will tell the hon. gentleman who they are. There is the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Finance the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Minister of Overseas Military Forces, the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Secretary of State, the Postmaster General, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Naval Service, the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, the President of the Privy Council, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Labour. Then there is Hon. A. K. Maclean, who is Vice-Chairman of the Reconstruction and Development Committee and who is also discharging the duties of Minister of Finance during the absence of Sir Thomas White. There is Hon. Mr. Robertson, who is Chairman of the Labour Committee and Chairman also of the Registration Board. Both those gentlemen are quite as actively occupied as any of the

ministers in the duties which devolve upon them. There is also Hon. Mr. Cochrane, who is a minister without portfolio.

Mr. CANNON: This list includes twenty-two ministers, if the Hon. Mr. Maclean and the Hon. Mr. Robertson are to be considered as Cabinet ministers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are Cabinet ministers.

Mr. CANNON: But at present they have no special department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They have the duties to which I have already alluded. One of them is Vice-Chairman of the Reconstruction and Development Committee, and virtually Chairman, because the work devolves altogether upon him. The other is Chairman of the Labour Committee and Chairman of the Registration Board.

Mr. CANNON: Am I to understand that besides those ministers there are also parparliamentary secretaries?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are two parliamentary secretaries, and the Solicitor General.

Mr. CANNON: Who are they?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The parliamentary secretaries are Mr. McCurdy who is Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and Mr. Hugh Clark, who is Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of External Affairs. The Solicitor General is the Hon. Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. CANNON: According to custom in Canada, the Solicitor General is not a member of the Cabinet. Is the Solicitor General under the present ministry, a member of the Cabinet?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Solicitor General is not a member of the Privy Council, nor is either of the parliamentary secretaries.

Mr. CANNON: Judging by these answers, we have at present 22 ministers, one Solicitor General and two parliamentary secretaries, making in all 25 ministers, and as I might call them, assistant ministers. At a time when we are all speaking of economy, I would suggest that it might be possible for the Government, instead of appointing a minister to administer this department, to pass the work over to another minister whose department is not working as hard on account of the war. I see, for instance, that there is in the Cabinet a Minister of Immigration. Immigration, at present, is absolutely nil. There is a little immigration from the United States, but the work of the department is in no way large enough to occupy the ability and energy of the minister. Why not utilize his energies and abilities in the administration of this new department? We would save money by doing so. The country would not have to pay the salary of one minister, and I am quite sure the work the Minister of Immigration would do in this department would be satisfactory.

Instead of putting the very important question of the civil re-establishment of soldiers in the hands of a minister who, unfortunately, in most cases is a politician, why not put it into the hands of a commission? The Prime Minister has, I understand, had a special preference for forming commissions since he became Premier of this country. The hour is late. I do not ask the Prime Minister to tell me the number of commissions he has formed since 1911, as the number is very considerable. I would not even ask the Prime Minister why all these commissions have been formed and what they have done. But I think that this is a case where one should be formed instead of entrusting this responsibility to a minister or a department. These soldiers are coming back from the war; I agree with all the remarks which have been made on both sides of this House, that they deserve the best treatment possible. Is there not a danger that if this civil establishment is left in the hands of a minister and a politician, you will have a certain amount of patronage? When the Union Government was formed it was to have many effects, but it had one effect, and a good effect, if we are to believe the newspapers. That is the effect of abolishing patronage. How long will this Government keep to its attitude as regards patronage? I do not know, but I hope patronage is abolished never to return. But when Union ceases because—after all, Union is not to be eternal—

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. CANNON: If it is to be eternal the ideas of some of our friends on the other side will have to change, because we have been watching since the session opened and we have seen certain signs of a lack of cohesion in the ranks of the Government supporters. But supposing Union ceases, we will have in this country either a Liberal or a Tory Government. If it is a Liberal Government there is nothing to fear as to how the soldiers will be treated. If it is a Tory Government, I hope everything will be

all right, but I am not so sure of it as I would be with a Liberal Government. In either case we will have patronage and under those circumstances ought a question like this to be left in the hands of a politician? I say no.

This same question has been submitted to parliaments before. The question of the civil re-establishment of soldiers has arisen in other countries. If you will refer to the history of France after Napoleon's wars you will see that the question was up before the Parliament of France. It was a very serious question. What were the French people to do with those soldiers who had fought for twenty years under the Emperor in every part of Europe and who had won glory for their country? These soldiers were handled by the Government as the Government thought best, and the consequences were very bad for the country. The soldiers were disbanded too quickly. They had acquired an adventurous spirit and it was hard to get them to return to the habits of civil life. That is a danger that we will have to avoid in Canada. What means will be taken we do not know, the Bill does not mention them. As to the evils of patronage in connection with the civil re-establishment of soldiers, the best example we have is what happened in the United States after the Civil War. Any man that would support a Republican thought he was entitled to a pension and he sometimes got it even though he had not fought at all in the war. After the Civil War had been finished for over forty years the number of people who were receiving pensions from the government was far greater than the number of soldiers who actually fought in the war. Is this going to happen in Canada? If it is what amount of money will be spent? Where will we stop? What guarantee have we as long as a politician is administering affairs in connection with the civil re-establishment of soldiers?

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman calls them politicians; the members of the Union Government are statesmen.

Mr. CANNON: I suppose that if we have statesmen everything will be all right, but how long will it last? I submit that this Bill, the principle of which is very good, the principle of which I approve of, ought to be amended in such a way that instead of establishing a new department, we shall have a commission composed of independent men, composed, for instance, of soldiers who have gone to the front, composed of business men, composed of men who can give justice without any regard to the political preferences of the people who apply to them for justice. What has happened since the war started? Soldiers who have gone to the front, soldiers who have done their duty, because they did not belong to the right side of politics, have been unable to obtain justice from the Government in some cases. I understand that since the Government has changed and has been improved by the fact that some Liberals have entered it, conditions have altered. But, we have no guarantee for the future.

I heard the Prime Minister say that this Bill was introduced because the Government realized that we were at war and that we had to do something for the returned soldiers. We all agree, but how it is that it took the Government four years to realize this? We have been at war since 1914, we are now in the year 1918, and it took four years for the Government to realize this. I believe the real reason is that some friends of the Government needed portfolios, that they had to be given portfolios on the fifty-fifty basis which the papers mention, with the result that instead of having a commission of impartial men in whom the people would have full confidence we have now a department the portfolio of which will be given to some politician, either Liberal or Tory Unionist. Mr. Chairman, before finishing these remarks, I wish to say that I am willing to give every support possible to the Government in helping the returned soldiers but I sincerely hope that politics will have nothing to do with the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Cannon). He seems to think that the late Government, myself particularly, appointed too many commissions during the past six and a half years, and yet he desires me to heap another sin on my head by appointing another commission. The observations of my hon. friend do not seem very logical in that respect. I leave it at that. As far as the duties of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization are concerned, I can only say to my hon. friend—if he will permit me to say it with all respect—if he were discharging the duties and carrying on the work which the minister is carrying on at the present time, he would find himself very much busier than ever he has been during his entire life. As far as the appointment of a politician is concerned, we have taken that matter into account and we have appointed a gentleman who is not a politi-

cian. My hon. friend has not been long enough in parliament to realize that in the pure and serene and happy atmosphere of the Senate there are no politicians at all, and it was for that reason that we selected Sir James Lougheed, who has been a minister without portfolio for six years before he assumed this post and who, during that time has given, without salary or remuneration, very effective and valuable service to the people of this country in many ways. My hon. friend also observed that we had waited for four years. We have not waited four years, because it is less than three years since the soldiers commenced to come back from the front—probably not much more than two years. They have not been coming back in great numbers until recently, but now they will be coming back in much larger numbers, and it seems desirable that this department should be established, in order that desirable safeguards and measures that are eminently necessary might be adopted and carried out.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Duties.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I desire to move that clause five of the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"Provided, however, that nothing in this Act shall be deemed in any way to affect the powers or duties of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada."

I do not think there is anything in the Act which would affect these powers and duties, but that board was appointed under the report of the special committee, approved by Parliament and afterwards carried into effect by Order in Council. It is desirable that the independent status should be maintained. It is probable that the board will report to the Minister of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Hitherto, it has reported wherever there was occasion to report, to the Minister of Finance who has desired more than once to be relieved from giving attention to such matters for the reason that his other duties and responsibilities are sufficiently onerous.

12 p.m.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I notice on reading Clause 5, the following:

The minister shall have the management and control of all matters relating to the re-establishment in civil life and activities of all persons who have served in the naval or military forces of His Majesty or any of His Majesty's allies during the present war.

Would it not be preferable to limit it to those who resided in Canada before the war?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand the point my hon. friend mentions, but it was thought it should apply to any soldiers who served in the Allied armies and came to this country, and that we should endeavour to assist them with vocational training and re-education and otherwise, so that they might be assisted, so far as they needed assistance, to take their part in the ordinary activities of our national life. That is assuming they came here to take up permanent residence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was a member of the Returned Soldiers Committee last year. I listened to the evidence which was presented to that committee and took part in the framing of the resolution which was adopted, and that principle was consecrated. Soldiers belonging to another nationality, but fighting with the allied nations should be treated on a footing of equality with our own men. The safe principle was embodied in the resolution introduced last year by the Minister of the Interior as regards the land in the West. It seems to me the principle is a good one.

Mr. STACEY: I have the honour to come from a province which, I believe, contributed by voluntary enlistment about one-tenth of the entire population. A very large number of those men, I am not prepared to say how many, are from the rank of what we call in British Columbia small farmers. They were on what we call ranches. A great many of those who are returning are looking forward to resuming civil life on some such plan as existed when they left, and I venture to suggest to the Government the advisability of making some special provision for them which, if I understand the Land Settlement Act correctly, is not made in that Act. We have in the province of British Columbia a great many thousand acres of the richest land in Canada, which is at present practically unoccupied. While theoretically and absolutely held by the Dominion Government, or held by some of the natives of that country, the land is wasted, has never been used, and in all probability never will be used. It might be well at this juncture, if consideration were given to the advisability of satisfying the Indian claims, and so arranging matters that these men could be placed upon small holdings of say 10 or 20 acres, so that they could resume the occupation which they left upon entering military service. I am safe in saying that if consideration could be given to a plan of this kind, which I have only barely outlined, it would meet with the approval of a

great number of people who have gone from that province to the front. Many of them would like to return, but the conditions are such that, unless some special arrangement is made, they will not be able to do so. If they could go back there they would be very valuable contributors to the welfare of the province. Referring to a suggestion that has been made, I am satisfied this House realizes that it would be next thing to criminal to compel our men, during the life of this generation, to go away back in the northern country far removed from all society—I mean society in a good sense—and from all social surrounding on the contrary. If we can keep these men near to us with the idea of community life, it would be very vital to their comfort and to the wellbeing of the community as a whole.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The observations which the hon. member for Westminster District (Mr. Stacey) has placed before the Committee are well worthy of consideration and they will receive it; I shall commend them to the attention of the minister. As far as the Indian claims in British Columbia are concerned, my hon. friend doubtless realizes that the Indians of that province have pretty comprehensive claims. As to what those claims are, and whether or not anything can be worked out along that line I am not prepared to say at the moment.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Previous action confirmed.

Mr. POWER: May I ask the Prime Minister if the Board of Demobilization will come under the jurisdiction of this new department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. The Board of Demobilization, so far as I understand, is under the Department of Militia and Defence. It deals with matters which are to be considered in connection with the discharge of the soldiers, their transportation from overseas, and the order in which they come. There are a great many considerations of that kind, which my hon. friend will appreciate as well as any hon. gentleman in this House, which must be taken into account. But those matters are naturally under the Department of Militia and Defence. So far as measures are to be taken overseas, they would come under the attention of the Minister of the Overseas Service.

Mr. POWER: Then this department will have no jurisdiction whatsoever overseas?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. It deals altogether with matters in Canada.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first and second times and concurred in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is there any objection to taking the third reading now?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would prefer, in accordance with the wishes of the leader of the Opposition, that the Bill should stand.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 12.10 a. m. (Thursday.)

Thursday, April 11, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE BILL.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Naval Service) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 49, respecting the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: The object of this Bill is to provide that the discipline on the ships of the Canadian Navy shall be similar to that of the Imperial Navy and the Australian or New Zealand Navies.

In 1911 when the Canadian and Australian Navies were being formed the Imperial Parliament passed the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911.

The Act declares that any dominion having adopted the Naval Discipline Act, references therein to H. M. Navy and H. M. Ships are to have effect as including the naval forces and ships raised by the Dominion.

The Act is intended to give effect to the agreement arrived at by the Imperial Conference with respect to the government and discipline of the naval forces of the self-governing dominions and their relations to the Royal Navy and to one another, namely, that there should be power by mutual agreement between the Home Government and the Dominion Government, and between one dominion government and another, to provide that the fleets and ships of the Royal Navy and of the dominion navy, and of one dominion navy and another dominion navy, when co-operating together, should be treated, so far as discipline is concerned, as belonging to the

same service, so that an officer of one such force could be treated as a superior officer in relation to an officer of another such force and could assume command over the ships belonging to such other force, and that for the purposes of court-martial officers could be taken indiscriminately from both or all such forces. The Act, however, provided that its provisions should not come into force with regard to the naval forces of any dominion until that dominion had adopted the Act by legislaion.

The Act was applied to Australia on the 12th August, 1913, and to New Zealand on the 16th July, 1914.

The Canadian Naval Forces having, since the outbreak of war, greatly grown, it becomes increasingly difficult to provide the necessary disciplinary measures.

It is almost impossible to form a court martial for the trial of offenders under the Naval Discipline Act, owing to the lack of Canadian officers of sufficient seniority. On the other hand, Imperial officers cannot sit on a Canadian court martial, as the above mentioned Act has not been adopted by Canada.

The passage of the Bill, a copy of which is attached, will place the Imperial and Canadian navies on an equal footing as regards disciplinary measures, and will have the effect of making officers and men interchangeable in the two navies. It will also provide that officers of both services will use a common form of commission, which is not the case at present. I shall be very glad to give further details when we are in Committee of the Whole.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to enter into any controversy, but would my hon. friend state if, when he speaks of the Imperial Conference, he has reference to the Imperial Conference of 1911?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: My remarks do refer to the Conference of 1911.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by astericks.)

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, VACANCIES ON TRIBUNALS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Is it the policy of the Government to fill vacancies on Tribunals, under The Military Service Act, with men opposed to the Government and to compulsory military service?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

2. Is it the policy of the Government to appoint as agricultural representatives on the Leave-of-Absence Boards in the Province of Ontario, representatives opposed to the Government and to compulsory military service?

3. If not, on whose recommendation are they appointed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to the first question: The method of filling vacancies on tribunals is determined by the Military Service Act. In reply to the second and third questions: The only policy followed by the Government is to appoint those persons who, having regard to the public interest, are most suitable for the duties to be performed and most capable of performing them.

POLICE INSPECTOR M. D. No. 4.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Who is the Dominion Police Inspector of Military District No. 4, whose office is in the Drummond Building, Montreal?

2. What salary is he paid?

3. What are his duties, executive power and prerogatives?

4. How many subordinates has he got, and what salary or remuneration is paid to each of them?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. J. A. Belanger.

2. $200 per month.

3. He is in charge of Dominion Police in Military District No. 4, under direction of Police Commissioner Kerr.

4. 129; 4 inspectors at $150 per month; 16 sergeants at $4 per day; 109 constables and investigators at $3 per day.

LOBSTER INDUSTRY.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysboro):

With reference to the announcement by the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the Government has decided to discontinue the propagation of lobsters by hatcheries and sell the equipment, has the Government any alternative policy for the preservation of this industry? If so, what it it?

Hon Mr. BALLANTYNE:

After exhaustive study and investigation the conclusion has been reached that the artificial propagation of lobsters by means of hatcheries has been of little or no value in the preservation of the fishery. In lieu thereof attention has been directed:—

1. To the adoption of a system of technical education for the fishermen, which will include study in the life, history and habits of the lobster and the necessity of preserving lobster life at its critical stages. Under the direction of the department original research has been conducted by Dr. Knight

and others, and much valuable information has been secured. These investigations are being continued.

2. To the prohibition of the taking of immature lobsters, regulations for which have already been adopted for that portion of the Atlantic coast westward from St. George's island, Halifax harbour, to and including the waters of the counties of Albert, Charlotte and St. John, N.B.

3. To increased efficiency in the enforcement of the existing regulations prohibiting fishing during the close seasons, and the protection of the mother lobsters. Considerable improvement has been effected in the past few years in this respect, and the better class of fishermen are co-operating with the department to overcome illegal fishing.

MR. W. C. REAN.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is Mr. W. C. Rean employed in the Privy Council Office or in some other branch of the Government?
2. If so, was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission after competitive examination?
3. What was the date of his appointment, what are his duties, and what salary does he receive?
4. What were his occupation, duties and salary immediately prior to his appointment in the service of the Dominion Government?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.
2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Mr. VIEN:

1. Has the Government paid any money in the past to an organization called Canadian Press?
2. If so, how much per year, and for the last five years?
3. To what person or persons was the payment made?
4. Is the organization a body politic? If so, how was it created?
5. Who are the officials and the members of same?
6. Has the Government any control on the appointment of officers?
7. Does the Government receive any report detailing the expenditure of the subsidy?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. It is presumed this question relates to what is known as Canadian Associated Press and the answer to question 1 is: Yes.

2. Fiscal year 1913-14, $8,500; 1914-15, $5,250; 1915-16, $5,000; 1916-17, $800; 1917-18, $7,999.98.

3. John Ross Robertson, president.

4. Incorporated under the Dominion Companies Act, January 16, 1904.

5. John Ross Robertson, president, A. T. Chadwick, secretary. The membership is made up of the subscribing newspapers.

6. No.

7. Yes.

FLAKE GRAPHITE.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What was the total production of flake graphite in Canada, during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1918?
2. What was the total amount exported from Canada during said fiscal year?
3. What was the total quantity imported into Canada during said fiscal year, and what was the gross value of the quantities exported and imported, respectively?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. The Department of Customs has no information.

2. Flake graphite is not separately enumerated in customs returns, but is included in the item, "Manufactures of Plumbago." The exports of "Manufactures of Plumbago" during the said fiscal year were valued at $372,410. The quantity is not stated in the returns.

3. Imports of flake graphite are included in the item "Plumbago, ground, and manufactures of." The imports of manufactures of plumbago during the said fiscal year were valued at $112,849. The quantity is not stated in the returns.

DIAMONDS AND PRECIOUS STONES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit the importation of diamonds and precious stones?
2. If so, at what date will measures prohibiting said importations come into effect?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Any necessary announcement in regard to these matters will be made in due course.

MILITARY HOSPITAL LAVAL No. 6.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Military Hospital Laval No. 6 still under the control of the Canadian Government?
2. If so, where is the said hospital actually stationed?
3. Who are the officials of the said hospital?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. This hospital was loaned originally to the French Government by the Canadian Government, and it is understood that this arrangement is still in force.

2 and 3. This information is not available in the Department of Militia and Defence, but a letter has been written to the Overseas Ministry asking for the same.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to investigate war trade conditions in the United States?
2. Apart from Members of the Cabinet, have any parties been sent by the Canadian Government on missions respecting war trade conditions in the United States? If so, what are the names of those who have been sent?
3. If any such parties have been sent, what is the total expense to the Government of such missions?

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Referring to Canada Gazette statement of March 30th giving particulars as to circulation and specie, against what approved securities were Dominion notes issued to the value of $92,820,000?
2. To what banks were these notes issued, and what was the respective security in each case?

PRIVILEGE—MR. MANION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday I referred to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and said that during the battle of Vimy Ridge I had the privilege of dressing the wounds of his son. Unrevised Hansard quotes me as saying:

In order that he might return to the firing line and continue the fight, although he did not do so.

What I did say was: "And he did so," meaning that he did return to the firing line after being wounded. And I might say that this gallant young gentleman received the Military Cross for his bravery in that battle.

THE VICTORY LOAN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I notice in looking over the reports of the sitting of yesterday that no mention was made of the manner in which the Victory Loan of $300,000,000 was made, and how effected. I made a motion in that respect as far back as the 20th March last. I shall expect that information to be brought down to the House before the Bill is proceeded with.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When was the motion made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the 20th March or thereabouts.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

IMPRISONMENT OF RETURNED SOLDIER FOR NON-EMPLOYMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to a news item which appeared in this morning's Citizen. It appears that at one of the criminal assizes held in Ontario—I forget at what place—the grand jurors, in their visit to the jail, found that a returned soldier was being held at the jail because he had found no employment. I will send the paper over to my hon. friend; I hope that he will remedy this grievance.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have seen no such report, and I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will send me the paper.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

ALLEGED ORGANIZATION OF DESERTERS AND DRAFTEES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains): I should like to bring to the attention of the Government a very important matter which, I think, should be promptly dealt with. I read in this morning's Citizen the following:

Band of Deserters Flying "Red" Flag, Defy Authorities.

Draftees and Germans Are Fortified in District Along the Petawawa River—Threaten to Die First.

Daring the minions of the law, both civil and military, to come on and take them a band of young men, two of them deserters from the army and the others alien enemies and draft evaders have formed a Bolsheviki soviet of their own in a lonely spot 20 miles out of Pembroke, and the neighborhood is greatly excited over it.

This happened, therefore, in Ontario.

Reports which came through from Pembroke last night to The Citizen give only fragmentary details of this extraordinary incident, but it is enough to make one marvel at the extent some young men are prepared to go to get out of serving their country.

Whether Jimmy and Cahill Coughey, two young men of Pembroke—

Deserters from Kingston headquarters.

—are the self-constituted leaders of the strange band is hard to determine, but these two fellows are deserters from the army and both the civil and military police have been after them for some time. They have been in parts unknown for several months now along with other men whose services are required in the army and also some German residents of the district, whom the police have to keep their eye on, and it was not until last week that a hint as to their whereabouts was received in Pembroke.

It filtered into the ear of Chief of Police Carroll on Friday last that he would find the fellows he was looking for camping on the banks of the Petawawa river in a very lonely place, some 20 miles from the town.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member does not intend to read the whole of the article.

Mr. ETHIER: No, I simply wish to finish my remarks—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. In my judgment this matter is not one of sufficient urgency to permit the hon. member to take the time of the House on the Orders of the Day. In any event, questions of this kind, which are not of urgency, should go on the Order Paper in the usual course.

Mr. ETHIER: I will leave to the Government the reading of the article from which I was quoting. I wished to bring this matter to the attention of the Government, and to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware of these facts, and if so, what steps he has taken. If he is not aware of them, does he intend to make an inquiry into the matter? Perhaps it would be a good opportunity for the Government to send Quebec troops there.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: Would I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in giving a short explanation of this report?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would not be in order. The question is one which should be asked in the ordinary course; it cannot be permitted to give rise to a debate or discussion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had no information on this subject until I noticed the item in this morning's paper. The attention of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Militia will be directed to the matter and the hon. gentleman may rest assured that if the facts are as stated, effective measures will be taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. W. F. O'CONNOR, K.C.

RESIGNATION OF COST OF LIVING COMMISSIONER IN DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton): I wish to ask the Government whether Mr. W. F. O'Connor, of the Cost of Living Branch of the Department of Labour, has resigned, and if so, what reasons are given for his resignation.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I think my hon. friend's question can be best and most briefly answered by simply reading Mr. O'Connor's resignation and my reply thereto. The resignation is in these words:

Ottawa, April 4, 1918.

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

I hereby resign as your commissioner and examiner, under Order in Council re cost of living, of November, 1916. The resignation takes effect immediately. My reason is that I have failed to secure from you that support in the administration of the duties committed to me, to which support I have conceived myself entitled, and without which I cannot possibly further carry out with effect, such duties.

I thank you for unfailing support until this occasion. If I did not deem the situation one which demands the action which I am taking, I would remember such unfailing support as a reason for overlooking your one failure, but I know that if the course upon which you have entered is persisted in, and if insubordinate employees may go over my head to yours, there will be an end to all discipline, and all effective work, so I respectfully retire from under.

Yours very respectfully,
(Sgd) W. F. O'Connor.

To which I replied the next day as follows:

Ottawa, April 5, 1918.

Dear Mr. O'Connor,

I have your resignation of the position you had in the Cost of Living branch in the Department of Labour—'to take effect immediately'—together with the reason assigned for the course you have taken. Your attitude in the matter does not commend itself to me, and if such is necessary, I at once relieve you from further duty in the Department.

The facts are few and simple. A little friction having arisen in that branch, involving a few clerks, one of them asked me to look into the matter, which I promised to do. Having apparently heard of that promise—

I recollect now that I spoke to Mr. O'Connor about it myself. (Reading):

—you wrote me advising among other things, that I should not trouble myself respecting the matter. The next morning I had a talk with you about it, when it appeared that you had no personal knowledge concerning it. I then saw your assistant, who also stated that he was not personally familiar with the circumstances causing the friction, but had learnt them from the officer immediately in charge of the clerk in question. I then asked him to request her to come to see me, but instead of her coming, in a few minutes you came in to see me, considerably excited, when you said, in substance, that if I pursued the inquiry further, you and they would resign, to which I replied that you were at perfect liberty to do so.

The simple question is whether a minister at the dictation of a superior officer of his department, is to refuse to make a personal inquiry at the request of a clerk who alleges unfair treatment. I have never refused, nor shall I refuse, to hear the humblest clerk in the

department who feels that he or she (in this case a young woman apparently exemplary in conduct and character) has been unfairly treated. However, you have chosen your course, which you had a right to take, and to which I have no right to object.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd) T. W. Crothers.

I think that answers my hon. friend's question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was there any reply by Mr. O'Connor?

Mr. CROTHERS: There was a reply some days afterwards, after the whole thing was over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think, in fairness, we are entitled to the whole of that correspondence.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think so.

SOLDIERS CIVIL REESTABLISHMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 12, respecting the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, was read the third time.

GOLD AND SILVER MARKING ACT, 1913, AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913, and to provide that an official certificate by any Dominion Government Assay Office in Canada that any article to which the Act applies has been assayed shall be prima facie evidence of the ingredients and quantities stated to be contained in the article, and that the certificate shall be receivable in all legal proceedings under the Act as evidence of the facts set forth therein.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the minister kindly explain the resolution?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The resolution really explains itself. As the Act stands at present, the certificate of the Dominion Assay Office at Ottawa fulfils the duties that are set out in the resolution. This is to make it so that any other Dominion Assay Office can give a certificate which will have equal force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the minister explain the reason why that should be done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reason is this: Supposing the Silver Marking Act director is in British Columbia and matters come up with reference to the violation of the law. There is a Dominion Assay office in British Columbia. As the Act is now, he would have to send the material to be analysed to the Assay Office at Ottawa. This is simply to make the certificate of the Dominion Assay Office in British Columbia of equal force in that regard as the Dominion Assay Office at the Mint here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That seems to be reasonable.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is all there is to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suppose the officials of the mint concur in the amendment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 50, to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The House again in committee on Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Women to be entitled to vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill has already been read, amended and reprinted. It was distributed last Monday as reprinted.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER: I presume it is now in order for me to discuss the merits of this Bill. This Bill, with respect to woman suffrage, which is now under our consideration, is only one of the forms of feminism which are now spreading throughout the world. The question may be asked whether all the laws which have opened the liberal professions to women and which have conferred upon them the right to vote, or to be elected to Parliament, have had any beneficial results on the progress of civilization, or have advanced the happiness of humanity. It is our urgent duty as law-makers to examine this Bill with the greatest care, and not to accept as necessary a radical reform, the advantages of which have not been clearly demonstrated. I for one say that it will be a great error if, on the pretext of giving a transitory liberty to a class, we should bring down women from their throne at the fireside, where natural law has placed them to fulfil a divine mission. If the consequences of this movement to take women

from the home and to lead them into the public arena where men are disputing great questions, are good, it is evident that we must vote in favour of this Bill; but if, on the other hand, it can be proved that those consequences would be evil for the country and regrettable for the home, it is our duty to vote against it.

For my part, I deplore this movement. The work of woman, her true realm, is nowhere but in the home, and this I say not only for the woman who already possesses a home, for the mother of a family, but for the woman who has no home.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. member consider that he has a right to speak for women?

Mr. FORTIER: Certainly; the Prime Minister said that we could discuss the merits of this question when the Bill was in committee. A woman who has no home will always be able to exert her energies for the betterment of those who suffer, and we all know that there are not lacking homes where distress and desolation reign supreme. I know of more than one home which is thus visited by good women who spend their leisure hours in helping their afflicted sisters. These good women really have a civilizing influence in these homes of misery. They are not satisfied with healing the wounds of the heart and of the soul, but by their example they raise the moral level of these fallen homes. It is therefore in the home, in that which she has found herself, to which she has brought consolation and enlightment, that woman accomplishes with a royal majesty the work which Providence has designed for her.

Natural law confides to men and to women a mission where the efforts of both are required towards the accomplishment of a great work. The work itself is varied, and each consort has a particular part to play in relation to the other. Nothing but confusion would follow if one did that part of the work which is allotted to the other, or both were to do the same work. Let me illustrate by the case of a woman who is forced by circumstances to earn the living for her familly which should be provided by the husband. The first unhappy consequence of this pretended freedom, or liberty, of the woman is that the industrial work in factories being ill-suited to her physical characteristics, she may become sterile or perhaps give birth to unhealthy or undeveloped children. This is not all, for moralists have shown the demoralizing effect of factory work, with its promiscuous and dangerous associations. Only too often the absence of the mother from the home during the greater part of the day is the ruin of family life; in fact, in some cases the children have to be sent to the orphan homes. This is one of the evils which factory work brings to the labourers' home, when the woman leaves her natural sphere and does the work of man.

Let us now pass to women in political life. Woman, naturally so good and beautiful, and so easily mastered by outside impressions, will naturally put her whole soul into this fascinating life, and will bring into every home from the most humble to the highest the same cause of ruin. Who can think for a moment that this right to vote, which is to be conferred on women, will be restricted to the depositing of her ballot in the box on election day? If a woman is to vote in an intelligent manner, will it not be her duty to get all possible information concerning political affairs, and to take part in the agitation which precedes the election? This means that she would have to attend political meetings side by side with men of all classes, or else organize such meetings amongst women. Many of them will make a personal canvass, or take part in the campaign through lectures, newspapers, and literature generally. Election campaigns in this country are usually long, and when one is ended it is almost time for another to begin. There are campaigns of many different kinds, for instance, municipal elections, election of school trustees, provincial and federal elections, the referendum and the plebiscite, which follow each other in almost uninterrupted succession. It seems evident that the question of political life must necessarily draw woman from her true sphere in the home, into the discussions of the forum and of the street, if she is to use her right of voting in an intelligent way.

No, Sir, this is not the conception we have of the important part to be played in the world by women. She must remain crowned with the halo of our deep respect and of our love. The work and activities of a man are not suited to her. We wish to see her in the home, surrounded by the unspeakable affection of her husband and children, and always deserving of the sweet appelation, "Mother of the living." This is the woman who instils life into a new generation, and this is the woman to whom go my praise and my admiration.

Mr. PAMPHILE REAL Du TREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): I am glad the Government have brought down this measure this session, although I think it should have been brought down last session. This Bill renders justice to women to some extent. At the last session of Parliament, the Government saw fit to enact a law giving the right to vote to a certain number of women in this country. The women of this country, of certain provinces at least, are desirous of having the vote to-day. In my constituency the women are very keen to vote. Let me give an example: Two days before the last election I was informed that only 2,400 women were on the list in my county, but on the day of election we were surprised to learn that about 3,400 had actually made application to vote. They tell me that certain women from certain parts of Ontario were so anxious to vote that they came to my county because they could not vote in Ontario according to law, but in my county they could do so. So that we can judge from this fact that the women of this country, to a certain extent at all events, are to-day prepared and anxious to cast their vote, when an election takes place. Now, the question is, do I favour the principle of this Bill? I say yes, but I want to submit the following observation: I think it is fair to say that all the women in all the provinces are not desirous of voting, and I think, in what I am about to say, I voice the opinion of the majority of the women of my province. I think it is a question of education and of sentiment, and when I speak of education I mean the direction in which education has been given to women. In France, for instance, the women do not intend, and have not the slightest desire to vote, and you will admit that the women of France in all respects are learned and patriotic women, that they desire to advance the interests and welfare of their sex, and take a great interest in the welfare of their country. Then we have, on the other hand, across the channel, the English women. Hon. gentlemen are aware that for some years the women in England desired to vote, and started a widespread campaign with the object of obtaining the right to vote. At first the statesmen in England refused them this right. Fine speeches have been delivered in the House of Commons and before the public, and speeches have been made by the women; I understand that the Government has decided that they will give them this right, so eagerly sought for many years. So that there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that this is a question of education, and this depends on the direction in which education and sentiment have been directed. Therefore, I think, that this being taken as a fundamental truth, we should leave the question in the hands of each province to decide for itself. In Canada we have a law regarding the franchise for men. It has been in force since 1898; by this franchise each province established a franchise for men within their respective limits. It was enacted by the Liberal Government of that day, and I think we are satisfied with it. In the United States, I understand, an amendment to the existing law was submitted to Congress, and has since been adopted. The amendment reads:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abrogated by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

This means that everybody in the United States of 21 years and over, by this amendment, shall have the right to vote. Now, what is the law? This amendment, after being sanctioned by the Senate, is to be submitted to the various states for ratification, and in order to become effective, three-fourths of the states must approve of it. There are 48 states in the Union, and, therefore, the approval of 36 states will be necessary to carry the amendment. Twelve states have already granted women suffrage. In the United States, by this amendment and by this law, they have approved of the principle that I have laid down. Why has this law been enacted by the Congress? Just for the reason that I have pointed out, that they understand that this question is one of sentiment, domestic necessity and of education, as was well explained to this House at the last session by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. In the United States the women are well advanced and well educated, this question has been before the people for years, books have been written on the subject and a commission has been appointed to study the subject, and this legislation is a result. In this country we are, to a certain extent, in the same position as the United States. We have different zones, and we have a large country. From the Atlantic to the Pacific different people speak different languages. Therefore, I say, if this law is wise for the United States it is wise for this country. If adopted in one province, it will not deprive any one of any right in the other provinces at all. Why force the women of the different provinces to vote if they do not wish to do so? Let this Parliament pass a law providing that each province shall have a referendum on the question. Let every woman over twenty-one years of age have an opportunity of going to the poll and saying whether she is in favour of voting or not. If I am con-

sulted I will say to the women of my province to take advantage of the opportunity that presents itself and declare themselves in favour of voting in future elections. I believe that the enfranchisement of women will have the effect of elevating our political life to a higher moral level. This is an advanced measure, but I am not afraid of it, because I believe that the women of our country have arrived at the stage where they can render valuable help to the men in carrying on the public business.

But, while I am on this subject, let me say that the franchise of a country is an important and a sacred thing. It should not be disturbed often and it should be touched with caution because it is the very basis of the liberty of the country. It assures popular liberty and security, and if the rules of this House permitted me to offer an amendment to the constitution it would be that the Franchise Act should not be changed by a simple majority of Parliament at the instance of the Government to carry out their own aims, or for any other purpose, before an election. The constitution should be so amended as to provide that before the Franchise Act can be touched by an unscrupulous Government at least two-thirds of the members of the House of Commons should concur in the change. We may be some day, as we have been in the past, at the mercy of an unscrupulous Government. This manipulation of the franchise is what has caused many of the troubles in countries to the south of us. The troubles which have distracted the Republic of Mexico for the past fifty years have been caused by the fact that political tyrants, in order to retain power, have, before the elections, disfranchised a part of the people. In this way they have sought to ensure victory at the elections. Therefore, we, the representatives of the people, in the interests of the people and of popular liberty, should declare that the Franchise Act must not in the future be changed unless with the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the House.

In conclusion, I would ask that it be left to each of the provinces to decide whether it is in favour of the enfranchisement of women or not. In that way justice would be done to the women of this country. I hope that some day the women will not only vote but that they will come and sit in this House, and by their presence, add charm to the public life of the country.

Mr. FOURNIER: Mr. Speaker, this House contemplates the idea of granting the women of Canada the right to vote in all federal elections, on the same grounds as men. Concurrently with that right, comes naturally the right and privilege to become candidates for, and members of, the House of Commons. My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in proposing this Bill stated that it was not prompted solely by the new conditions created by the state of war, but as a reward due to the high merits of all the mothers, wives and daughters of this Dominion.

With all the reverence and respect due to the word of the Prime Minister, I think that the reward he proposes to grant them could be classed in the same category as the gift which Nessus gave to Hercules' wife. The reward offered the women of Canada by the Prime Minister will become the instrument of their torture and the cause of their downfall.

Are we not too much in favour of all the ideas coming from the old world; are we not too easily attracted by the whims, fancies and freaks promoted in countries whose people do not know how to exercise their activities? Before granting the women of Canada the right, and imposing upon them the duty, to vote, before throwing them into the turmoil of political campaigns, before deciding that we shall abolish all and every distinction between man and woman, we must consider, and seriously consider, the ultimate consequence of that action.

With the Prime Minister, I pay a tribute of admiration and gratitude to the marvellous work of all the Canadian women in this dire crisis of the war. With him I acknowledge that they have deserved well of the country, and I would be in favour of granting them the highest privileges possible in so far as it would not be contrary to the best interests of the women and of the country.

A country cannot, without paying the full price, act contrarily to the laws of God and of nature. There is an essential distinction between man and woman. Although they have been moulded in the same clay, although they have received the same divine gift which we call intelligence, although they feel, think, speak and act alike, in almost every walk of life, there is an essential difference which ordains that a man shall always be a man, and a woman a woman, and all the laws of man shall not change that. The immediate passing of this measure will create no commotion in this country; the people will go along living in the same old way, but who shall foretell the result in a few decades from now? Shall

there not be conflicts between men and women? Shall there not be causes of dissatisfaction in the home or elsewhere? Or shall there even be any homes? We cannot take up a daily paper or a periodical without reading that the birth-rate is decreasing every year at an alarming rate. Will the granting of a franchise like this increase the birthrate? People may sneer at this petty preoccupation; people may consider it as a joke, but the future of a young nation like ours rests entirely upon the birthrate. And to keep up the birthrate of Canada we must keep our women within their sphere; we must attract them towards the accomplishment of the duties of their sex, duties specified by the unchangeable laws of nature.

A nation is not a collection of individuals; it is a collection of families. To judge of the prosperity of a nation you have to look at the condition of its family ties. If the parental authority is respected, if the parents are not afraid of the hardships and difficulties inherent in the bringing up of a family, you may say without any danger of misconception that this nation is strong, because its fundamental element, the family, is sound and healthy. On the contrary, if the family ties are vanishing, if parental authority is a myth, it is a sign of weakness. This Franchise Bill, in my humble opinion, tends towards the disruption of family ties and the destruction of parental authority.

This Bill is not only disastrous from a national standpoint, it is deplorable if we consider the sole interests of the women. It is useless to review the state of subjection in which women were before the Christian era. They were mere slaves in the hands of men; they still are mere slaves in all the countries where Christian civilization has not brought its light. Christianity has brought women to the position for which the Creator made her; it has made her the companion of man. The wonderful qualities of woman have been utilized by Christianity to complete the work of man. In all matters where men could not exercise all the needed beneficial influence, women have accomplished it. And it is in the Christian home that the all-powerful influence of woman has been felt. For all that she has done in that direction she has been surrounded with respect and love. There is not a man who does not look upon his mother as the sweetest creature on earth. There is not a manly man who does not surround his wife and daughters with respect. Will the passing of this Bill increase that respect? I think it tends to destroy it. This sort of feminism tends to place women on the same footing as men. They will no longer be considered the companions of men; they will become their rivals. I have a great deal of respect for the women who are most desirous of obtaining the suffrage, but my respect is for the purity and beauty of their characters and lives, not for their political judgment. The ideal woman of man is not a politician. I readily agree that women should be fully guarded by law in all rights of property and labour, but as they have been the guardian and the wellspring of the world's faith, morality and tenderness, I say that if they are degraded to a commonplace level with men this fine essential quality will be impaired, and their weakness will have to beg and follow where it now guides and controls.

It will be a nice condition of affairs with our women in politics. Imagine at a convention multiplying the tongue whangers, without increasing the minds capable of initiating legislation. It will injure women physically. Who shall say that at all times they will be equal to the excitements of caucus rows, campaign slanders, briberies, inflammable speeches, torch parades, and balloting on stormy days? How will the poor workman's wife go to the polls? It is the sediment, not the wave of a sex. It is the antithesis of that highest and sweetest mystery, conviction by submission, conquest by sacrifice. I want no contest with women, Mr. Chairman.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FOURNIER: They are higher, purer, nobler, smaller, meaner, more faithful, more frail, gentler, more envious, more merciful, far more merciful, than men are. Those of them who are Catholics are better Catholics than their husbands and sons; those that are Protestants are better Christians than their menfolk. Women have all the necessary qualities to make good men, but they must give their attention to it while men are boys. If the rich ones do not do so, they will have to hand their work over to the poor ones.

This win-the-war Government is the sponsor of compulsion. It was elected by means of a policy of force, but it should employ its force towards other problems of national needs, paying heed to the call of the Motherland for production, and not to the forcing through of legislation such as the grading of hay and straw, playing with the clock, and forcing women into the foul vapours of politics.

Mr. GERVAIS (Berthier) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I believe it is only seemly that, when a Bill of such prime importance

as the one now before this House is being discussed, I should pay my homage to woman in the beautiful French language.

For more reasons than one the question of woman suffrage is among the most important matters that could be submitted to the law-makers of any Parliament. In the first place, we must remember that we are living in a democratic country, blessed with a constitutional government, and that any law which has to do, either proximately or remotely, with the representatives of the people becomes, by virtue of that very fact, a matter of the highest importance. The representatives of the people, sitting in this House, are here in answer to the popular will, and when it is sought to change the law which governs our elections, whether in war-time or out of it, this, in all justice, should be gone about with the greatest circumspection, for our laws are the voice of Parliament and this voice may be influenced both by the manner in which the vote is taken and by the preparation of the voters' lists.

I believe that the women of the community are entitled to absolutely equal rights with the men.

If the woman of to-day, if the woman of our century, if the woman of our civilization, is not the equal of man in several respects, it is a question of education and training, which are encompassed not by one year but by the work of centuries.

Were I to indite a list of the men who have shone in the arts, in politics, on the speakers' platform, in Parliament, everywhere, and confront it with the names of those women who have acquired a certain fame, there is no doubt but that list of men would be much more imposing.

If we consider the comparative brain capacity we find that man's brain is more developed than that of woman; but this again is a matter of training and of civilization.

With regard to the physical aspect, woman is man's inferior. This is still a matter of civilization and of training, taking into account the nature of the work that she has had to accomplish for generations as also the nature of the work performed by man.

It is certain, nevertheless, that we must take things as they are and enact legislation which will keep abreast with the progress of our present-day civilization.

So true is it that women could develop, and should develop, in the same manner as men, that all through the history of civilization you can keep track of civilization's progress amongst the different races by considering the measure of freedom which they granted to their women. It is for us to guide woman and to educate her; and, having shown her her duty, to grant her all her rights; and I believe that, once sufficiently enlightened, women should enjoy all the rights of men.

Let us take the situation as we find it. My colleague from Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Du Tremblay) was saying a moment ago that the women of France are not asking for the vote. That is true; but you cannot deny that the Anglo-Saxon women most decidedly do want to vote.

All of us remember the struggles, at times hysterical, which were carried on in England for the cause of woman suffrage; and it is only the recognition of women's tremendous generosity and patriotism during the war that has prevailed upon the Government there to grant them the vote; I do not know as they would have ever got it otherwise.

But, in a general way, if you glance at the map of the United States, it is certain that the Anglo-Saxon woman does want the vote. The French women do not desire to vote because their education was not conducted along those lines, whereas the education of women in Anglo-Saxon countries was precisely along those very lines, and these women want the ballot.

Now, what should our position be? What attitude must I adopt? What attitude shall I adopt?

In theory, as I showed a moment ago, I am in favour of conferring on woman all possible rights, and I believe that these rights should be equal to those of man. When all is said, beyond the theory, there is the practical side of the question; and I do not believe that the time has come to put such a law on our statute books. Let me tell you the reason why.

Mr. Chairman, how will the voters' lists be prepared? On the one hand, the western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia and in the east, Ontario, have given women the vote, so we hear, and have found it to their advantage, on the other hand, in the province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces women are as yet denied admittance to the voting-booth.

So far, the Federal Government had always accepted the voters' lists prepared by the different provinces for their own elections and I do not see how these lists will be compiled hereafter. The Dominion Government grants a certain right; hence,

its duty to prepare its own electoral lists. This was previously done by the provinces and the plan worked out to the general satisfaction. Do you ask for instances to show that the provinces, and the Federal Government as well, were fully satisfied with the system of preparing these lists, in vogue till now? In 1887-88 the Federal Government, which was Conservative, took upon itself to name revisers who were intended to prepare the voters' lists for the following election. What were the consequences? A clamour of indignation against the proposed system arose from the Liberal ranks, and in 1893 the Liberal party adopted as the first plank of their platform the suppression of these revisers, and gave their word that they would take the preparation of the voters' lists out of the hands of the central authorities entirely. When the Conservative party came into power in 1911 they accepted the reforms brought about by the Liberal party, as also the lists prepared by the provinces.

We have another example of the danger of allowing these lists to be prepared by the Federal authorities. Does any one believe, for instance, that we on this side of the House are at all satisfied with the manner in which the lists were prepared for the last election; this thing is not even approved by all the members of the Government and it cannot be satisfactory to those who believe that an election should be carried on honestly and lawfully.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill we are discussing is not sufficiently clear. It makes no mention of the way in which the voters' lists will be prepared; for instance, as regards the province of Quebec, there is not a word about the way these lists will be obtained. Evidently, the provincial lists will not avail, since women in Quebec are denied the right to vote. The Government can allow women the vote but can they force the women to register? What I say of Quebec province is equally applicable to the Maritime Provinces, since conditions are the same; there, as in Quebec, how will these lists be prepared?

No, Mr. Chairman, 'twere better to allow this idea of woman suffrage to mature; we should let it grow by itself, make its way unaided in the public mind; let us allow the slow advance of the social education I was speaking of a moment ago. We should wait until this reform has sufficiently matured in the public mind; we should respect the privilege granted the provinces by the central power; let us leave to the provinces the preparation of the voters' lists, as in the past; in this way we will avoid a new cause of misunderstanding between the western provinces which have given the vote to women and the eastern provinces still withold this right from them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Does this Act suspend the provincial lists? For instance, in Manitoba the provincial list is adopted as the federal list; if we pass this Act, will Manitoba be obliged to accept it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it does not affect the lists for the provinces. Upon the provincial lists there might be some not entitled to vote at federal elections. Lists would have to be made up if the elections took place under the War-time Elections Act in the manner provided by that statute. If, on the other hand, an election should be held under the Dominion Elections Act as it existed in the past, it would be necessary to have additional machinery by which women could be put on the lists in provinces where they are not entitled to vote at present. Moreover, in the provinces where women have the right to vote, the lists would have to be brought in accordance with the principles which are embodied in this statute.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think it is important that an educational test should be applied under this Act. In 1890 when Mr., now Sir Hugh John, Macdonald was premier of Manitoba, he introduced into the legislature an Act providing that an educational test should be applied to all electors. In the West we have a very heterogeneous population, including many foreigners, and the view of the then Premier that there should be an educational test was generally accepted in the West. Let me give an illustration to strengthen my point. In the municipal election held in Manitoba not many years ago, they were voting on a by-law as well as for reeve and councillors A number of electors were brought to the poll, and when requested, improperly, of course, to state for whom they were going to vote, in a number of cases they said: we want to vote for Mr. By-law.

The committee will see that if there are many electors so ignorant—and there are—it is well that an educational test be provided in an Act of this kind. The educational test by Mr. Macdonald when he was Premier of Manitoba was that every elector should be able to read and interpret the Manitoba Act. Perhaps it was a rather severe test, but I believe that no person, male or female, should be given the franchise, unless he or she is able to explain

the idea of voting or has some knowledge of the constitution of the country. It was our judgment at the time that the test proposed by Mr. Macdonald was not too strong.

I believe that this country has been all too tardy in rendering justice to the women in the matter of the franchise. The women have demonstrated in past years, and particularly in recent years, their ability, their intelligence and their right to exercise the franchise. Although during the recent election the vote was extended only to women who were relatives of soldiers, I am glad to say that the women of the West generally took a deep interest in the election and worked faithfully and well a month prior to the polling as well as at the time of polling. I have no sympathy with the view held by the gentleman who spoke in the French language (Mr. Gervais), or of my distinguished looking friend with the white hair (Mr. Fournier); I do not think that the birth rate would be materially affected if the women were given the franchise. As a newspaper man of long standing I have found the women in favour of moral reforms, always ready to take a hand in promoting such an issue as prohibition or any measure designed to benefit the people. I have great pleasure, therefore in recording my earnest support of the extension of the franchise to women; I believe it will prove to be a good thing for the Dominion of Canada. In Manitoba the women have been given the franchise, and, I think, in Saskatchewan as well.

Mr. DENIS: When the Prime Minister moved the second reading of this Bill, he spoke as follows—I quote from page 95 of Unrevised Hansard:

> I do not depend for this upon the considerations which I have placed before the House as to the condition of provincial legislation on the subject. I do not even base it on the wonderful and conspicuous service and sacrifice which women have rendered to the national cause in the war. Apart from all these, I can see that women are entitled to the franchise on their merits, and it is upon that basis that this Bill is presented to Parliament for its consideration.

Not being very familiar with the English language, I thought it wise to consult Webster's dictionary as to the meaning of the word "merit" when employed in this connection; and this is the definition I found:

> The quality or relation of deserving well or ill.

From this definition of the word which the Prime Minister used we find that this Bill is presented for the acceptance of the House on the principle that it is based on conditions stable and permanent. A Bill presented on its merits is a Bill based on principles which are supposed to be true now, which were supposed to be true yesterday, and which will be true in time to come. I would contrast a Bill presented on its merits to what I would call—I wish to be corrected if I am mistaken—an emergency Bill. The question of woman suffrage is not a new one in this House. Last year, there was presented to this House a Bill to give a certain class of women the right to vote. This year, a new Woman Suffrage Bill is submitted for our consideration. I have found it hard to believe that the two Bills do not conflict. Although it may seem rather strange to some hon. members, I would go so far as to say that the ideas contained in the Bill of last year and in the Bill of this year appear to me to be opposed to each other. That may seem paradoxical, but nevertheless I am convinced that the merits of one Bill defeats the merits of the other. Let me explain what I mean. The principle of a Bill presented on its merits was true yesterday, it is true to-day, and it will be true in the future. Consequently, if last year it was true, on its merits, that woman deserved the right to vote, why is it that last year only a certain class of women were given the right to vote? The merits of the case were the same last year. If it is true and correct to say that on the merits of the case women are entitled to vote, how is it that last year the right to vote was not given to all the women of this country? Is it to be supposed that the admiration or condescension of the Government towards the whole class was only in its infancy last year, while this year it has attained to its full growth and maturity. If last year we ignored what is this year the merits of the case, it must have been because there was a reason. What is the reason? I cannot find any other reason than this—

An hon. MEMBER: To win the war.

Mr. DENIS: It is because last year we wanted to give the right to vote to a certain class of persons who were expected to help this Government to win the elections? This year I suppose compunction has come to the hearts of my hon. friends on the other side, and they want to repair the injustice which they did last year to a large majority of the women of this country by depriving them of the right to vote. This year, therefore, the Government is presenting to this House a Bill on its merits which will give the right to vote to all the women of this

country. If the Bill were presented last year for the sole reason I have mentioned, I congratulate hon. members on the other side on the sinister success they achieved. They certainly made no mistake last year if they gave the right to vote to a certain class of persons with the sole intent of winning the elections. If I may be allowed to use an expression which I have often heard in the speeches of the Prime Minister, I might say that this Bill of last year, drafted as it was, was certainly "fully adequate." It was adequate because it fulfilled the purpose for which it was drafted.

Let us examine the merits of this question. The question is a very wide one and one on which a great deal may be said. The few remarks which I intend to make to the committee will, I am sure, be very incomplete. If we refer to sacred history, as far back as we can go, if we read the first chapter of Genesis, we find that woman was given only as an aid and consolation to man. We find that all through the Holy Scriptures that woman has no other part. She does not govern. She does not command. She has her place in no council except in that of the family. Profane history in antiquity does not show woman in any other role than as an aid and consolation to man, or else in an inferior role. The highest philosophy of antiquity has not conceived any other function for woman than that of companion to man. We all know that a companion is not a principal. A companion is a person whose object it is to follow and assist a principal, but not a person who is supposed herself to be a principal. In all domains of life, from childhood through middle age into old age, whether in science, literature, philosophy or religion, we do not find that woman has shown any superiority. Perhaps, as the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Gervais) has said, that was because woman was not given an opportunity to develop her mind and her talents. At all events, as it is now, we must admit that woman has shown no real superiority except in so far as sentiment or imagination is concerned.

The physiology of woman, the anatomy of woman, reveals that she is in this world for the purpose of love and motherhood and not for the purpose of political strife. If the father has to be away from the home, it is the part of the mother to remain at home. I do not mean to say that she should be confined to the house, nor that her mind should be closed to all intellectual subjects; but one of the two has to remain in the home, and if it is not the mother, it will have to be the father, to take care of the children, so long as there are to be children in this world. From that point of view, I say if the father is not to remain in the home, then the mother should. If we give the right to vote to woman, we must as a consequence give her the right to attend political meetings, because what is the use of giving her the right to vote, if she is not to be well informed in regard to politics? Women must know for whom they are voting and why they are voting. Consequently, it is a matter not only of marking a ballot, but of studying the politics of one's country, which of course entails the necessity for women attending and assisting at political meetings.

Mr. McMASTER: Why not?

Mr. DENIS: If it is my hon. friend's opinion that they should, I respect it, but I hold that it is preferable for the sake of the family that the woman should remain in the home instead of taking part in political strife at political meetings, and at times, hearing the hard words which we are often accustomed to hear at such gatherings. Conjugal harmony is almost impossible between a husband and wife holding different political views. It would be all right if they held the same views on politics, but when the husband holds one view and the wife a different one, as will happen very often, conjugal harmony will be impaired. This law, while not especially designed for that purpose, will, it seems to me, lead to a husband being arrayed against his wife in certain instances.

Have the women of this country asked for the right to vote? Some say they have this right already, which is not so true as some people believe. But if it is true that they have an undeniable right to vote, how is it that in England, the United States and other great democracies they have been so long denied that right? Consequently, we must conclude that it is very difficult to decide whether women have or have not the right to vote. But assuming they have that right, are the women asking to be allowed to exercise it? There are many rights which we possess which are never exercised, perhaps because we never think of asserting them. We must not forget that happiness is a relative thing. A man who is happy in one condition may be unhappy in another, and so it is with the right of women to vote. If the women of this country wanted the right to vote so keenly that they could not be happy without it, I might go so far as

to say that, though it would be a dangerous tool in their hands, we should give them that right. But they do not ask for it. What did we see in England? Suffragettes there have been going after the Prime Minister day after day, intruding on him in the privacy of his home, but the Prime Minister would not give them the right to vote for a long time; although lately they have been enfranchised. The same is true of the United States. In Canada there has been no demand by women for the vote. If, then, the franchise is a dangerous tool in the hands of women, why should we give it to them when they are not asking for it, and when it might work against the welfare and happiness of the women themselves?

I will take the liberty of quoting the law of the province from which I come on the status of women. Article 174 of the Civil Code of Lower Canada reads:

> A husband owes protection to his wife; a wife obedience to her husband.

Has civilization advanced beyond that? I do not know, but this is taken from the old Roman law which was introduced into the French law, codified by Napolean in 1804, and now the law of the province of Quebec. The wife owes obedience to her husband. That does not mean that she is a mere cypher in the family, but that there must be a head and the husband is that head.

Article 175 of our Civil Code reads:

> A wife is obliged to live with her husband, and to follow him wherever he thinks fit to reside. The husband is obliged to receive her and to supply her with all the necessaries of life, according to his means and condition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should like to ask whether my hon. friend suggests, having regard to the law which he has quoted, that the wife should be obliged to vote in the way that her husband directs?

Mr. DENIS: Not by any means. I am quoting the law, and the intention of the law is that the husband shall be the head of the family. If we give the wife the same rights as her husband it might separate the family and array the wife against her husband. We have seen by Article 175 that the wife is obliged to live with her husband and follow him wherever he thinks fit to reside. If we refer to Article 1292 we find the same principle laid down; in fact, we find this principle all through the Civil Code of Quebec. It is a basic principle of our civil law now in existence that the husband shall be the leader, and that the rights of the wife, or woman, shall be confined to the family council.

Before taking my seat I should like to summarize my objections to this Bill. I say that the Holy Scriptures, theology, ancient philosophy, Christian philosophy, history, anatomy, physiology, political economy, and feminine psychology, all seem to indicate that the place of women in this world is not amid the strife of the political arena, but in her home. Let me give one or two facts. In the United States the right to vote has been granted to women. This right to vote necessarily entails the right to become a candidate in the elections for Congress or for Parliament. At the last election in the United States, Miss Jeanette Rankin was elected to Congress from the state of Montana, the first woman ever elected to the Congress of that country. When she first entered the House of Representatives her name was freely mentioned in the newspapers, and many people had their eyes on her to see what she would do. The first important measure that came up in Congress after this lady had taken her seat was the question of declaring war against Germany. After the question had been discussed at length Miss Rankin was called on to vote, but she would not speak; she was called the second time, and still she would not speak; when called the third time she wept, and at last she said in a voice scarcely audible that she was not willing to throw her country into war, and she voted with the very small minority against the declaration of war. In the opinion of a great number of hon. members in this House, Miss Rankin certainly did not prove that it was a considerable asset to have women in parliament, nor I do not think it will be an asset to have them in public life. The experiences of Miss Eva Zaintz, in the Russian "Battalion of Death," have been published in this country. Miss Zaintz was a soldier in the ranks of that battalion. Nothing could be more pathetic than the case of these women who enrolled voluntarily to defend their country when the men of Russia would no longer defend it. I will not take up the time of the House to give details. These women have shown to the world, if ever it will be shown, that they were heroes equal to the best that this wonderful war has produced. They had their hair cut. They donned soldiers' uniforms. They went through their training. They swore they would fight until death for their country, and that if every soldier in Russia ran away from the Huns, they would stand

their ground. And what happened? They fought the exterior enemies of their country and many of them were killed. Then they fought the interior enemies, the Bolsheviki, and many others of these women were killed, and at the conclusion the premier, Kerensky, was so horrified that he ordered the disbandment of the Battalion of Death. All those that remained returned to their homes, and Miss Zaintz adds that after that she made her way with her aged father across Siberia and came to America. Her action reminds one of the Trojan hero of yore, fleeing from Troy, carrying his aged father upon his shoulders, to avoid the vengeance of the Greeks. And yet this woman writes to-day that there is a place for men and women, and it was not their place to go and form this Battalion of Death because they were altogether out of their sphere. The case which I am citing to this House might seem to be an exceptional one. I might relate at length facts in regard to it, but I am simply mentioning this to show, that from my point of view, there is a place for man and a place for woman in this world. Consequently, I say it is a social question, a moral question, a question of education, a question of local tendencies, a question of family traditions a question of race traditions, and a question of personal aspirations and feelings. And for all those considerations I think that this central power of Canada should not interfere in this matter, but should leave it to be decided by each province in Canada. That, Sir, is my conclusion. We do not want to interfere with the rights of the Anglo-Saxon ladies of Ontario or elsewhere, nor to interfere with their aspirations and traditions. We shall be very happy if they find happiness in getting the right to vote. Let every race, let every family and every province—which is, perhaps, to a certain extent, a large family—decide as to their needs and settle this question for themselves. I have every admiration for the fair sex, but I would be very sorry to think that this admiration went to the extent of sacrificing all the traditions that we have known ever since this world has existed. I say very humbly that I have not been convinced that I should give my support to this Bill.

Mr. THOMAS HAY: When this Bill first came before the House I asked the same question as was asked by the hon. member for Springfield whether an educational test would be provided in connection with this Bill. The Prime Minister misunderstood my question, or, perhaps, I did not make myself clear, but the reply was to the effect that the Naturalization Act provided for an educational test. My question did not refer to the women that were to come into the country after this time, but it related to that class of women already in the country—and we have thousands of them who are unable to read or write in English, French, or any other language—and I asked at that time if the voters would have to comply with any law the province might pass in regard to a test, before they could become Dominion electors. I think that was the text of my question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As far as the educational test is concerned, I think I did understand pretty well what my hon. friend asked. Perhaps he did not quite understand the answer I gave. In the first place, if we are to have an educational test at all, I think it should apply to men as well as women. There is no particular reason why we should establish an educational test to which women should be subjected, and provide no educational test for men. So far as the matter is left by this Bill, both are in precisely the same situation. That is to say, any person who comes to this country and is naturalized must have a certain educational qualification, which is provided in the Naturalization Act. Any woman who comes to this country, and is not naturalized in her own right, but is naturalized by reason of the naturalization of her husband, or by the naturalization of a parent, must, before she is entitled to vote under this Bill, possess the qualification which would be required if she were making application for naturalization in her own right. That subjects men and women in this country to precisely the same test, so far as their right to vote is concerned. If the House in its wisdom conceives that some additional test is necessary, that ought to be provided by a general law applicable to men and women alike. It has not been undertaken in this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Was there a Naturalization Act passed by the Dominion?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, there was an Act passed in 1914 which has a wider effect than the previous Naturalization Act. Those who are to be naturalized require to have a fair knowledge of either the English or the French language.

Mr. PACAUD: Mr. Chairman, if the few observations which I venture to make in criticism of this Bill could be construed as a desire on my part to deny to the women of Canada a privilege which they were claiming, I confess that I would promptly

desist from such a course, remembering as I do this obvious truth, that it is never given to men to have the last word.

This is not my intention. I fully recognize, Sir, that it may be claimed with a great deal of justification that, as a matter of right, if the women of Canada really desired the privileges of citizenship which are now conferred only on men, these privileges should be granted to them.

Looking at this question from this angle, I readily admit that the women of this country have the necessary qualifications to exercise the franchise. They have both the intelligence and the culture to grasp the issues at stake and to cast their votes with an unbiased mind and a conscience free and unhampered by those selfish interests which too often weaken the judgment of man.

May we not add, Sir, that strong as may have been their claim in the past to have a vote in the management of our public affairs, stronger still is that claim to-day, when we recall the noble part that women have taken in this war? Their title to the vote has grown in proportion to their splendid service to the state and to their never ceasing sacrifices to our men at the front.

Whether in Canada or abroad, they have given their time and their help for a great cause and amidst these scenes of misery and of woe they appear to us to-day, more than ever, "as heaven's chosen messengers on earth."

Sir, it is because women have to such a degree elevated themselves that I hesitate to-day to be a party to a measure which, to my mind, will only tend to bring woman down from her lofty position where she is admired, respected and loved. The influence of her example is a great moral asset to the state. That influence is derived in a large measure from her position of "splendid isolation" within the home. Let us not tamper too lightly with this tradition by dragging women into the turmoil of political strife.

The question which impresses itself upon my mind is not whether we should grant the vote to women, but whether the women themselves want it. I do not believe that the majority are in favour of it. I know that in many provinces this right of suffrage is already granted. I recall the legislation of last year passed in this House granting to some women a right which was denied to others. This was a grave injustice. It had no justification in fact. It was done for a special purpose. It achieved the end which its authors had in view and in so far as this Bill tends to repair a wrong done, to wipe away an unfortunate distinction that was made in the War-time Elections Act, it has the merit at least, though too late, of extending equal treatment and equal justice to all the women of Canada.

Speaking for my province, I do not believe that there will be great enthusiasm displayed for this Bill. We do not consider that woman's mission has changed; her kingdom is still her home. We are more concerned about placing a wedding ring on her finger than putting a ballot in her hand. We feel that the larger field of human activity which is offered to women by this Bill will not raise them any higher, but may even degrade them in the youthful eyes of those whose hearts they never cease to lighten and to bless.

Sir, this does not mean that the women of my province do not take an interest in our public affairs. Far from it. They hold in a large measure what I may call the substance of power. Their influence in the home is dominant. They are consulted in all matters. Their advice, always sought, is usually followed.

But, with that instinct, which women alone possess, they feel that it is wiser and better to leave to others the expression of that power. They have large families which entail heavy domestic duties which they fulfil with care and devotion. These obligations are a barrier to their appearance on a larger stage. I do not believe that it is wise to take the risk of destroying their true, womanly work, their domestic skill, their lovable and endearing qualities, by tempting them to follow us to a polling booth, to a public platform, and, some day, into this very House. For, Sir, we cannot be blind to the fact that we are but entering into the first phase. The others will follow rapidly.

Neither man nor woman can play a double part in life; they have their own spheres of activity. I do not believe that this is a time to experiment with a new order of things or to uproot that which has resisted the test of centuries.

Mr. J. E. PREVOST (Terrebonne) (translation): Mr. Chairman, am I wrong in believing that two speeches in the French tongue are not over-numerous when we are dealing with "la dame de nos pensées," the lady of our thoughts, as they used to say in dear old France?

The Bill before the House just now brings up this question of feminism which has elicited such divergent opinions in this House, in the press and elsewhere.

I do not believe in being absolute, neither on the one side nor on the other; and I believe that here, as always, it is in the happy medium that truth and justice abide.

In theory, it is indisputable that every person who contributes to the resources of the State is entitled to a voice in controlling the administration of the resources of the State. That is just and logical.

In practice, it should be borne in mind that, ever since 1869 the English have given their women the municipal vote which exists if not everywhere, at least in many parts of Canada. There have been no complaints on that score.

The women-voters have shown themselves to be most discreet, mainly devoting their activities and their time in matters political to questions affecting the relief of the poor, and bringing with them into this sphere, side by side with a sound administrative control, a little of the spirit of charity and of tenderness, a little of the maternal spirit.

In New Zealand, in Australia, the women have a voice in the election of their representatives. These representatives are none the worse for that... neither are the women. I have even heard that public life in those countries had been chastened thereby. That may be.

Even, if that were all.

It is said moreover, and this of England as well as Australia, that the women voters pay great heed to questions of morality, honesty and respectability, and that they give more weight to the moral character of a candidate than to his party affiliations.

If this be so, then the experiment is surely deserving of a trial in our own country.

Forcefully anti-feminist in many respects, absolutely convinced that what exists, and what should exist, between woman and man, is not equality but equivalency, I am grieved to see women invading occupations which are not the least bit in the world suited to them and which remove them from their proper sphere, that is from the hearth; most of all I regret that our economic methods and the condition of our manners should often induce women to follow that course; I am saddened, too, by all this childish, silly feminism, by this insane desire to be mannish in ridiculous things, by women who smoke, women who cycle, by women, man-fashion, astride a fiery steed, women who invade professions nowise meant for them, etc., and who neglect their kingdom for all these things.

Nevertheless, I am inclined to approve whatever tends to establish "equality of rights" and to facilitate "the exercise of these rights." Here I approve, but with the understanding that the exercise of these rights will not go to lengths where woman will be diverted from her function, from her natural and sacred duty.

When you say to me: The woman doctor, the woman lawyer, my features express my disapproval; because I am sure that one woman lawyer is perhaps not one lawyer more, but it positively is one woman less—and one mother less.

When you say to me: the woman teacher, my face, begins to brighten up because there is nothing to prevent a woman from being at one and the same time a teacher and the mother of a family.

No doubt, we would rather see—however, let that be.

And, finally, when you say to me: the woman voter, I haven't a bit of objection left. In the first place I am just and logical and in a country where my messenger is a voter I find it rather "tough" that my sister should not enjoy that privilege; in our day, when a woman may be queen, Queen of Great Britain, Queen of Holland, Queen of Spain, I can see no reason which would make us consider a woman as unworthy of expressing an opinion on political matters. I even see in the right of expressing that opinion the welfare of society.

There are people who argue against woman suffrage that the exercise of this right will whirl our women into the political vortex. Do those who speak in this vein reflect that, as a matter of plain fact, that in reality, our women are practically living to-day in the atmosphere of politics, that they devote both time and attention to politics, go to the meetings, very often attend the committees organized, even in the most remote country districts, talk over the election with their husbands and with their neighbours, men and women; that, even, when the country is in the throes of discussion anent a question of the utmost import, the women are not the last to feel the consequences and to be stirred by them?

For instance, when military conscription was brought up, when there is talk of prohibition, when there is any discussion of questions involving the relief of the poor, public health, sanitary regulations, etc., our women, feeling themselves directly interested, take an active part in the discussion of these questions and are really in the current of public life; but they have not the right to express their opinion by a vote when the day comes to choose a legislator who will make enactments which

the women will have to observe. Women are to a certain extent inferior to men in education and culture, that is, amongst what we have chosen to call the upper classes; they are superior to men in intelligence, common sense and natural keenness, in those things which are comparatively inborn to mankind, I mean to say, in those things precisely which are brought to the fore in the almost universal suffrage of our elections. The working girl has a finer sense of the fitness of things and a sharper intellect than the workingman; the peasant woman has better insight than her male companion; the latter is well aware of this and always consults her. Hence, our electorate is deprived of the more intellectual influence in its phere.

Women voters will pay more heed to moral questions than to matters of party, they will give more weight to the morals of the candidate than to his platform, his manifesto and his declarations. The more I look into this thing, the more I favour woman suffrage and the less reason I see for opposing it. Its sole effect would be the introduction of calm counsel and of the human element into polities generally. Another point of view; it will persuade man, by a tangible warning and a permanent demonstration, of a thing in which, amongst a certain class, he does not sufficiently believe, namely: that the woman is his equal; that he is the head and that he must remain the head, but not the master, and that his helpmeet is a person before the State as before God. And so I come to the conclusion that women should have the vote. However, the solution of this problem, for it is a problem, should be left to the provincial legislatures.

As a matter of fact, this is a question of education and of temperament. In certain countries people willingly admit that women should go to the polls, in others where, nevertheless, the ideals of liberty and progress are in honour, as is France, for instance, this right has not yet been granted to women because it is not consistent with the French temperament. It is the same thing in Canada where ideas differ and education varies from province to province within Confederation. Each provincial legislature is better informed than any other regarding the state of mind and the opinions of that province and it should be left to that Parliament to decide whether or not the women of that province shall vote. Moreover, this interference of the Federal power in the provincial sphere has an ugly look to us. We have reason to believe and to fear that in thus assuming the role of the legislature and defining the electoral qualifications on a given point, the Government of Ottawa is heading towards the old system of Federal voting lists, which was so faulty and so unjust. Prior to 1896 the Federal voting lists were prepared by revisers who were handsomely paid by the Government at Ottawa and who could add or cancel a name, at their own sweet will, so as to make the lists favourable to their masters. Nobody has forgotten the crying injustices which were wrought against so many voters whilst this system was in vogue.

The liberals came into power in the year 1896; and in 1897 they abolished the system of Federal revisers. Since that time the voters' lists have been compiled in each province in accordance with the provincial law. For instance, in the province of Quebec the lists are prepared by the secretary-treasurer of each municipality and are revised by the municipal councils where every voter has the right to produce his qualifications and get fair treatment. By this law granting the ballot to women all over Canada the Government at Ottawa is encroaching on the system established in 1897, it deprives the provinces of the right to themselves define the electoral qualifications which shall preside at elections, and seems desirous of setting up once more the very vicious system of olden days. This foreboding is all the more justifiable on our part since at the time of the last Federal elections, in 1917, the Government, by its ignoble War-time Elections Act, was guilty of the gravest injustice against a huge number of voters in giving over the electoral lists for revision, in the very last days preceding the election, into the hands of a legion of examiners who, in nearly every part of the country, played havoc with the lists; which is one of the reasons behind this Government's success. We meet again, in 1917, the Tory spirit of former times, the spirit which presided at the preparation of the voters' lists to the detriment of the voters but all to the advantage of those in power. So I do not look favourably upon the present interference of the Government who, through their law granting women the ballot are beginning to deprive the provinces of the right to prepare, themselves, the list of voters. That is why, although favourable to the principle of woman suffrage, I am opposed to the law which the Government is now asking the House of Commons to sanction. It is the right of the provincial legislature to decide

whether or not their women shall vote. I fail to understand the eagerness and the zeal of the Federal Government, which has suddenly become imbued with an excess of politeness towards the ladies, in taking away from the provinces the opportunity of granting or refusing to their women the right to have a say, by means of the ballot, in the elections of our country.

M. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet) (translation): Mr. Chairman, pray do not be astonished if I make use of the French tongue in voicing my opposition to this measure. When, under pretense of protecting woman and of elevating her social status, the Government proposes a law which is a slight upon woman and which will fatally result in lowering her, I believe candidly—with the hon. members for Berthier and for Terrebonne—that, in championing the dignity and the grandeur of woman it is only proper to employ the richest, the most delicately shaded, the daintiest and the purest of human tongues, which, by reason of these qualities has been acclaimed as the language of diplomacy.

On the second reading of this Bill the right hon. Prime Minister brought up a question of principle. Amongst other things, he said:

> I can see that women are entitled to the franchise on their merits, and it is upon that basis that this Bill is presented to Parliament for its consideration. It is our belief that the influence of women exercised in this way will be a good influence in public life. We believe that beneficial results have ensued wherever the franchise has been granted to them; indeed the principle of granting the franchise to women generally was practically affirmed in the last Parliament.

Let us examine right away, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, the pretext invoked in the last sentence I have just read. Personally, I am not very much inclined to follow the bad examples of the last Parliament; it was guilty of far too many iniquities: witness, the conscription law, a monumental blunder from both an economic and a patriotic standpoint, founded on a principle which is false and unconstitutional, and a law which I would choose to see wiped off our statute books, if the thing were possible; witness, again, the Wartime Elections Act which embodies the most heinous injustice and an absolute breach of faith towards thousands of British subjects, citizens of this country; that law also should be repealed, which repeal moreover has been requested by the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan.

I would never be through were I to recite the long list of iniquities perpetrated by the last Parliament. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we were not elected for the purpose of approving all that had been done by that Parliament. If that were the case, an election would always be superfluous and we ourselves would be mere machines.

This argument of the hon. Prime Minister is not serious and he knows that better than any one else. We are here to study questions on their merits and to decide them according to our conscience and not at all according to what may have been the opinions of the members of the last Parliament.

Read over the hon. Prime Minister's speech and, outside of the pretext just mentioned, you will find nothing but the glittering generality: "Women have the right to vote and their exercise of this right will be an influence for good." Not a single word of argument to prove his contention, so much so, that if we had only his utterances to guide us in forming an opinion upon this question, which is highly important from every point of view, we would be hard put to it to reach a conclusion founded not alone on reason, but, I say more, on the teachings of experience and of facts.

So I was obliged to look elsewhere and it is a brief synopsis of these explorations that I wish to present to the members of the House. In running through the best authors who have dealt with this subject I have become convinced that the Bill before the House is contrary to the natural order, to the social order, to the economic order and to the moral order. For the sake of argument, I take it for granted that, once this Bill has become law, women will exercise the privilege granted them and will take an active part, in the same way as, and side by side with, the men, in political contests. They will come to the meetings in search of information, they will busy themselves with propaganda and with what we commonly call electioneering; consequently, they will undergo the rude apprenticeship of the brutalities of public life and, sooner or later, will claim the right to become members of Parliament and to sit in our legislative halls. This, of necessity, will divert them from their homes and from their usual occupations and will pit their native weakness against all forms of seduction and deceit.

With this admitted, allow me to try and demonstrate the truth of my thesis. First, this Bill is contrary to the natural order which has endowed woman with a different constitution from that of a man; and since

nature has not given woman the same strength, she cannot impart to woman the same tasks, the same duties and the same rights.

"In general," says Auguste Comte, "the true path of human progress is this: to render the feminine life more and more domestic and to release it more and more from all outside occupation, the better to insure the accomplishment of its end: mating."

This theory of the Positivist philosopher is confirmed by a celebrated practitioner, Doctor Fonssagrives:

"Woman," he teaches in a treatise on the education of girlhood, "is essentially a hidden being, primordially destined to a private life; public life, once it touches her, transforms her into a strange being, a hybrid, a sort of pariah creature."

Further, it is contrary to the social order which demands a guardian over the home, and which in consideration of woman's relative weakness has confined to her everywhere the ministry of the interior.

Woman's place is in the bosom of her family. Everything calls her there, everything holds her there, everything ties her there.

"The state of the family," writes M. Villey, "assigns to each his natural task: the man works and produces; the woman administers and takes care of the children; you cannot normally ask her to perform any other task; her own, well accomplished will require all her activity, and it is a great pity that she should engage in outside occupations: this is responsible for the fact that the domestic hearth is broken up and that family ties are loosened and often sundered."

It is also contrary to the economic order and on this score I will quote no less an authority than M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu. In his treatise on the theory and practice of political economy, he expounds the following doctrine:

Well-ordered consumption is equivalent, in part, to production, since it causes objects to last without diminishing the pleasure they afford. So, just as we say that the woman constitutes half the fortune of a home, we might add that the qualities of thrift and of caution in its women form half the fortune and welfare of a nation. Hence, the absurdity of trying to foist upon woman the functions of man; it is against the most natural division of work and of tasks; it is striving to destroy wealth. (Page 202, vol. 4.)

And elsewhere:

The question of the condition of women is one of the most delicate and the most complex that exists. We tried to deal with it in one of our first works. No doubt, we must grant women more rights, make them mistresses of their earnings and of their savings, make their lot happier. But we must not fail to realize that the "Feminist Movement" such as promoted by a number of propagandists and favoured by several of the lesser States, constitutes, from any point of view, a serious menace to civilization. By making the home less desirable, and motherhood more troublesome, more formidable, the masculinisation of woman must gradually strike at the birth-rate which, already, in most civilized countries, has too great a tendency towards falling off. So legislation, while making it easier for women to earn their livelihood, should not favour the assimilation of woman to man, neither should it suppress what is consecrated by law, nor interfere with the natural division of the functions between the sexes. (Page 625, vol. 4.)

The reduction of the birth-rate, Mr. Chairman; is not that the shoal we should avoid, particularly at this sorrowful period of our history? The birth-rate is intimately associated with the question of the increase of our population, which is one of the hardest problems to solve, when you consider the tremendous number among us who will have fallen victims to this disastrous war. The Government has given its attention to this problem. In order to solve it, partially at least, they have evolved the problem of giving more importance to immigration by placing it under the special direction of a minister who will have charge of both immigration and colonization. But they should not, it seems to me, render fruitless the efforts of this minister towards increasing our population, as they are doing in a law like this which will inevitably result in gradually decreasing our population.

I wish to draw your attention to a further drawback from both an administrative and economical standpoint; is not it to be feared Mr. Chairman, that when women have the vote they will demand their share of the election spoils? Then the plague of patronage will be intensified. As a consequence, the expenses of civil government will constantly tend to increase, for I doubt very much if the ministers—no matter what Government may be in power—will be able to resist the prayers and supplications, not to say the orders, of the women voters who will demand their reward for services rendered. Why preach economy when the Government by this Bill is deliberately laying itself open to greater expense and greater waste.

Finally, it is contrary to the moral order which suffers greatly from promiscuity between the sexes, and from the desertion of the domestic hearth. The women are exposing themselves to serious dangers in taking an active part in our political contests which, too often, alas, are carried on without pity, without generosity and without courage; and where the clash of interests, of dislike and of selfishness seek their only outlet in the crushing

of an opponent. Even if they were to escape all these other perils it seems nearly impossible to me that their minds should remain chaste; in the language of Jules Simon "she will inevitably suffer in her virtues." Woman cannot fail to be the enormous loser when, in the social relations brutal constraint, material force, "the yoke of numbers and that of wealth," ineradicable consequences of political contests, take the place of persuasion, of reason, of sentiment, of intelligence and love. The mite of material power that, by means of the vote, she might painfully obtain through the sacrifice of her health, her modesty, her motherhood and her happiness, cannot possibly be sufficient compensation. Through mingling in public affairs she will feel the need of, in a way, deserting the home, of becoming interested in others than those who have a natural claim to her love, she will live her life for herself and not for her loved ones, she will become dissociated, so to speak. Only part wife, she can be none but an insufficient mother. Her role and, consequently, her grandeur will inevitably wane.

On the contrary, by remaining in the home, which is her sanctuary, woman will wield an influence beyond compare. She will remind all classes of the "Fundamental preponderance of sentiment over reason and over activity."

What woman needs is to live in the midst of her family, to return to the home. We are here concerned with the future of the nation, with the dignity of woman, with the sanctity of family life and with the welfare of the country.

In a preface written to Mesdames Van Vorst, for their book "The Working-Woman in the United States," ex-President Roosevelt says:

> A people whose men are not prepared to labour in every way, not ready to fight with all their might and who have not in their hearts a yearning after fatherhood; a people whose women are not convinced that there is for them nothing grander than to be a good wife and a good mother; well, such a people has serious reasons to be alarmed about its future.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this Bill to my mind is a deplorable yielding to a wretched sort of feminism and bids fair to cause the social disintegration of what remains of the family, to the injury of the true woman: wife, mother and queen of the household. As a result, all the world of feminine parasites—blue-stockings and "society women"—will unfold. And that is only the beginning. To complete the disintegration, there is

thought, it seems, of submitting a Bill to facilitate the granting of divorce. What profound aberration!

Those are, Mr. Chairman, some of my reasons for opposing the present Bill, which is not called for by the majority of women, but solely by a few emancipated creatures, a few suffragettes, crazy for a crumb of petty glory.

If I take this stand, if I maintain that women should be exempt from all political responsibility, it is not, I pray you to believe, with a view to lowering her social rank and limiting her influence. Far from that. It is so as to consecrate woman with more splendor to the eminent role which nature has assigned her and which she alone can fulfil; it is to prevent the dispersal of the family, to labour towards the resurrection and, at the same time, the reconstitution of a solidly organized society, which will make suffering much more bearable and will avoid an incalculable amount of harm; it is because I respect and love woman that I do not wish to see her abandon her rank, and I intend to remain worthy of her and of her teachings; finally, it is to safeguard, in its entirety, her moral sovereignty which, till now, has been the whole charm of our civilization.

Mr. FRASER: I have the honour to represent the constituency of Welland, which I represented in the local House for ten years, and during all that time no woman in my county ever asked me to vote for women's franchise. To-day, the cry is apparently "women's franchise." I am free to admit that the women of this country should have a vote; they are far more intelligent than the majority of the men. But I want to say right here and now that in the county of Welland the women are not looking for the franchise, but they are looking for help to be sent to their fathers, husbands and sons overseas. Why should we waste time? We have wasted one day discussing titles; we are wasting another day over votes which the women do not want, and we are not dealing with matters which will support our men at the front. Why do we not get down to business, forget these side lines, and try to help the boys who are helping us? These matters of titles and votes for women are mere camouflage; let us forget them and turn our energies towards the means of sending help to the boys at the front.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. DEMERS: I desire, Mr. Chairman, to express my views in a very few words, although the question under consideration is one of the most important ever brought before the House. In doing so, I am not moved by any selfish motive. I am not afraid of the results of this legislation so far as the men of Canada are concerned; I am inspired only by a desire to preserve the happiness of our women, for whom I have the most profound respect and admiration and whom nobody appreciates more than I do.

Sir, I have no faith in the results which will be derived from this legislation; on the contrary I believe that it is a bad piece of legislation. This Bill, when it becomes law, will not in any way improve the organization of our social, moral, economic or political life. Far from being a step forward for women, this so-called emancipation will mean disaster to those on whose behalf it is granted, as well as to the nation at large.

Let us not forget that in this country woman occupies an exceptional position. She is at all times the object of the respect, the consideration, the solicitude of all; but I am afraid that in what we are attempting now, far from elevating her to a still loftier position, we shall but bring her to the level of those who, like ourselves, have to gain their bread by the sweat of their brow.

The great, democratic principle of equal rights is intended to be applied by this legislation. This principle may have been quite sound when applied to the large labouring classes in their struggle to better their position and standing in the community, but such circumstances are not applicable to the position of the women, especially those in our own country. At all events, in the province from which I come, the women are so well satisfied with existing conditions that not only are they indifferent to this legislation, but the great majority of them are against it. This seems to me a good reason why such legislation should be left for the various provinces to decide on. The workingman fought for suffrage because he held an inferior position in the community; because he suffered ill-treatment at the hands of the wealthy classes. Have the women of Canada the same motives to impel them to desire such legislation as this? I answer, no.

It is said that woman desires the right to vote in order that she may be able to affirm that she is on an equal footing with man. Does she not realize that under existing conditions she is far superior to man, and that to be equal is to renounce that superiority? Does she not fear that by assuming the functions especially exercised by men up to this time, she may lose much more than she can ever hope to gain? The women of this country have rights, and they also enjoy privileges. A single glance through our civil and criminal codes will convince us that our laws have guaranteed to women a standing in society which is sacred.

Let us also consider the social position of women in the state. Everywhere they are tendered respect, admiration, attention; in a word, they are idealized. This admiration is extended to them because we all recognize their sublime mission; that is to say, the moral and intellectual development of our children. We should not distract them from this great domestic and national duty. I believe that it is a dangerous experiment to take away from our homes those who are so efficient in them and transport them to the slippery and dangerous regions of politics. I am afraid that in the future there will be realized the prophecy made by a great French writer that in all our attempts to make women perfect, we shall simply succeed in making them imperfect men:

Au lieu de faire des femmes parfaites, on ne réussira qu'a faire des hommes manqués.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Chairman, he would be a poor man who would not say something on behalf of women at this crisis. We have heard enough about their being idealized; they are so idealized and so etherealized that they seem to be utterly useless and to have no rights. Let the women alone; let them speak for themselves. Pray, who gave men authority and dominion over them? I am amazed—not only amazed, but chagrined—that there is such a solid feeling on the part of the Opposition against granting women the right of the franchise. To think that the Liberal party, the great Liberal party, led by that illustrious gentleman who leads it now, and who stands so high in the history of this country—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: —should put itself on record as having fought throughout the day and throughout the night a measure to grant to women the right to have a voice in the affairs of this country. Ought they

to have it? We hear this from hour to hour and from mouth to mouth as if some of those hon. gentlemen had the divine right to say whether women ought to have the franchise or not. Pray, who put the destiny of women in their hands? Who made them the judge? They say one minute that women are such superlatively fine beings, and the next they presume to say what they shall do. They put the harness on women; they bind them, as if, forsooth, my hon. friends were the more superlatively fine beings themselves. The inconsistency of the position needs only to be cited to be seen. The truth of the matter is that women stand really on a par with men. If women choose to have children and choose to bring them up, that is their own business. If men hitherto have gone out and earned money to keep the pot boiling and have had, after all, the easy end of it, let them be thankful, without depriving women of the right to vote if they want it. And if they want it, they alone can say. It is presumption for men to answer for them. It is only an attempt to treat them as children. Do I understand that the province of Quebec, the oldest and, in many respects, the most cultured of all the provinces, the seat of so much history, of so much learning, and of so much that is fine in the affairs of this country, wants to stand to one side and put her women behind the screen as if they must be placed, like the Turkish women, in a sort of harem, lest they be looked upon? Nay, rather, they should have a right to look upon the affairs of this world in which they participate and from which they so often suffer.

There is no compulsion about this Bill. If women do not want to vote, they need not do so. If they do wish to vote, let them vote, and let men, instead of treating them with opposition and discrimination, drive up to their houses on the polling day and escort them to the poll, and show them, if possible, the polite way to take part in the affairs of this country, so that they may bring to bear some of that idealizing influence, so that they may put a drop of the ambrosia of the gods, as it were, into the ordinary liquor of every day life. If they can do that, why, let them do it. We need it. The affairs of the world are not so superlatively fine that they cannot be improved. Let them try, but whether they try or whether they do not, there is not one man who dare deny that they have the right to vote. And that point having been granted, to discuss the practical part of the question is simply,

as I have said, to assume a dictatorship over women, which is not only an insult to women but derogatory to man. Notwithstanding the prejudices which actuate so many and which seems to have taken such entire possession of the Opposition, notwithstanding the deep-rooted prejudices, it cannot be gainsaid that women should have the right to vote. And let me say that if my hon. friends should succeed in breaking down this Bill, they will put back the cause of woman for an age, at least, for a decade. Would it not be a nice thing to think that the illustrious women, the splendid women, the average women of this country should owe it to the Liberal party that when they wished to have it they were debarred from having a voice in the affairs of this country? Woman can do kind acts for us; she is allowed the sublime privilege of ministering to our wants; but when indeed, she asks to have a little voice in the affairs of this country the Opposition say: No. They say: You may be our servants, and we shall tolerate and even praise you, but our equals, never. I sincerely trust that the opposition which has been manifested by the Liberal party in this House to this measure is more academic or jocular than real. At any rate, to me, it is absolutely unaccountable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened with a great deal of attention to the various speeches which have been delivered this afternoon and evening on this very important subject of woman suffrage. I think I voice the sentiments of the House in stating that we have listened to new speakers who will be quite an addition to our debating power and I am pleased to say, as hailing from the province of Quebec, that it has given this new Parliament quite an array of talent which the country might well be proud of. I have listened to my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), who is an exile in the Tory part who should be in the ranks of the radical party. He has proved that on many occasions. I am sorry to say, that on this question, he has begged the issue. He exclamed in his opening remarks: "but what, Sir, the great Liberal party is opposed to woman suffrage" —as if it were something new that the Liberal party were opposing a measure of this nature. If my hon. friend will look to England, from which the Canadian Liberal party and Conservative party draw their best inspirations, he will find that in that country the leaders of political thought on both sides have been opposed to woman suffrage. If my hon. friend will accept the

revered name of Gladstone as the best personification of Liberalism during the 19th century, I may tell him—and I shall quote chapter and verse in a moment—that Mr. Gladstone was opposed to woman suffrage. If my hon. friend will come to more recent times, he will find that Mr. Asquith, the great radical Premier of England, was also opposed to woman suffrage. And might I not say, taking another aspect of the question, that if the Liberals, who are in a majority in the Union Government, were true to themselves and true to the cause of provincial rights, they would be with the Opposition on this question? Does my hon. friend believe that the Conservative party in England is a unit on this question? I have read speech after speech, lecture after lecture, by the leading members of the great English Conservative party, and I have found that they also are opposed to woman suffrage. The very agitation which took place in England took away from the woman's cause the most ardent believers in woman's rights.

I am sorry, for reasons which I shall give the committee in a few moments, that the Prime Minister has thought it proper to bring forward this measure at the present time. If I have one reproach to address to my right hon. friend, it is that he is too fond of swimming with the current. He listens a little too complacently to passing whims and he is too ready to grant whatever request is made under the shallow pretext of winning the war. When the Prime Minister was in England two years ago, he was interviewed by Mrs. Pankhurst herself, the leader of woman suffrage.

The press reported that interview, and if my memory serves me well only one day or so before his departure the right hon. gentleman was not persona grata with the Woman's Franchise League in England. He gave the league a very curt answer. I do not forget that when Mrs. Pankhurst came within the precincts of this House some time ago she was introduced by our late lamented friend the member for Dundas, Mr. Broder. Mrs. Pankhurst might be said to be the very personification of woman suffrage, but the right hon. leader of the Government hesitated before giving his assent to her presence on the floor of this House. I remember the remark made by our good friend the late Mr. Broder in introducing Mrs. Pankhurst, "At last, Mrs. Pankurst," he said, "you have succeeded in entering Parliament without a fight."

Let me say at once to my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) whose opinion I generally respect, that when he states the Opposition in this House deliberately insults the women of this country by denying them the franchise, he is quite beside the mark. Those of us who are opposed to woman suffrage—and we are on both sides of the House, because this afternoon the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Fraser) declared himself in a few terse sentences against woman suffrage—do not wish to insult women or belittle their influence, but we wish to keep the woman as the angel of the home; we wish to keep her where she is most needed and where she does most for the family and most for the country. I would qualify my remarks this evening by this statement: I recognize the right of any province of this Dominion to adopt woman suffrage. As has been stated and proven beyond peradventure this afternoon, it is a question of education and environment; it is a question of ambient air. If I were living to-day in the province of Alberta, where my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) introduced and carried woman suffrage through the legislature, or if I were living in the fair province of Saskatchewan or Manitoba I would bow to the verdict of the majority, but I would not agree to imposing woman suffrage on any other province which, for reasons of its own, did not think the time ripe for granting the franchise to women. My hon. friend is surprised to find that outspoken statements have been made on this side of the House against granting the franchise to women, but if he will read the literature on this question he will find that not only men of eminence in politics, in the churches, and in the various walks of life are opposed to woman suffrage, but to his chagrin, that some of the most prominent women in arts and literature are opposed to the granting to the vote to women. Let me mention only two well-known names. I remember some years ago we had the honour of a visit to this country by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, one of the brightest writers of English literature. Mrs. Humphrey Ward is the president of the Anti-Woman's Suffrage Association in England. In the United States Mrs. Everett P. Wheeler, noted for her interest in many social organizations, is also opposed to woman suffrage, and has headed many leagues against the extension of the franchise to women.

I may be told by my hon. friend—indeed, I think he meant to say it this evening—that we are not very progressive on this side of the House, and especially those of us who come from the province of Quebec.

Let me tell my hon. friend that the legislature of the province of Quebec, known at the time as the legislature of Lower Canada, was the first one in the British Empire, and possibly in the civilized world, to elect a representative of the Jewish race. One hundred years ago, Sir, the unprogressive people of Quebec elected the first Jew who ever sat in Parliament, and the city of Three Rivers, represented here today by the ex-Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) was the city which the late Mr. Hart represented in the legislature of Lower Canada. No, we are not unanimous in our opposition to woman suffrage. My hon. friend, who understands French, knows perfectly well that one of the best arguments that could be adduced in favour of woman suffrage was delivered from this side of the House by my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Prevost). He delivered an excellent speech in French in favour of woman suffrage, but always with the qualification that the franchise was a matter of provincial rights, and I shall prove in a moment that it is also a question of civil rights, and therefore appertains exclusively to the provinces.

The reasons why I am personally opposed to woman suffrage are many. War time, as my hon. friend from Welland has said this afternoon, is not the proper time to press such a measure as this, because it is a revolutionary measure. It is difficult, if not impossible in war time—and my hon. friend must realize this after the last election—to discuss matters calmly, and war time, I claim, is not the proper time to introduce a question of such grave import as the one before us.

I do not wish to refer to the meetings which were held during the last campaign. If I have fault to find with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, it is not so much on account of the Franchise Bill, which he passed through closure during the last Parliament in order to obtain the majority of votes, not so much on account of the fact that he duplicated the vote of every soldier, but it is because of the fact that he gave a special franchise to some only of the women of this country during the last election. We had the women, the favoured few, of this country in the various provinces organizing themselves, holding meetings, canvassing, giving the people of this country a sorry spectacle indeed. If I had only one objection to granting women's franchise at the present time, I would say that the meetings which were held during the last campaign were sufficient reason for

me, at least, to hesitate before granting them that franchise. But my objections are on higher grounds. My hon. friend a moment ago uttered a truism. He said that the franchise was a right granted by the state to the individual. A human being, as a member of the community, is a subject of right, and it is desirable that different rights should be recognized by different people at different times, and as attaching to sections of the community. Sir, I am not expressing a reactionary principle. I appeal to the common sense of my Anglo-Saxon friends. No man has studied more deeply the constitution than Professor Dicey, and what does he say? Dicey, I might say, en passant, was carried away by the doctrine of Stuart Mills and was at first a supporter of women's franchise, but he changed his mind later on and, he said:

> The right to vote is in reality not a right at all; it is rather a power or function given to a citizen for the benefit, not primarily of himself, but of the public.

The franchise to women has not been the only right denied by Great Britain and by all other civilized countries. It has been also denied to minors, and why should you deny the franchise to a minor of twenty, for instance, and grant it to a man who becomes a major at twenty-one? Why the distinction is so trivial that no explanation can be given for it. Yet there is the raison d'état which justifies the legislator in denying the franchise in that case. To say that it is an insult to women to deny them the franchise is preposterous. Are there any men in this community, Mr. Chairman, who are better fitted to vote on public questions and to pronounce upon public issues than the judges of the land? Yet they are specifically denied the right to exercise the franchise. Why? Because society deems it imprudent on the part of a judge who represents the sanctity of justice to be dragged into the turmoil of public affairs. The fair name of justice and the fair fame of the judiciary is sufficient reason why the franchise is denied. Might I not say, by way of comparison, that if, for that reason, you deny to the judges of the land the franchise, you also deny it to women, because of your respect for the stability and the sanctity of the home. Mr. Chairman, good citizenship is realized through many functions. Some of the most important, indeed the most important of all, motherhood, is assigned to women. I say further that it is unnecessary to give women votes in parliamentary elections, because, at least with my own race, women wield a great moral influence on the votes

of men. I have had some experience in elections. I have sat in this House for over twenty-two years. I am sorry to say that I am one of the deans of the House, with the leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister, who entered this Parliament the same day as I did in 1896. I have passed through many elections, I know what a crucible it is, and I make bold to say that, when electioneering in the county of Gaspé, and the county of Nicolet or Rouville or Maisonneuve, if I were sure of getting the women for me, I could easily carry the men afterward. They have moral influence, and no candidate will begin an election, in Quebec at least, without securing the good will of the fair ladies of that province. Mr. Chairman, the interests of the women are so intermingled with those of the men that, in safeguarding their own interests, men will, ex necessitate, to use a judicial expression have to safeguard the rights and privileges of the women. Besides, women are indirectly represented by men of intelligence and sympathy, who have the interests of women at heart. Is there a man sitting on either side of the House of Commons who would stand for any injustice being embalmed in the statutes of this country against womanhood? I say there is not one man in this House who would not do his utmost to prevent any injustice being done in regard to the rights of women. Moreover, it is admitted that the women of this country, as of all other countries, have their fair share of intellect, even of genius. They can always agitate, they can always write, and they can speak as much as they can smile. So that their point of view cannot remain unknown. A moment ago my hon. friend was surprised to find that Liberals were opposed to women's franchise. I do not suppose that John Bright was ever a Tory. He was a good Liberal. He was even called a radical in the forties at the time of the passage of the Corn Laws in England. What do I read from John Bright? He was opposed to John Stuart Mill on this question, and he said:

> I act from the belief that, to introduce women into the strife of political life would be a great evil to them, and that to our own sex no possible good could arise. When women are not safe under the charge or care of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons, it is the fault of our non-civilization, and not of our laws. As civilization founded on Christian principles advances, women will gain all that is right for them to have, although they are not seen contending in the strife of political parties. In my experience, I have observed evil results to many women who have entered heartily into the many political conflicts and discussions. I would save them from it.

That is the opinion of John Bright, the great mind of the radical party, and one of the greatest minds of Britain, and of the civilized world. Women, as was stated this afternoon by my hon. friend from Joliette, are unfitted for military service. Is it fair or is it just that women should be called upon to pronounce on a question of peace or war? Because I say, Mr. Chairman, if you give the women of this country the right to vote, you must be logical, you must be consequent with yourselves. If she has the right to vote, she is eligible. If she can be elected to this Parliament, then she will have the right to pass judgment on questions of peace or war, while she is labouring under a disability and is unfitted for military service. I have just quoted a few words from John Bright. Might I quote Cardinal Gibbons, who has summed up, in a few terse sentences, all his objections against this franchise? He said:

> When I deprecate female suffrage I am pleading for the dignity of woman. I am contending for her honour. I am striving to perpetuate these peerless prerogatives inherent in her sex, those charms and graces which exalt womankind, and make her the ornament and the coveted companion of man. We must remember that, though woman does not personally vote, she exercises the right of suffrage by proxy. So powerful is the influence which a sensible matron exerts over her husband and sons, that they will rarely fail to follow her counsel, which comes from an inspired instinct, rather than from laboured reasoning.

My right hon. friend, in introducing this Bill the other day, said that the women of Canada had done an admirable work during the present war. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my right hon. friend that Canadian womanhood has given the world a great example. We have seen in every home, in every hamlet, in every village, and in every city of this Dominion, our womenfolk doing its utmost to afford comforts to the boys at the front. It is not through a lack of chivalry, or a lack of recognition of the admirable work performed by the womanhood of Canada, that we oppose the granting of this franchise. Rather is it to preserve the chivalry which exists as between man and woman and the good standing of the community that I am opposed to female franchise. The women of this fair land should not be embroiled in the bitter party conflicts of Canada, because we wish to preserve the unity, purity and sanctity of the home. If political ideals are divergent in the home, what will be the result? Domestic controversy will ensue. The words of Mr. Gladstone on this question are appropriate. He says:

A permanent and vast difference has been impressed upon women and men respectively by the Maker of both. I for one am not prepared to say which of the two sexes has the higher and which has the lower province. I am not without the fear, lest beginning with the state, we should eventually be found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental and more sacred, the precinct of the family and should dislocate, or seriously modify, the relations of domestic life.

In all frankness and sincerity, I must say to my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that Mr. Gladstone never insulted the women of England, he never insulted any one in his life, and I prefer his reasoned judgment on this question to that of my hon. friend. We should not burden the majority of women with a responsibility, which, I believe, they do not want. To use the words of another Radical, and possibly the leader amongst the men of letters in this country, Mr. Goldwin Smith:

It is the course of nature that man particularly does uphold the Government and enforce the law.

To sum up my objections, I say that woman suffrage implies not only the casting of the ballot, but the entering of women into the field of politics. Politics is modified war. We saw it during the last campaign. There is struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart-burning, excitement and agitation, all things which are out of harmony with the true character of womanhood.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me examine this question from another angle. All those hon. members on the other side of the House who have a fond recollection of ever having belonged to the Liberal party, should, even if they support woman suffrage, oppose this Bill. The Bill is the thin edge of the wedge in the sense which I will explain to the committee. The Bill implies a uniform franchise in the Dominion of Canada. Liberals in all parts of Canada, whatever may have been their differences or their contentions about certain issues, have always united on the question of provincial rights. There is here a concrete question of provincial autonomy. This Bill aims at a uniform franchise.

This is not the first attempt which has been made in Canada to put upon the statute book a uniform Franchise Act. At the first session after Confederation Sir John Macdonald, who was the apostle of legislative union, introduced a Bill in favour of a uniform franchise, but he withdrew it. In the seventies he introduced another Bill founded upon the same principle. Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion, who was one of the leaders of the Opposition, moved an amendment, and Sir John Macdonald again yielded and withdrew his Bill. Finally Sir John came before the Parliament of Canada and introduced the famous Franchise Act of 1885, by which he undertook to get a uniform franchise for the Dominion. He instituted the famous organization of the revising officers. The Liberals who sit on the other side of the House must remember the plucky fight which was put up at that time by their late leader, the Hon. Edward Blake, Sir Richard Cartwright, the Hon. David Mills and the right hon. gentleman, the present leader of the Opposition. Sir John Macdonald was in favour of centralization as against local liberty. The principle of centralization was, and is, antagonistic to the very federal principle which governs this country. The Bill was fought energetically by the then Opposition, but it passed after a protracted debate, and in the elections of 1887 and 1891 the Liberals had to face in every constituency a franchise made by revising officers created and paid by the Government of the day.

So incensed, so disgusted were the people of this country that in 1896, when not only the school question but the question of the franchise, was fought out, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was justified to present new legislation. It was introduced during the session of 1897, or 1898, and by that new legislation the Parliament of Canada reverted to the principle of the provincial franchise, and it has elected us ever since. There has been no agitation to return to the revising officers of old. On the contrary, the people have declared time and again in favour of the principle of the provincial franchise. It is the best adapted to our people. We are all elected upon the particular franchise of each province. I may be told by hon. gentlemen that this diversity of franchise constitutes an anomaly. But, Sir, let me again go to the source of parliamentary government. Let me read the opinion of that great exponent of British Liberalism, Edmund Burke.

Government has been deemed a practical thing made for the happiness of mankind and not to furnish a spectacle of uniformity to justify the scheme of visionary politicians.

No doubt, it would be an excellent thing if in this country, so large and yet sparsely settled, with different provinces and populations, we could have one language and one law. That would be considered the millennium. But that is only the scheme of a visionary mind, as Burke said. In the United Kingdom, they have not uniformity of laws. Scotland has laws differ-

ing from those of England. It is a strange spectacle for one who has attended the sittings of the Privy Council in England to hear one day counsel from the province of Quebec arguing in their own language and citing their own French laws; and, next day, to hear counsel from the Channel Islands again cite the old laws of Normandy. Again, Indian counsel argue on the law of Manou. Still again, there is Mauritius, with its own French laws. Then there is the common law of England. In some of the other colonies, Roman law and Dutch law also. So cast away from your mind, Mr. Chairman, the idea of uniformity in the British Empire. The beauty and the real unity of the British Empire rest on its diversity. So it is with our own Dominion. We have different laws, beliefs, customs; we have different minds on many questions; and it is the duty of a statesman to respect those laws, those customs and those characteristics of each province. An anomaly in our Constitution? Of course. In the province of Quebec, when I was a younger man than I am to-day, alas! I remember that my party, the Rouge party, was deadly opposed to the maintenance of the Legislative Council. Being a little older to-day, I stand for the Legislative Council. Why? Because the Legislature of Quebec, constituted of a majority of French Canadian members, is at times apt to pass hastily-considered legislation, and the older men on the Legislative Council are there to revise the legislation of the Lower House. The people of my province have come to realize that the Legislative Council is, after all, a useful institution, though it may not be as useful in other provinces. There is, I think, a Legislative Council to-day in Nova Scotia. It has been abolished in New Brunswick and in Prince Edward Island. Yet, it is an anomaly; in some provinces, they have only the popular legislative body, and we, in Quebec, have the bicameral system. The same anomaly exists as regards the franchise.

A franchise, Mr. Chairman, must suit the particular circumstances of the community. We have nine provinces in the Dominion. There are different elements in our population; we have a different territory. It may be, and I believe it is, a good thing in Alberta and Saskatchewan, where the homes are so distant one from the other and the population is sparse, and where you have a medley of races, to have a woman franchise. If I were living in those fair provinces, I should certainly accept the verdict of the majority in that respect, the golden principle in our country being that the majority rules. But, Sir, each of the provinces knows its own peculiar circumstances, conditions and sentiments, and, furthermore, its passions and prejudices.

Let me again recall to my hon. friend the ideal which should prevail in public life. We must have national unity in Canada. To reach that goal, we must not only respect the qualities and the virtues of our fellowmen, we must also respect their prejudices and their passions. That is the great test of national unity. The franchise, I submit humbly, is a civil right, and civil rights come within the ambit of the provincial legislature. Mr. Chairman, will you allow me to give you the authority of Storey on this point:

> The truth seems to be that the right of voting, like many other rights, is one which, whether it has a fixed foundation in natural law or not, has always been treated in the practice of nations as a strictly civil right, derived from and regulated by each society according to its own circumstances and interests. It is difficult, even in the abstract, to conceive how we could have oherwise been treated.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the question of franchise is a civil right, as it is, it belongs exclusively to the provincial legislature, and I claim that the Dominion Government has no right to invade or to impinge on that domain. In the United States, where the Federal principle is supreme all over the land, the question of franchise is relevant only to state legislatures. In the republic to the south the states themselves determine what their respective franchises shall be; and so it happens that in some of the western states, women may vote in federal elections, while in many other states they are denied that right. To use the words of the late Mr. Blake when citing that example during the famous debate of 1885: "There you have the reason and the theory, the practice and the experience of the federal principle."

I said a moment ago that we drew our inspiration from England in matters of legislation. Although England, Scotland and Ireland have a legislative union, it is a fact that the franchise in each differs considerably. In England the franchise is controlled by the minor municipal bodies, not by the central Parliament. On this point let me quote the admirable words of the late Mr. Blake:

> Now, the English system has for its basis the local making of the lists. I have spoken of local liberties in the sense of provincial liberties; but I say that municipal liberties are not less important. It has been recognized in England by the students of free institutions

that the nurseries of larger liberties are minor local liberties; and that the powers of action of municipal bodies, within their narrow sphere of executive work of business done, and of functions and privileges enjoyed, are of the greatest consequence, as educating the people in the general principles of representative government; and in those restraints, under constituted authorities, which are essential to the establishment of a democratic, and yet orderly and stable system of Government, I say, then, that the privileges which the municipalities enjoy in England, of making the lists through their overseers and officers, are ancient and important privileges, and if the hon. gentleman defers to British practice, he had better follow it here.

I also defer to British practice on this question. We have had no general agitation throughout the country in favour of the adoption of a federal measure of woman suffrage. We have had in a restricted degree an agitation for woman suffrage in some of the provinces; I do not object to the granting of the franchise to women in such cases. But no petition in favour of Dominion-wide franchise for women has been sent to this Parliament, and I do not see why at this moment, under the flimsy pretext of giving votes to women throughout the Dominion, we should ignore the first cardinal principles of our constitution. I am willing to give the women of my province the franchise if they ask for it and if the majority votes for it. Living in Ontario, I should have no objection to woman franchise if it is the will of the majority. It would be a provincial franchise, and that is the only franchise which constitutionally elects the members of this Parliament.

Mr. GLASS: The hon. gentleman says that if the women of the province of Quebec asked for the franchise he would be willing to grant it to them. Will he tell me whether the women of his province have ever had an opportunity of expressing themselves on this subject?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There has been in all the provinces—mostly throughout the West—some agitation in favour of woman suffrage. In the province of Quebec we have women of the highest intelligence, some of whom are leaders in social works, yet there has been no concerted action on their part in favour of woman suffrage. I think I am right when I say that the majority of the women in the province of Quebec to-day are safe in the hands of the men, and do not care to exercise the franchise.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (York East): I desire to congratulate the Prime Minister on having brought forward this very advanced and progressive measure.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind members of the committee that the same decorum must exist in committee as in the House. There is altogether too much conversation. Members are not obliged to remain here; if they do not want to listen to the speakers I would ask them kindly to retire from the chamber to carry on their conversation.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Our American cousins to the south have also brought forward an advanced measure similar to this, and action along this line has been taken in England as well. Many of the hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think that this measure should be a provincial, not a Dominion measure. I do not agree with that view; I think that the law should be made applicable to the whole of the Dominion.

An hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon said that some 2,000 to 2,100 women were qualified to register in his riding in Montreal, but that 3,000 either registered or made the attempt to register, showing that they were anxious to have the franchise. The hon. gentleman did not tell us how many of the 2,100 who were qualified to vote actually did vote. If out of that number 1,500 or 2,000 voted, I would say that the women of his riding were sufficiently educated and sufficiently advanced in their ideas to vote, especially when they thus evidenced their appreciation of the opportunity of exercising the franchise.

It has been said that it is necessary, before extending woman suffrage to all the provinces, that there should be a campaign of education whereby the women would become qualified to vote intelligently. That may be the case in one or two provinces, but I think I can speak for Ontario and some of the western provinces, and say that the women in these provinces do not require to be further educated, to enable them to vote intelligently. They are to-day well educated along that line. That was proved in the recent Dominion election. In my constituency some 3,000 women were eligible to vote and out of that number some 2,700 exercised the franchise. I may say that they did not spoil their ballots, their ballots were properly marked and they took a great interest in the election. At one of my public meetings I had the honour to see presiding the first lady who occupied the chair at a political meeting, and I know of no man who could have discharged the duties of that position better than she. That shows the capability of women to exercise the franchise.

In performing all the necessary duties in a campaign, and in taking an interest in all matters pertaining to an election, women are well qualified. I think that, even in the province of Quebec, if the women had the opportunity, they would show the men that they were quite capable of exercising the franchise. Women have been tested, and have shown their capabilities to occupy public positions. In Toronto we have had two lady representatives on the School Board. We have had the franchise extended to women in the election of mayor, aldermen, and controllers of the city, and invariably in municipal elections the women take great interest. You do not have to send automobiles to their homes to take them to the polling booths; they go to the polls and vote and return to their homes without any urging, thus showing the deep interest they take in municipal matters. If that is so, why should they not take an equal interest in Parliamentary elections? Have we not, in the western provinces, extended the franchise to women? Have we not lady representatives in some of the provincial legislatures in the West? Judging from those who have been elected, I would prophesy that they will make very capable representatives in those legislatures. If women are a success in municipal and provincial matters, surely we can extend the franchise to them in Dominion matters. We should have no fear of their capabilities. If women had the franchise in Dominion matters, I think there would, in many cases, be better results. The women would not be so apt to play politics as perhaps some of the men are. When an election comes on some men whom one might call politicians will say: Well, there is an election coming on in a couple of months; we must size up the leaders of both parties; there is Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the one side and Sir Robert Borden on the other. After reviewing the situation, they will say: Well, if I do not support Sir Robert Borden I may be disappointed; he is the one that I shall support and I hope that he will be elected; if he is elected, I expect, on account of my influence and the energy and work that I have thrown into the campaign, that I shall succeed in getting some favour for my company. If he is not a commercial man, he may feel that some title should be bestowed on him for the good work he has done and the results he has produced in the campaign. He might say: I do not think I shall follow Sir Robert Borden; I shall make my choice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because I know from past experience that he has been generous; if I want to build a railway similar to the Grand Trunk Pacific, there is no doubt that Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be generous, and in that way it will be worth my while to vote for him. Thus, with the men, there is that danger of playing politics for the benefits that they may get out of the game. My experience is that whn you extend the franchise to the women they will not play the political parties for the benefits they may get out of them, but they will play their part with the greatest of honest simplicity and thought. They will say: How will this affect my home; in making my selection of the one I shall support, my first thought shall be of my home, my family and my general surroundings; from which of the parties shall I get the best results in those regards? They will thus accomplish more for their homes, their families and their general surroundings if they receive the franchise. There is, therefore, not any danger in granting the franchise to women. We can trust them. Two hon. gentlemen opposite referred to the days of Napoleon and John Bright. The opinions of those men in those days can be explained, but what would their positions be to-day? If John Bright occupied the position of Premier of England to-day, his opinion, in my judgment, would be quite different from what it was in those days. By extending the franchise to the women of England he would show his appreciation of the great work that has been done in this war through the women's organizations. Why should he not do so? Are we not all proud of the part the women have taken in this great war? Have not the boys overseas appreciated what the women have done? Have they not gone on their knees night after night offering up prayers to the women of Canada, to their mothers, their sisters, and others for the great work they have done and the comforts they have given them? Are the women not going into the munition factories and on to the farms? Are not thousands of them operating machinery? Have they not shown ability in that work equal to that of men? Are not thousands of them drawing equal pay with men? And, if they are doing equal work, they have a right to receive equal pay. If they have performed all those duties and accomplished so much good, surely the least we can do is to extend the franchise to them.

It is certainly then a progressive idea to bring a measure of this kind forward,

showing that the Government is listening to the sentiment and feeling that prevails over the whole country. Why should we misinterpret that sentiment? From my experience in cities and different ridings, I believe a strong sentiment prevailed throughout the Dominion that the franchise should be extended to women.

My experience in the West has been that there is that general feeling, and if there is the general feeling that the franchise should be given to women after this thorough test of whether they are the equal of the men—and I say they are the equal of the men—it is our duty to extend the franchise to the women in appreciation of the great work they have done. Do you not think there will be great rejoicing among the four hundred thousand of our boys overseas when they hear that this Bill has passed this House and that their mothers and sisters and other female relatives who have been working morning, noon, and night to help them, are to be given the right to vote? I appreciate very much the Premier's action in bringing this measure forward. It is a Dominion measure, not a provincial measure. It has been suggested by several members on the other side of the House that this is a question for the provinces to deal with; I do not agree. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has spoken of some of the western provinces, and he thinks it quite right that the women in those provinces should have the franchise. Well, if he is consistent, why should not the women of all the provinces have the franchise? He should be consistent and say: Give it to the women of this whole Dominion; they are as well qualified to vote as are the women in the western provinces.

Mr. E. D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Before confiding to the House the few remarks I wish to make on the important question which forms the subject of this debate, I would like to cite an instance to the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) which will prove that his statement is not true when he claims that the province of Quebec always gives proof of narrow-mindedness. I shall cite an instance which has to do particularly with the county which I have the honour of representing here. I wish to inform him, should he not know it, that on the suggestion of the great Lafontaine, Robert Baldwin, beaten in his own province, was elected in the county of Rimouski, the most beautiful county of the province of Quebec. I cite this incident to show that it is not always right to arouse popular passions and prejudices, and on all occasions to strike at the back of Quebec in an effort to prove that we are behind the times and that we are shortsighted people.

The hon. member for Peterborough said also, in the course of his speech that we, of the Opposition, we, the members from Quebec province, had no mission from our women, nor from the women of the country generally, to come here and oppose this legislation.

I might say the same thing to him and ask him if delegations of women came to him begging that he would champion this measure.

Mr. Chairman, for my part, I would believe myself guilty of a serious lapse of duty towards the voters who did me the honour of electing me as their representative, if I were not to submit to the House the reasons which prompt my opposition to the present Bill.

I am entirely aware of the sentiments of my constituents towards woman suffrage, and I know perfectly well that the women of my county haven't the least desire to vote at Federal elections.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not beat around the bush. I am opposed to this legislation, on principle, because I believe it to be radical and inopportune. By obliging woman to take part in our political contests and quarrels you are forcing her out of her own noble rôle. Woman's place is not at political rallies, on election committees or in the polling-booth.

The ideal spot for woman is the family fireside. Isn't she, in all truth, the angel of the hearth, which she has helped to establish and of which she is the most beautiful ornament?

The application of the law of woman suffrage will necessarily contribute to the destruction of family unity and to the decrease of that respect which man must have towards woman. What quarrels we will witness, and how many interminable disputes; all of which will be the result of our own deeds, if we adopt this Bill which gives to the women of this country the right to vote.

I am surprised, I find it strange, Mr. Chairman, that a Government which calls itself a Union Government should bring up this legislation which is foreordained to cause disunion in most of our Canadian homes. And I wonder what respect men will have for the woman voter, the woman organizer, who lend themselves to all sorts of low machinations so as to favour such and such a candidate or such and such a political party.

If we wish to safeguard for woman that respect from man which is her right, let us not, by granting her the franchise, deprive her of that dignity and daintiness which make of her the most delightful and most exquisite of creatures.

In my humble opinion, I believe I can assert that woman suffrage is immoral and that it will, of necessity, result in regrettable and irreparable disasters.

So, let us leave our women beneath their own roof with their husbands and their children. There they will fulfil their true function, that of rearing noble and valiant defenders for their Canadian fatherland.

Mr. STACEY: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of those who have spoken, especially to those I was able to understand. One gentleman, whose name or constituency I do not know but from somewhere in the East, stated principles with which I most heartily agree, and I wish to take him at his word at that particular point where he said he would advocate a policy of education, of enlightenment, of instruction, study and research, or words to that effect. I think that is right, and permit me to say that for a generation at least that very policy has been in operation among the women of this country, to such an extent and with such a result that from the spot where we now stand to the Pacific ocean there is not a foot of ground which is not hallowed with the presence of a political atmosphere that recognizes no distinction of sex. The women of the West have given a great deal of study and attention to this question, and so have the men, with the consequent result that, in the provinces west of the Ottawa river, without exception, the women have equal privileges with the men. We have in each of the two extreme western provinces a woman sitting in the local legislature. And why should not women sit there? In one of those provinces, from which I have the honour to come, there is a woman in the local legislature. Her husband was formerly an ornament in that legislature, and was a member of the provincial cabinet. If I mistake not she has given three or four sons for the defence of her country, and at the voice of her fellow-citizens she accepted a nomination, and obtained a majority of some 3,000 over her male competitors. She was accorded a most hearty welcome in the provincial House, which House she graced as an ornament, not merely because she is a woman, but because of her capacity to discuss provincial and other questions. And why should this not be so? I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments and statements of the members of the Opposition on this question. Why should there be a distinction between man and woman in the sole item of franchise? Men and women equally recognize the law and obey the law; there is not a law prohibiting certain crimes which applies only to man and exempts women. But, when we come to the door of the polling booth, in the past women have been prohibited from entering because of their sex, although in mental capacity and general ability they are fully the equal of men. Why should they be debarred from the expression of their convictions at the polls? They have a right to express themselves because of their services to society and their contribution to the intellectual and moral wealth of the community and of the State.

I have listened also to the address of the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) who has spoken of himself as one of the deans of the House. I had listened to his remarks up to this stage with a very great deal of interest, but I confess that to-night I was disappointed. It may be because of my parliamentary youth. Why, Sir, I believe this is the year 1918; we are not in the last century. If reference be made to the action of celebrated British statesmen and their deliverances in the latter half of the last century, why not go back a little farther? For, if we do we shall find equally celebrated British statesmen unwilling to grant the franchise to men. It is only in comparatively late years that a practical manhood suffrage law has been in force in England. They have grown. But why go back to that date in English history when to-day we find that in England the franchise has been extended to women? They have grown, they have widened, they have seen the obligation resting upon them as citizens and they have granted what the women in England have asked for and what the most advanced conviction of English manhood believe to be their right to enjoy.

One other argument advanced by the hon. gentleman was that women were unfitted for military service. I felt like hanging my head when that statement was uttered. Look at the state of affairs in England to-day. Look at the countless thousands of women who are working their full time and every day for the defence of the realm. Look at the women who are taking the places of men in, as far as I know, every avenue of life, every avenue of manual labour—working on the farms,

driving motor cars, acting as conductors on tramways, taking their places in the munition factories by the tens of thousands. Is any one justified in saying that these women are unfitted for military service? Does military service simply mean taking your position on the firing line? Hon. gentlemen on the other side have been telling us that there were men in their provinces who were engaged in agriculture and that that was a form of military service. I grant it. But is it not a form of military service to supply the men at the front with the munitions and the materials of war? Surely military service is not confined to pointing a gun?

The records of the past will show that in all forms of active national service in the history of mankind woman has taken her place and done her full share. There is no question in regard to that. Military service is such a broad term that I take it that every man and woman who does his utmost for the Empire, for the protection of society and for the great principle for which we are all striving is deserving of the qualification of being fitted for military service.

Another point spoken of by my hon. friend —and I hesitate to state it here at this hour —was the necessity of preserving our chivalry towards women. I endorse that most heartily. But, Mr. Chairman, let us remember that we cannot preserve our chivalry while we allow women to remain under this injustice. We cannot have them retain our respect, and we cannot secure and hold their respect, if we are unwilling to do the right thing by them. It is certainly at this hour in the world's history, the right thing to recognize their equality in the realm of active life, and the only way to secure and preserve their respect and confidence is to grant them the privileges which we as citizens enjoy and not condemn them to inferiority because of the accident of sex.

My hon. friend to whom I first referred showed his true manhood, I think, in his closing words. His remarks seemed to me to suggest a political argument. He argued against woman suffrage, but I noticed that when he came to the conclusion his bigness of heart shone forth and his manhood expressed itself when he said that he hoped soon to see women in the position in which this Bill seeks to place them. If I understood him correctly, that was his concluding remark. That is characteristic, I believe, of men all over. Many talked against this reform, and I would fain think that if there are men on the other side of the House who talk against it it is because they are in Parliament. They feel that to grant women the franchise is the right thing to do and when it comes to the vote, and to the decision I trust they will not act against their better convictions.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat late in the evening to attempt to say anything new about this very important Bill. But there are, perhaps, some observations which can be made on it with regard to features which have not been touched upon before. There are two objections to this Bill generally. There is a great deal in favour of the Bill, but I will first mention two general considerations against woman suffrage. The first general objection is that it may possibly create a certain amount of friction at election time if the husband belongs to one political party and the wife to another. I think that is an objection which should be considered, although I do not believe it is strong enough to offset the good features of the Bill. The main objection to the measure is that which John Bright found to a proposal for woman suffrage towards the end of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Woman suffrage is not a new proposal in British countries. It was about 1873, if I mistake not, that John Stuart Mill introduced into the British House of Commons a Woman Suffrage Bill, and it was defeated, but received a surprisingly strong support at that time. John Bright on that occasion voted in favour of the Bill; but subsequently, he voted against the Bill, and the reason he gave for so doing was that it would enormously increase the power of the church in politics both in Great Britain and in Ireland. Now, we are all, I take it, anti-clericals. None of us want to have the church trench on the state; none of us want to have either priest or minister suggest, dictate or exhort from the pulpit what attitude his flock should take on a political question. And there is no question but that at the beginning of woman suffrage it may increase the power either of the priest or the minister of religion. We Liberals in the province of Quebec have for years and years stood out against clerical interference in politics. There is an interesting case in the law reports of our province where an election was set aside because a parish priest had unduly endeavoured to influence his flock to vote for one candidate rather than another. We have set our faces against that. For forty years and more the Liberal party in Quebec fought against that attitude of mind on the part of the church, and we stopped it. And, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen

in other provinces, as well as in Quebec, have got a work to do along these lines in regard to the ministers of other churches, because in the last election we had a very sad condition arise. We found that ministers of the Gospel did not confine themselves to advocating principles, but they stood up on the Sunday before election day and told their flocks for which party they were to cast their votes. Now, I am no enemy to the Christian church; I hope I am a humble member of that body. I remember on the Sunday morning before election day that in a church in the county in which I was running a certain circular letter—a mandement we would call it if it came from a bishop in our province—came from a certain committee on social and moral reform of a very great church in this country, and those ministers who read it exhorted their flock to vote for one political party rather than another. That happened on the Sabbath morning. I did not go to church that morning; I thought there was going to be something like that, and I thought I would rather not hear it or be tempted to walk out, as a number did do on that morning. In the evening I went to church, and there the minister prayed the Lord for guidance for the people that they should vote in the way that their conscience and mind dictated, and you could not tell from his sermon whether he was going to vote for me or for my adversary, and I do not know which way he voted. That was the proper attitude for a clergyman to take. This question of clerical interference in politics touches very closely the subject we are now discussing, for women are more religious animals than men are, and are more likely to be affected by either the priest or the minister. Now, I trust that we shall have no more of this in Canadian elections. I trust that the ministers and the priests of all churches will see to it that they render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.

Now these are two points against woman's suffrage on the surface; I do not think they go down to the root of the matter. I am in favour of the principle of this Bill. The husband and wife may disagree even if one of them has not got the vote. The fact that both of them have the vote may lead the husband to endeavour to convert the wife. It will be worth while, for she will have a vote. And the wife, of course, will not cease her efforts to convert the husband. The unbelieving husband may be saved by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife may be saved by the believing husband. And, as regards clerical domination, it is just as well for women to have the vote, because that will raise them in their own self-respect and it will make them in time less prone to take political direction from their husbands, or their ministers, or anybody else.

What are the arguments that can be, and have been, brought forward against giving women the vote? There is the argument that woman is queen of the home. I often think she is more really queen of the dishpan or of the washtub. The idea that a woman sits regally enthroned by the fireside is very pretty, but it is not according to facts, because, as a rule, women have to work longer hours, go through greater drudgery, and enjoy fewer holidays than men do. The idea that women are going to be in any way lowered by mixing in politics does no credit to the political atmosphere of this country. If our political atmosphere is low we must endeavour to raise it to make it worthy of the women we are admitting to our ranks to-night. It has been suggested that women will have to go to political meetings. Of course they will. I will say that they go to political meetings already; they certainly do in the county which I have the honour to represent. So far as the children are concerned, I have seen a grandmother come along with a daughter, accompanying the father and with a tiny baby who was placed on the schoolhouse desk and who slept peacefully all through the meeing.

An hon. MEMBER: Small families.

Mr. McMASTER: Small families, my hon. friend says. Political meetings do not come along at all times. Most women do their own work, and are very busy, but most are able sometimes to get out to church even in the country districts. They are able to attend social functions at times, and there is no reason why they should not attend political meetings when they want to. It is for us to see that political meetings are conducted with such fairness and decorum that it will be an honour for women to attend them. I believe that their presence always tends to make debate more moderate. And let me say this, Mr. Chairman, politics will not become less bitter when the ladies come into it. We saw that very plainly in the last election. The ladies are often prone to bring a personal element into a discussion which men do not. But that is possibly due to their training; possibly after they have

been voting for some time they may tend to view matters from not such a close personal point of view.

Now, I would not like hon. gentlemen opposite to think that because certain of us from the province of Quebec are not in favour of woman suffrage we are any less gallant than the rest of the country, because that is not so. The reason for it is that in the province of Quebec the woman in the family occupies as high a position and is as much looked up to—more looked up to—than anywhere else in the Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McMASTER: I will say as much; we won't make any invidious distinctions. What I mean is this: I believe that the inhabitant of the province of Quebec is as prone to consult his wife and to be guided by her opinion on every important transaction in life as people are anywhere else in the Dominion of Canada. I think that perhaps one reason why there has been no demand among the vast majority of the women of Quebec for the vote—and that is absolutely true, there has been no great demand from the women of the province for the vote—is because they have had a very large influence in politics and in social life through the simple fact of their position as wife and mother. There is no place in the wide world where family ties are stronger, where father and mother receive more affection and more respect, than in the province of Quebec. The law of that province creates a partnership between man and wife. All the movable property—the personality, as you would say in the English-law provinces—which either of the consorts owned at the time of marriage goes into the partnership fund. All real estate which they acquire during the marriage falls into the community property; that is, generally speaking, there are exceptions. During the marriage the husband controls that community property, but when he dies he can only will half of it away; the wife who survives the husband becomes immediately the owner of half the joint acquisitions which have been made during the lifetime of the husband, the theory of the law being that the wife by her work in the house and by her prudence and economy does just as much to build up the family fortunes as the man does by his work. There is a statement of law in the province of Quebec that the husband is the "seigneur et maître," that is, lord and master, of the community. But, as our professors told us in college, that is only a legal fiction; the husband is not lord and master of the community; he is the joint partner—the senior partner perhaps only in name, because he has to consult the junior partner all the time. I make this explanation because I do not want hon. gentlemen from other parts of the country to have the impression that we of the province of Quebec wish to keep the women in a place inferior to ourselves. Those gentlemen who have spoken out against the Bill are interpreting in a large measure the views of the women of the province of Quebec who are not anxious for the vote. But my contention is that there are women in the province of Quebec who wish to have the vote, and even if the majority do not want to have it, that is no reason for keeping the vote away from those who want it—and there is no law to compel people to vote who do not want to do so. I am, therefore, in favour of the principle of the Bill.

But I wish to direct the attention of the committee to section 2 of the Bill, which reads as follows:

> 2. This Act shall be construed as one with the Dominion Elections Act, chapter six of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and The War-time Elections Act, chapter thirty-nine of the statutes of 1917, and in each of the said Acts the expression "person" or "male person," or any similar expression, shall include a female person, unless a different meaning is required by the context or by the terms of this Act.

It was with deep regret that I observed this clause in the Bill, because it seems to indicate that the Government propose to keep on the statute book an Act which I consider to be a blot on the fair name of Canada, that is, the War-time Elections Act. This Act was described by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) the other evening as having been passed for certain purposes. I read as follows from his remarks, found on page 404 of Hansard:

> As I say, we had to face—

"We" apparently was the last Borden Administration, as distinguished from the present Union Government.

> As I say, we had to face an adverse vote in Quebec and in the West, and men like myself realized that if the Government had gone to the country without first adopting the War-time Elections Act, the control of the country would have been lost to anti-British—

With that statement, of course, I do not agree in any way; there are no anti-British people in this country. We all desire the success of the Allies; we all have affection and respect for the Motherland, and al-

though we may differ as to the best means to a given end, that does not give hon. gentlemen opposite the right to infer that we are anti-British or anything of that kind. (Reading):

> Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.
> Mr. CURRIE: The control of this country would have been lost by the British element and handed over to the anti-British element for the next twenty-five years.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is quoting from another debate which is not allowed by the rules of the House.

Mr. McMASTER: If I am not allowed to quote further from the debate, I certainly will not do so.

The CHAIRMAN: A member cannot quote from a previous debate during the same session but reference to a previous debate by way of illustration only, would be considered in order.

Mr. McMASTER: That is to say, I may rely on my memory, but not on the written words. Well, my memory is that the member for North Simcoe stated in very emphatic terms that this Government owed its election to the War-time Elections Act; that without it, this Government would have been defeated. Moreover, the hon. member justified the War-time Elections Act on the ground that without it the country would have passed into the control of anti-British people. That is what he said—I do not agree with him. What I would not hopefully, but very respectfully and very earnestly, ask the Government to do is to strike out from this Bill any reference to the War-time Elections Act. Why should a woman from Switzerland or some other part of Europe whose language is German, but who is a true Canadian woman, not have the right to vote? Under the War-time Elections Act a man who came from a country at peace with us, but whose native language was German, lost his vote. I do not wish to go into this matter at length, but I know that other gentlemen sitting opposite think with me that the War-time Elections Act is a blot on the fair name of Canada, and should be removed. We do not wish to see the conferring of the franchise on women tarnished by the restrictions on their voting which are imposed by the War-time Elections Act. The other day Mr. Asquith addressing his constituents at Cupar, Scotland, said that he felt sure of the success of the Allies in this war because the great spiritual forces of righteousness were fighting for us. The War-time Elections Act was morally wrong; it took away from people who were as loyal to Canada as any of us the right to vote just because they happened to come years ago from countries with which we are now at war. Bohemians, Ruthenians, people who had no sympathy at all with our enemies, were deprived of the right to vote. It was not right; it may have been expedient, but I belong to the school of political thought which believes that honour, justice and righteousness are stronger than expediency. I believe that we shall be on the side of the great spiritual forces fighting for righteousness if we, the common people, in Parliament assembled, see to it that in granting the franchise to women, we take away the stain from the Canadian shield and escutcheon by wiping off the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. GLASS: In rising to say a few words in this debate, I do not presume that I shall be able, at this late hour, to contribute any new thought or add to the arguments in favour of granting the franchise to women. But if I did not place myself on record as being in favour of woman suffrage, I feel I should not be doing my duty to the noble women of the district which I represent, who have rendered such splendid service to the nation during these four years of war. I have listened with some interest to my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster), and, for a moment, I was hardly able to understand whither he was drifting. He gave two outstanding objections to granting the franchise to women, first, that it would create friction at election time, and, secondly, that it would enormously increase the power of the church. If his opinion in that respect were correct, I am at a loss to understand why he drifted to the other angle later on. I am reminded of a homely story which, while it may be an old one, is very apropos. A couple of tramps travelling through the country arrived at the gate of a farm where a large collie dog, in his happy, or, as it might have been, unhappy way, was wagging his tail, and at the same time growling and showing his teeth. These men wished to go to the farmer's house so that they might get something to eat. Henry was a little in advance, and Pat was a little in the rear. Pat said to Henry, "Go on, he will not bite you; he is a good-natured old fellow; can't you see he is a-waggin' of his tail." "But," said Henry, "he is also a showing of his teeth, and blest if I know which end to believe."

During a period of many years women have been more or less engaged in election contests in the province of Ontario, and I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the granting of the Dominion franchise to them is liable to cause family friction. I would respect and honour my wife quite as much even if her opinion differed from mine. My hon. friend refers to the possibility of the wife trying to convert the husband and the husband trying to convert the wife. I suppose, under such circumstances, if they were pulling apart and were settled in their views, neither one could be converted. I am reminded of an incident of a public man, a politician, who was on one occasion accosted by a suffragette and asked for his opinion on woman suffrage. He was very ready to answer her question. He said, "Yes, my dear lady, I go further than believing in woman suffrage; I maintain that men and women are equal in every respect." The lady's reply was, "Now, Professor, are you not bragging?"

I have found, in the activities of our women during recent years, that woman has measured up in her powers and capacity for assuming responsibility in every respect equal to man. Let me give an illustration to show the quality of intellect and the capacity of women even amongst the girls of our schools. I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Greater Resources Committee of the province of Ontario, in which it is attempted to show how the boys and the girls in that province assisted in the great work of production last year. In connection with that work a competition was held amongst the schools in the different counties. In each school where the competition took place there were offered first, second and third prizes. The object of the competition was to have the boys and girls write an essay showing the best way in which greater production could be assisted by the co-operation of boys and girls. I find that in one competition, out of the three prizes given, a girl won the first and a girl won the third. I was interested enough to look into the pamphlet further, and I found that in the schools of the province in which the competitions were held, of the first prizes won, 96 went to the girls and 50 to the boys, and out of the total number of prizes, first, second and third, 206 went to girls and 180 to the boys. Some time ago the Canadian Municipal World had an article written by Miss Agnes Chesley, in which she was answering the arguments of Dr. James Murray, who, amongst other points of opposition to woman suffrage, brought forward the following: First, that when the franchise had been extended to women they had not shown an interest in the work; second, that they had not recorded their votes in the proportion that was expected of them. Miss Chesley went on to show that this argument was not borne out by facts. She said:

In New Zealand, according to the latest returns, 82 per cent of the women voted as against 84 of the men. In Australia 57 per cent of the women voted as against 68 of the men. Practically all the women registered, and the percentage of women voters was higher in the settled districts and lower in the unsettled, as might be expected. It is not difficult to understand, in places where the voters have to travel, that it is easier for the men to go than for the women.

She stated further:

In Wyoming, 80 to 90 per cent of the women vote; in Colorado 75 to 85 per cent vote; in Utah, 85 to 90 per cent. In Washington 85 to 95 per cent; in California, a splendid percentage, 90 to 99, and so on through the list. Statistics show conclusively that where women have the vote they do use it.

Miss Chesley at that time undertook to make a report as to the conditions in the province of Quebec, to which my hon. friend has referred. She said that at the civic election held at Montreal previous to the writing of the article—that is, at the last election—the Montreal Local Council of Women undertook to get out the women's vote. She continues:

So successfully did they accomplish their big undertaking that the percentage voting was very high, in one ward reaching 90 per cent. I wonder if any ward would show such a high percentage of men voting! At one civil election in a ward of this city, 25 per cent of the men voted. Talk about the apathy of the women! The women of Montreal are vastly more interested in municipal affairs than the men.

If women in that part of the province have manifested such an interest in municipal affairs, it is only natural to conclude that they will manifest a similar degree of interest in the larger sphere of provincial and Dominion affairs. There will be all the more reason as the years go by for the influence of the women in our public affairs, because many of the things on which the provinces will have to legislate go very closely home to the people. The article goes on:

Suppose we now examine a few more of Mr. Murray's preposterous statements and see if they are also based on ignorance. "Even in matters affecting the lives of women and children, the women voters have shown little interest," he says. This is the apotheosis of ignorant dogmatism. The very smallest enquiry into facts would have stopped any pen

from making such a statement. I can go over country after country where women have the vote, and the unanimous testimony of the wisest and best is that the women's vote has invariably been used for his very thing:—the betterment of the conditions under which women and children live. Judge Lindsay writes, "We have in Colorado the most advanced laws of any state in the union for the care and protection of the home and the children, the very foundations of the Republic. We owe this more to Woman Suffrage than to any other one cause." Turning to our own British Empire, Sir John Cockburn writes, after an experience of nearly twenty years in Australia: "It may be safely affirmed that the inclusion of women in the electorate has greatly facilitated the passage of laws safeguarding the welfare of children and women and removing temptations from the path of men."

It is not necessary to quote such statements, because we have other evidence. No statesmen dare say on the floor of the legislature in those provinces where the franchise has been extended to women that it was a mistake. I believe that giving women the vote will raise politics to a higher plane—to a plane which as my right hon. friend has said, would justify women taking a more active interest in public affairs. If our country is growing better, and we think it is growing better from day to day, every move that has been made for a higher civilization and better ideals of citizenship has been due, to a large extent, to the influence of the women behind it. The moral laws, the laws of right, the laws which provide for better care and protection of the home and for better citizenship, have been largely the result of women's influence.

I congratulate the Prime Minister on introducing this Bill at this time. Some hon. gentlemen think this an inappropriate time, but in view of what woman has done for the state in this crisis, in view of her activities and the real serviceable work which she has done, and which has meant so much, I think this House dare not longer deny her the right which, in my opinion, should have been granted many years ago. I believe that in supporting this measure, as I propose to do, I shall be unanimously endorsed by the electors whom I represent.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I am unequivocally in favour of the principle of this Bill. Among the many reasons I have for supporting this Bill, the first is that my mother was a woman, my wife was a woman, and the old Queen Victoria was a woman, and so was Queen Elizabeth; and if there are any two individuals on the earth who have demonstrated the fact that women can exercise public functions wisely it is these two great queens who have given to their several eras their names—so that we speak of the Elizabethan period and the Victorian era. I think there is no question as to the capacity of women to exercise the functions which the franchise will confer on them. Slavery always degrades, and woman has been a slave in this country, in a political sense, until the western provinces gave the franchise to women. Giving the franchise to women will develop public spirit, on the same principle that it developed public spirit in the non-property owner. I am surprised at some of my hon. friends telling us we ought to go back and listen to what the French people and the English people did away back in the night of time. We need not go back to the night of time. It is only a very few years ago that the Roman Catholics in this country and in all the British possessions did not have the franchise.

There is another thing I want to point out. If you give the franchise to any section of the Dominion, it does not follow that the women have to exercise the franchise. The greater includes the less. It is not as if we were taking something away from them; we are giving something to them, which they can use if they like, and if they don't like they can stop home. There is nothing compulsory about it. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier), I think, made use of a fallacy. He was afraid the birth rate would decline if we gave the franchise to women, but at the same time he told us that in old France they did not give the franchise to women. I am speaking of this to show that giving or withholding the franchise has nothing whatever to do with the birth rate. The people of old France, in my judgment, are the first and the only people who have solved the great question of modern civilization in regard to the birth rate. The people of Quebec have followed quite a different policy; they have been increasing their birth rate while the French in the old country have decreased theirs; and there were political reasons for that, and not only political reasons but scientific and national and social reasons.

I say that the great French nation, so far as civilization is concerned, stands ahead of every nation in the world. People of this country do not seem to realize that our present civilization and our present democracy are absolutely new. Why, the world has only been fit to live in for about fifty years as a matter of fact. The reason we have this democracy and this civilization is because of the relief of the congestion of

the populations of Europe by the discovery of America, and the giving room for the people, and giving them time to think. The man who is pressed against the limit in the matter of subsistence cannot become civilized. The man who gets up in the morning and looks for a snake for his wife's breakfast cannot become civilized. Our present civilization depends upon our present democracy, and our present democracy is absolutely the result of immunity from pressing want. But what has happened? What induced this war? This war is more or less the direct result of over-population. The Empire of Germany in my time—and I am not a very old man—and in the lifetime of nearly every hon. gentleman sitting in this House has doubled its population. Since the Franco-Prussian War, 40 odd years ago, their population has doubled. Now, remember the population increases in a geometrical ratio. I am using that term in contradistinction to an arithmetical ratio. Take Germany as an illustration. The German population in forty years rose from forty millions to eighty millions. In the next forty years it will be one hundred and sixty millions and the following forty years it will be three hundred and twenty millions. What about the forty years following! It would be six hundred and forty millions. North of the boundary between the United States and Mexico, at the beginning of this century, we had one hundred million people, in Canada and the United States. In thirty years that population will be doubled, and we will have two hundred millions; in sixty years, four hundred millions; in ninety years eight hundred millions. Given peace, plenty and immunity from epidemics, and there will be nearly twice that many, if Quebec keeps at it at the present rate. According to Malthus, the population of the Anglo-Celtic people, given peace, plenty and immunity from epidemics, will double itself every twenty-five years. Get to work with your pencils and paper and figure out what that means, and think of what the future has in store for the civilized nations of the world. At the same time, remember that I am not discouraging the increasing population. I do not want to do that; Canada is a new, great country, almost illimitable, in one sense of the word, and the first duty of Canadian statesmen is to occupy that land, and make it a white man's country. Another duty we owe, and especially we owe it to the people of this country immediately after the war, is to get as many people in here as we possibly can, so that they will divide up the tremendous public debt, and thereby lessen the debtb per capita, otherwise, we will all have to go out of the country. These are little suggestions, but I should like the House to sit up and take notice, and look to the future, because, as a matter of fact, we do not want to live on a smouldering volcano and not know it is there.

There are some other little points made. Some gentlemen said that women were not the equal of men. Why is that? Simply because they have not the franchise. If you give the women the franchise, I venture to say that in twenty years they will have just as much public spirit as the men, and be just as capable of exercising the franchise, because there is nothing like freedom, nothing like liberty, and nothing like giving people their rights, if you want to develop their character, but you must develop it along lines of self-reliance and not make slaves of them, because slavery always degrades.

Speaking about the influence that the church will have upon women, give them the franchise, and that will obviate the very difficulty that my hon. friend feared; because once the women get the franchise, they will develop the same as the men. It is because women have been driven out of public life and out of taking an interest in the affairs of the country, that they have been driven to patronize the theatre matinee and the five o'clock tea, when they would be a great deal better out of such places. At the same time, I want to draw the attention of the hon. leader of the Government to a principle which I think he would be well advised, and the Government be well advised, to recognize, and that is they should not be showing too many red rags to a bull. The Quebec people are sensitive; they are as fine a class of people as there are to-day in Canada, or any part of the world for that matter, but they are sensitive, and when they see a measure before this House, whether it is a conscription Bill, or Woman's Suffrage Bill, at an inopportune time, they necessarily think that it is aimed at Quebec, particularly if it has that colour. That is what it looks like to a good many of my friends. They feel this legislation is aimed primarily at the province of Quebec, because they do not happen to have women suffrage or for some other reason. I am not going into the generic reasons, because you will recognize the situation as well as I do. That is one of the principal reasons why hon. gentlemen on this side of the House criticise the Bill more severely than they would if my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had introduced

it. I want to warn the Government to be careful and not irritate any class of people in this country. The truth of the matter is this is a young country, and the inhabitants are not homogeneous. But they will become so if you leave them alone. And another thing, if you want to crystallize certain things that you think are evils, persecute the people, because persecution defeats the very end the persecutors have in view. You cannot get a better illustration of that than Old Ireland, where the southern part of Ireland has been persecuted—

The CHAIRMAN: I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to come nearer the subject-matter of the Bill.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: This is very apropos of the Bill. We will leave that alone, however. I was speaking about the Bill and the feeling that my friends on this side of the House have towards it. They feel that it was aimed primarily at the province of Quebec. Let us do away, as far as possible, with this irritation, and I am satisfied the Bill will pass if put to a vote. I do not know that it is worth while for me to speak any further on the subject. I could take up a great many other subjects touching this Bill, but I am anxious to see the Bill become law. However, it is all right to stop at this late hour.

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Chairman, I have never been a believer in the divine right of kings, nor am I a believer in the divine right of men to the franchise. I think women have just the same right to the franchise as men have. It has always been my belief that when Adam gave his rib for the creation of Eve he lost the best rib he had and possibly a good deal of his backbone with it. We are going to give women the franchise. We have no right to withhold it from them and never had. The only fault I have to find with this franchise Bill is that it is a sort of skim-milk proposition. It is siamesed with the War-time Elections Act, and I think that phase of it is objectionable. I think that is practically the only objectionable feature to my hon. friends on this side of the House, or the other side, because there was just as much objection to that phase of it from the other side, when it was last in committee, as there has been from this side. I would like to call attention to the fact that the best speech made in French in favour of the Bill to-day was made on this side of the House by a Quebec member, and I think the best speech in opposition to it was also made on this side. My hon. lessen the debt per capita, otherwise, we favour of the Bill; so are any number of gentlemen on this side. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) was not justified in suggesting that the opposition to the Bill was actuated by a political motive or in talking about eighty-five members on this side of the House defeating a hundred and fifty members on the other side. That was only talking to the gallery, or the press, or his constituents. There is no good reason to my mind why women should not have the franchise. They are just as intelligent and as capable of voting as men are. The women of the constituency which I represent polled a very large vote in the last election. I got more votes in the last election than the combined votes of the candidates in the previous election; so that the women must be voting intelligently. That is another argument that is very much in favour of woman suffrage. I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member from East York (Mr. Foster) when he was explaining the inner workings of the Tory mind and suggesting that it was a good thing to offer the women this inducement. I am satisfied that the women, being honest and honourable, will naturally turn to the honest party in the country and of course this measure must be of great benefit to the Liberals of Canada.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary's, Montreal) (translation): Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I heard the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) express his astonishment that the province of Quebec should be opposed to granting women the franchise. I appreciate his position—which is of a very particular nature—and if the hon. member fails to fully grasp our objections to this Bill, it may result from the fact that he is in the very midst of his honeymoon.

Mr. Chairman, we are not opposed to women obtaining the vote in the other provinces; on the contrary, we believe their mind to be ripe for this reform, as folks are pleased to call it. And if we are opposed to this law it is not because we consider the women of Quebec less intelligent than those in the other provinces; on the contrary we are convinced that they are just as well able as any one to judge political questions at their true value and will use their ballot with both enlightenment and intelligence. But we are opposed to this law because we fail to see, clearly, in what way, from a social point of view, it will improve the situation in our province.

We may well ask ourselves, in the first place, whether or not the women of Quebec have any desire to be admitted to the voting-booth. To this question, Mr. Chairman, we are in a position to give an exact reply, because we have just come from meeting with our constituents in every county of the province, and we may state, in full sincerity, that all the women of the province are strongly opposed to being saddled with the responsibility of the ballot, a burden which they find too heavy for their delicate shoulders.

During the last election campaign we had the opportunity to ascertain whether or not the franchise does improve woman's status, socially. Well, what took place? When the Patriotic Fund was organized, in the very first days of the war, it had been understood that the Fund, which was subscribed to by all the citizens of Montreal, irrespective of race or party, would in no way interfere with forthcoming election contests. That is to say: the Patriotic Fund was entirely neutral in the matter of politics. Now, what happened? At the December elections we saw women, who belonged to this organization, soliciting votes for the Government; we even saw them go from door to door and some of them went so far as to offer money. More than that, Mr. Chairman, on the very day of the election, they organized a Unionist masquerade. In the district of St. Henri-Westmount we saw a certain group of women who were entitled to vote, spend nearly the whole day in the different polls so as to prevent citizens from voting, by making them believe that the polls were overcrowded with people awaiting their turn to mark their ballots.

Such, gentlemen, are the results of the first trial of this granting to women the privilege of the ballot. Now, we are opposed to this proposal of woman suffrage because we find that it is contrary to the character and the temperament of our women in the province of Quebec.

We believe that the sentimental side of their nature is so developed that this would expose them to many dangers.

I will cite only one instance to show that the sentimental side of woman can often be at fault. Last winter, I believe it was, we witnessed an association of women, moved by the imperialist spirit, decreeing, after due deliberation, that an honest citizen, who was exercising his right of free speech,—that is what Mr. Armand Lavergne was doing,—should be thrown into prison.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, was this young man, in taking advantage of his freedom to express his opinions, doing anything else than these women themselves?

He was their best friend, and they wanted, at the time to encroach on his liberty. I wish to draw their attention to the fact that the principles of Armand Lavergne were their own principles in 1911, that he has always been consistent in his manner of reasoning and in 1918 continues to profess the opinions he expressed in 1911. Which all goes to show that nerves are at times unduly influenced and that it is not prudent to grant them a privilege like the franchise.

Now, we are told, as an argument, as a reason, that this is being done all over the world, that it is a well-established current of opinion, in a word, that we need something new in this country. I will admit that we do not require novelty; but, at this time, when thousands of our Canadians are falling on the fields of Flanders; at this time, when those who return to us are disabled, mutilated or contaminated, it is at least strange that we should be presented with this proposal of replacing the family spirit in our country by the spirit of the hustings.

No, Mr. Chairman, it is not by making speeches, it is not by writing articles in the newspapers, nor with lectures, nor with poetry, that, under the present circumstances, the family spirit, which is certainly the most precious for us to nurture, can be replaced.

I must draw your attention to the fact that in the province of Quebec we are not relying on immigration to increase our population; besides I find this hope unfounded even in the other provinces. I must tell those who hear me, that at the present time the gates are closed against immigration. It is not the United States who, after the war, will allow their subjects to come and colonize a depopulated Canada; it is not France nor England assuredly; and still less, devastated Belgium and ruined Serbia. No, Mr. Chairman. Moreover, a barrier will surely be established in this Dominion.

We have a last hope: the immigration of the yellow races; but we fear the yellow peril. If our friends in the other provinces are hankering after this immigration, that is their own affair; but, for our part, we are opposed to having this race enter the country. We claim that the French Canadian cannot be replaced by a Chinaman; and neither can the English Canadian be replaced in this Dominion by a Chinaman.

Mr. Chairman, I will not go on very long, as the hour is late and a number of speakers have eloquently dealt with the subject;

but I must say that, to my mind, politics and the home are two incompatible things.

By granting the franchise to women we will, in a way, oblige them to become well-informed so as to cast their vote in an enlightened manner; in a way we will force them, in order to gather this information, to read all sorts of things; we will oblige them to desert their homes and go to clubs in search of information; we will oblige them to be present at meetings; and we, who have the habit of considering our women with the greatest respect, will be pained to see them set off, bound for those common meeting-places where, perchance, they will leave a little of their reputation.

I do not share the opinion of the English philosopher, Stuart Mill, who maintains that the rôle of woman throughout her whole life is to drag the chains put on her by her husband, for this opinion is absolutely false.

However, I do not say that such a thing could not happen amongst those who are not really married.

This Bill is presented to the House in the shape of a reward. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how we can accept this reward when it means the imposition upon woman of a heavy responsibility which will force her to leave her home to go to rallies, to leave her family, to leave her household duties, so as to fulfil a duty which is far too arduous for her character, her habits and her delicate temperament.

Now, if I understand aright, this Bill is presented to the House as a reward or as a token of gratitude for the services rendered by Canadian women to the divers organizations having for their object the relief of our soldiers and of their families during the present war.

I wish to point out to the hon. Prime Minister that, if such be the end he has in view, there are other means of proving his gratitude to the women of our province, means far more effective than the ballot, which will never dry the tears of so many bereaved mothers, nor soothe the deep wounds left in their hearts by the absence of their sons on the firing-line. This franchise will not console our old men who, because their sons have gone, are forced to bend their backs to labour so as to earn, by the sweat of their brow, a bit of miserable war-bread. No, Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister wishes to reward the devotion of our Quebec women to patriotic undertakings, let him give them back their sons, the object of all their tenderness and their sole interest in life. I may assure him that this form of reward from the Government would be much more appreciated by them.

So I say, in closing, that I am opposed to this Bill, first because it is against Nature, and next because it turns the established social order upside down. Each tree must bear its own fruit and no other. The mission that woman is called upon to fulfil is absolutely incompatible with the rôle which this Bill seeks to foist upon her.

I make bold to hope that the observations made against the Bill will be accepted in good part by the Government. As regards myself, I am convinced that the province of Quebec is not ready to accept this change. Things may be different in the other provinces and against that, we, in the province of Quebec have no objection; but we maintain that it is for the provincial governments exclusively to decide this question. To them belongs the privilege of preparing the voters' lists; and when the province of Quebec is ready to adopt such a radical change she will not fail to take advantage of this privilege, which will put her on the same footing as the other provinces. For the time being, I do not hestitate to say that this Bill shows a very bad policy and constitutes an abuse of power, since it takes a prerogative away from the provinces and gives it to the central authority.

Mr. J. E. LESAGE (Hochelaga): Mr Chairman, it was not my intention to say anything on this subject, but I think it is a duty to my constituents to express my opinion on the Bill. There have been many arguments for and against this measure which have their value and deserve great consideration. I do not think it is necessary to cover the subject as thoroughly as many of the preceding speakers, but I merely want to call attention to certain details, and to explain the reason why I am against this Bill. This question of franchise, if you will look at it in a political way, may suit some localities and certain persons, but I do not think you can advance any reason which will modify in any way the nature of women. I have seen in the United States women elected on school boards. I can very well understand the reason for that, but there I think you will admit they were elected by the people as mothers, not as politicians, in order that they might come in closer contact with the children in the schools. I understand that in that sphere they were very useful following up the work which they had begun at home. In all ages we have found women in hospitals as nurses; we find them in this war taking care of the wounded soldiers at the front, but always

as women, not as politicians. It was within their sphere to follow these different occupations and to perform work appropriate to women. They have done more. It has been mentioned here that they have taken the place of men in the field and in the factory. I can understand that very well. It was the duty of everybody to do what was possible to help win the war. The women did it willingly, they are still doing it in many places, but I am very sure that it was more because of the compulsion of events, and that they will be glad to be relieved when their duty is over and to return where they belong, in the home. It is all very good, Mr. Chairman, to talk of privileges and to bring forward the argument that, because they have done so much for the country, they deserve the right to vote. I believe the natural franchise which belongs to them, and the only one for me is the franchise at home. One hon. member has told us that politics stirs up passion and emotions. The two go together. I believe that if politics leads to these ends, we had better keep our wives at home and the passion there with them. In the province of Quebec, I know very well, as has been stated here, there has not been any particular movement or demand for this franchise. I am sure that the women would exercise it in that province as well as they would anywhere else. But there is one thing sure: if men feel political life to be a burden sometimes, and find that it is a sphere in which one goes deeper and deeper, if you give women the privilege of voting and deciding upon political questions I am much afraid that the privilege will expand a great deal further than it is supposed to do, and I think there will be a revolution in our ideals which will be incompatible with ideals of home life. And that is one reason why I do not agree with the principle of this Bill. I remember that a candidate in one of the counties in Quebec in a certain election was very surprised at being defeated, and all his friends told him after the election: "We loved you so much that we wanted to keep out at home." I love the women so much that I want to do likewise. Allow me to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that in my business I am in close daily contact with them; I know that they want to be respected, and that they should be respected, and I believe I would vote against the Bill, to keep them at home. I have nothing more to add, but, as the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) stated, as an argument for the Bill, that the emotion was so great at one time in his last campaign that even women with little babies came to political meetings, I am of opinion that that is an argument against the franchise. I do not believe that common decency would allow that as an argument for a Bill. There is a limit to everything. It shows an abuse that should be corrected. I do not think that women, enjoying all the rights and privileges which they do, should expect to have the right to vote at this moment.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I promised the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) that I would see him next.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The only reason I desire to speak is that reference has been made to me this evening——

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. The reason I rise at this late hour is because I come from a province where the women may rightly be termed electors. At the time of the last election, I want to point out to the Government, these women in the province of Saskatchewan and in the constituency which I have the honour to represent who had been privileged to exercise the franchise in June of last year and were denied that privilege in December of the same year, do not feel very kindly toward the Government who put them in that position. I notice that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) attached some significance to the fact that in clause 2 of the Bill there is a reference made to the War-time Elections Act. Personally, I am content to accept the statement made by the Prime Minister the other day about this matter in connection with the War-time Elections Act. If I thought that by endorsing this Bill I was in any way endorsing the War-time Elections Act, my vote would certainly be registered against it.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I come from a province where the women have the franchise in the provincial sense at the present time. I was struck with the remark made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He said that if a candidate in the province of Quebec could be sure of the support of the women he would be all right. That remark carried some little significance to my mind; that the hon. gentlemen to the left of you, Mr. Chairman, who have been opposing this Bill are not in the happy position of commanding the support of the women of the province of Quebec. But my

mind was disabused of that thought by the explanation given to the committee by the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), who showed us that in his constituency the women had been enfranchised to a considerable degree, and that they used the franchise.

The women of Saskatchewan—I speak only for those in my own constituency—are looking for just such a measure as this. To my mind they are entitled to it in every sense of the word, and should have had it at the last election, if for no other reason than as a reward for good citizenship, proof of which we have seen ever since this great war began. As evidence of the unfairness of the enfranchisement of some of our women as against the enfranchisement of all, I may point out that nearly all the women of the small village in which I live who have given their time to war work have no sons to send overseas. They worked hard; they burned midnight oil, doing all they could in the way of Red Cross work, knitting socks, and so on; but they were not permitted to cast their vote in the election of last December, while those who happened to have sons overseas and were not in a position, perhaps, to do so much war work, were enfranchised. These things brought home to fair-minded men and women the unfairness of the War-time Election Act.

Some at least of those who oppose this measure must do so from a selfish motive. Often when a man marries a woman he expects her to bury her individuality and merge it with his. But we cannot build up a strong citizenship in this Dominion by building up one-half of our people; we must build up all classes in order to make the development complete. I am guided in my support of this Bill by the old axiom, "Equal rights to all; special privileges to none," and I believe that hon. gentlemen who have opposed the Bill have not been acting in the best interests of the whole of Canada. I hope that when the time comes I shall have the privilege of voting for this Bill, and also of voting to wipe off the statute book of Canada the War-time Elections Act. The people whom I represent have sent me here to do that. Other matters, I have been told, are to rest in abeyance during the war, and I shall not take up the time of the Committee by discussing them now. I am heartily in favour of this Bill.

Mr. MAHARG: Mr. Chairman, were it not for the anxiety that seems to prevail among a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side, I should not have attempted to say anything to-night. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, seem to have been living in an atmosphere of terror almost ever since the opening of this session. They seem to dread the effect of every measure that is proposed, and I wish to attempt to relieve their minds with regard to what they deem to be the probable effects of the legislation which we are now considering.

In Saskatchewan, women have voted in provincial and Dominion elections, and I have been unable to detect any trace of difficulty. If domestic affairs have been adversely effected by giving women the vote, the difficulty lies not with the woman but with the man of the household. Up to the present time the male electors have been giving the franchise to the women, and if they turn round and create trouble in the household, surely it is their own fault.

The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) laid particular stress on provincial autonomy. I agree that we should have provincial autonomy wherever it is advisable, but there is a point where we must draw the line. I desire to emphasize this fact: in all our provinces there have been cesspools of iniquity for the removal of which the vote of the women is necessary. In this respect, then, the limit of provincial autonomy is reached; the Dominion Government must step in and provide legislation whereby such cesspools may be prevented or removed. Our experience in western Canada is conclusive proof that the extension of the franchise to women has been the means of clearing up some of these cesspools of iniquity. I may refer, in the first place, to the almost entire removal of the liquor traffic from Canada. This movement started in a province where the women had the franchise; to the female electorate of the western provinces must go the main credit for this reform. Had the franchise been extended to the women of the province of Quebec two or three years ago there would have been no such evasion of the prohibition law of Ontario as has been evidenced by the traffic across the Ottawa river. The Ontario law did prohibit very largely, but a new vessel was created—called the "self-container," I believe—which worked continuously between the two provinces its particular path being across the bridge that spans the Ottawa river. I shall just go a step further, although this may not be very pleasing to the members of the Cabinet at the present time. Had we had women representatives, not only in this House, but in the Cabinet,

this nefarious trafficking in that, I was going to say, damnable stuff—because it is nothing else—would not have been given another lease of life as it was about a month ago. Recently I spent a week end in an Ontario city where I have some friends who are in business and who require the services of draymen to conduct their business. They told me it was absolutely impossible for them to secure the services of draymen because every possible conveyance that could be secured was being used in the distribution of liquor that had been ordered before the first day of April and it had to be delivered before the first of May. They further told me that the draymen had a full month's business. One of these people had a boy under sixteen years of age who is a particular friend of my friends and who comes of a splendid family. If his people had known in what occupation he was engaged, he would not have been allowed to remain there.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. gentleman to come nearer to the subject-matter of the Bill under discussion. I can understand references to temperance legislation by way of illustration, but I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to go into matters connected with the liquor traffic.

Mr. MAHARG: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but the circumstance was so outstanding that, holding the belief I do, that the granting of the franchise to woman is going to have a considerable effect on traffic of that nature—and that is not the only case; there are a great many of them—I could not refrain from giving you the information.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve also spoke about the influence woman has over man, and how she would affect him in his exercise of the franchise. He stated that if he could secure the support of the women he would be quite sure of election. I have on several occasions listened to the sweet, I might say melodious, voice of the hon. gentleman, and I have often wondered how he cultivates such a sweet, soothing voice, but he has given us the explanation himself here to-night. We shall not have to worry about that any longer.

Another point that the hon. gentleman made was that woman should not have the privilege of speaking on either war or peace. His reason for that was her physical condition, that women were not considered physically fit to go to war. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would be consistent, and if he is, his method of reasoning should apply all the way through. I would ask him: Is he going to abide by the Militia Act and allow only those who are physically fit for the ranks of the army to have a vote in this House? If that were the case, how many of the honourable members present would be sitting here to-night to exercise their vote on this particular Bill. I do not think there would be very many. I, at least, would be counted out, because I would be considered beyond the age at which they would take a person for active service. We must at least recognize some field in which women will be on an equality with men.

My hon. friend also made reference to the Liberals always falling into line in so far as provincial autonomy is concerned. My hon. friend may be quite right in that, but the West has been very largely Liberal; it is still Liberal, but it is not of the Liberal school that is always afraid to step out of the old rut when necessity arises. It is of the school that is not afraid to strike out when new conditions arise, and that does not go away back into history as the hon. member for Maisonneuve has done for his references. The Liberal school of western Canada is not of that type, and does not yield to my hon. friend's argument.

Another hon. gentleman spoke of the birth rate decreasing. I do not think we have any cause for worry in regard to the birth rate. That is largely a work of nature. We have reason to worry a little as to whether a child is well born or not, and whether it is surrounded with a suitable environment after it is born. If it is not the work of the mother to study out and suggest legislation, and even to enact legislation, in this case whose work can it be? Surely we can trust that to the mothers. Consequently, to make that work effective, the women must be given the franchise.

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) made one or two references to the ladies. It is difficult for me to understand why some hon. gentlemen have used those references. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) placed women in a class with minors, as it were. He said that we would not allow minors to vote; yet we were going to allow women to vote. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) referred to women as being a more ferocious animal than man. I do not think that can be borne out at all.

Mr. McMASTER: If the hon. member will pardon me, I did not say that woman was a more ferocious animal than man; I said woman was a more religious animal than man.

Mr. MAHARG: I shall take it all back. I should not like to get the hon. member in wrong with the ladies. The hon. member said that political meetings were not fit places for ladies.

Mr. McMASTER: I never said that.

Mr. MAHARG: That statement was made by one of the hon. members.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want it fastened on me.

Mr. MAHARG: During the recent election campaign, I attended a few political meetings, at practically all of which we had ladies present. At one meeting a gentleman had the nerve to make a silly interjection, and one lady in the meeting silenced him to such an extent that he did not open his mouth during the rest of the meeting. If we had had a lady or two like that present at some of the meetings in some parts of the Dominion of Canada, who could have silenced similar interjectors as well as she did this one it would have been a good thing. I think the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) stated that in Quebec the men had a partnership with their wives. He put that forward to show that the electors of the province of Quebec had done more for the women than the electors of some of the other provinces. I would inform the hon. gentleman that we have similar legislation in our western provinces. We have our dower laws there, and the women are very well satisfied with them. Moreover, they did not have to secure the franchise in order to get those laws; they had them before they received the franchise. I will leave the War-time Elections Act alone for the present, as there will probably be another opportunity to discuss that measure.

Mr. COPP: I do not rise for the purpose of discussing this Bill, although I have the right if I want to, but I do not desire to do so. I have never been very much enamoured of the granting of the franchise to women, but any doubts I had in my mind have been settled by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Maharg). I am going to support the Bill, but I would prefer to have the franchise come from the different provinces. Some of the provinces have already granted the franchise to women, and I understand that legislation will be passed by the New Brunswick legislature next session giving to women the vote. I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question on section 1.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better, now that the principle of the Bill has been discussed, to take the Bill up clause by clause, it being well understood that the debate on the second reading is now over, and that we will confine our remarks to the clauses as they come up for discussion.

On section 1—women to be entitled to vote:

Mr. COPP: In the province of New Brunswick it is not one official, but a board of revisers, of three officials, that makes up the lists. I see that paragraph (c) of subsection 2 of section 1 says that a woman may vote if she is otherwise qualified and "obtains and presents to the official in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists." If the statement was filed with just one of the officials it might not get before the board of revisers at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think under the interpretation clauses the singular includes the plural wherever necessary, but we could put in after the word official the words "or officials." I beg to move that after the word "official" the words "or officials" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: In the province of Quebec the lists in rural municipalities are made up by the clerk of the municipality from the assessment roll and revised by the council sitting as a Court of Review after the lists have been posted for a certain time. We have no enumerators except by virtue of the War-time Elections Act, and if a woman wanted to get on the roll she would have to appeal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have explained three or four times already what perhaps my hon. friend has not observed, that so far as the Dominion Elections Act is concerned, we must provide additional machinery, but that is no urgent at the moment; we need not do that at this session. So far as the War-time Elections Act is concerned the machinery is there, but before using the Dominion Elections Act again we must undoubtedly provide the machinery.

Mr. BUREAU: That machinery would apply only to women voters.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The machinery necessary to enable women to be put on the lists.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought it might be as well to put the machinery in the Act that gives women the franchise.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is quite right, except that the Dominion Elections Act will not come into operation before another session, and therefore we need not trouble about that this session. It would require a good deal of consideration as to how that is to be worked out in the different provinces. We may have to embody in the Dominion Elections Act some such provisions as those which are now in the War-time Elections Act, but probably those could be improved and simplified. We did not want to cumber this Act, which is designed to affirm and carry into effect the principle of giving to women the vote, with the provision of machinery which will not be necessary until the next session of Parliament at least.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the word "said" at the commencement of line thirty is superfluous, and I move that it be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: Why would a certificate as to age be required from a judge of a Superior Court? That is the case of a woman who had become a British subject by marriage, or who had become a British subject, her father being an alien, and naturalized while she was a minor. I do not see how a judge would be in a position to decide such a case.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be a matter for the judge to determine, on such evidence as he might hear. We are following the provisions of the Naturalization Act.

Mr. DECHENE: I understand a certificate would give the lady in question the title of British subject. She is entitled to be considered a British subject, but will not really be one.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If I correctly apprehend the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that this really provides that women who have been naturalized in one of two ways—that is by marrying a British subject, or by the naturalization of the father while the women was herself a minor—shall not be entitled to vote by virtue of that naturalization until they themselves fulfil what would be required by the Naturalization Act, if they made application in their own right. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. DECHENE: Yes, but that is not the point. Take the case of a lady born in Germany coming to this country. She has been here five or six years. She is alone, unmarried, and over twenty years of age. She goes to the judge and asks for a certificate proving she has fulfilled all the requirements of the Naturalization Act. She gets a certificate that she is entitled to British citizenship, and then stops. She does not go through all the procedure required by the naturalization laws. She gets a certificate, and her name is put on the voters' list. A year or so later she goes back to Germany, or some other country, and subsequently returns to Canada. She has not lost her first status, and has the right to vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: She has not the right to vote in the case the hon. gentleman puts, because she has never become a naturalized British subject.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think that is the point my hon. friend wished to make. The section of the Bill says:

"and is possessed of all requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject, and that she has taken the oath of allegiance.

At one time—I do not know how it is now—we had to post up the name for a certain time, so that, if there were objections to the man seeking naturalization, they could be stated. But my hon. friend (Mr. Déchène) had in mind all the requirements. In the case referred to, the woman may have the residence age and everything, without actually following out all the procedure. She might seek to become a British subject and take the oath of allegiance. The section says: "and that she has taken the oath." In fact, she would be a British subject at the time she presented the certificate.

Mr. SIFTON: She cannot get the certificate unless she is a British subject.

Mr. BUREAU: And the necessary requirements are just surplusage?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It seems to me very plain. She is entitled to vote if she is a British subject whether by birth or by naturalization made on her own application. But if she has become naturalized by reason of naturalization of her husband, by reason of having married a man who was a British subject, or by the naturalization of her father while she was a minor, she must conform to the qualifications set forth.

Section agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before going to the preamble I would like to add a sec-

tion. I move, seconded by Mr. Sifton, that the following section be added to the Bill:

3. Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, it shall not be necessary by reason of any of the provisions thereof, to prepare new voters' lists for the purpose of any by-election to be held before the 1st day of January, 1919, and in the case of any such bye-election any lawful lists available therefor may be used for the purposes of such by-election to the same extent and with the same validity as if this Act had not been passed.

The intention is that this Act shall go into immediate operation, so far as the preparation of lists in the ordinary course is concerned, but inasmuch as there are lists available for by-elections, it was not thought desirable that it should be necessary under this Act to prepare new lists for by-elections before the first day of January, 1919. In the meantime, I think, in most of the provinces, new lists will have been made, and the Act will have its operation after the preparation of those lists, but new lists are not considered necessary in the case of by-elections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of this new amendment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If there are lists available for any by-election between now and the first of January, it shall not be necessary to make up new lists for the purpose of this Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then the women would not have the right to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They would not have any additional right at any by-election between now and the 1st of January.

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing new lists were made?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It merely says it shall not be necesary to make new lists by reason of anything this Act contains. If they are made in the meantime, well and good, but it shall not be necessary by reason of this Act to make specially any new lists for by-elections before next January.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Suppose by-elections are held in the province of Quebec, the women would not be entitled to vote until January, 1919?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Except in so far as they are upon the lists now available.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, (Minister of Railways and Canals) the House went into committee on the following resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that an employee in the service of His Majesty who is injured, and the dependents of any such employee who is killed, shall be entitled to the same compensation as the employee, or as the dependent of a deceased employee, of a person other than His Majesty would, under similar circumstances, be entitled to receive under the law of the province in which the accident occurred, and the liability for and the amount of such compensation shall be determined in the same manner and by the same Board, officers or authority, or by such other Board, officers or authority or by such Court as the Governor in Council shall direct; and any compensation awarded shall be paid to such employee, or dependents, or to such person, as may be directed by the Board, officer, authority or Court, who may award costs as in cases between private parties in the province where the accident occurred; and any compensation or costs so awarded may be paid by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID: I wish to introduce a Bill, after this resolution is passed, placing not only the employees of Government railways, but all employees in the Government service under the same laws as other railway employees are under in so far as compensation for injury or loss of life is concerned. The Bill will provide that the compensation is to be the same as under the law of the province where the accident occurred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the object of the resolution is a very proper one. I have no objection to the principle, but I must take decided objection to the manner in which the compensation is to be fixed. It is to be determined

—in the same manner and by the same Board, officers or authority, or by such other board, officers or authority or by such court as the Governor in Council shall direct.

This is another instance in which the Governor in Council is assuming jurisdiction which he should not exercise. The board which is to determine the compensation should be fixed by law. However, it is late and I shall not press the point now, but I shall press it upon the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If I understood the minister aright, this law will apply only to provinces where they have a Workmen's Compensation Act. I believe there are four provinces in Canada where there are no such Acts. There is one in Quebec, one in Ontario, I believe one in Manitoba, and one in another of the western provinces. I believe that Nova Scotia and New Bruns-

wick have no Workmen's Compensation Acts.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is such an Act in Nova Scotia.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps it is in New Brunswick in which there is no such Act. There are certainly three or four provinces where there is no such Compensation Act.

Mr. TWEEDIE: What are the provinces which have no Compensation Acts?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I believe that in Prince Edward Island there is no Compensation Act.

Mr. SIFTON: They have one there under which the amount is decided by arbitration and the real object of this resolution is to provide for the appointment of a board in Prince Edward Island instead of submitting the matter to arbitration. All the other provinces have Acts of some kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was told by a gentleman in one of the labour unions that there are four provinces in which there is no such Act.

Mr. SIFTON: There are four provinces in which the Acts are practically identical; there are four provinces which have Acts that they prefer; but all the other provinces have some kind of an Act.

Mr. BUREAU: The object of this resolution is to bring workmen employed on Government railways under the Workmen's Compensation Act of the province. I object to any provision that will require the submission of the case of a man injured on the Canadian Pacific railway to a different court from that to which will be submitted the case of a man injured on the Canadian Northern.

Mr. SIFTON: That is an alternative only.

Mr. BUREAU: I object to the alternative. I want the same court to try every case whether the accident happens on one line or on the other. These two lines run parallel in my constituency for about twenty-five miles, but, notwithstanding that, a case affecting a man employed on the Canadian Northern will be tried before a different tribunal from that which will hear the case of a man injured on the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is not the intention of the Bill at all.

Mr. BUREAU: That is what the resolution says.

Mr. J. D. REID: The intention is that the case affecting a workman employed on a Government railway shall be tried by the same court that will try the case of a man employed on the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. BUREAU: If that is the intention it is all right.

Mr. McMASTER: I trust that the Bill, when brought down, will contain a saving clause to protect all causes of action which have already arisen from the operation of the Act. I have knowledge of one case which is being dealt with by my office. My partner is negotiating with one of the departments to get what we consider an adequate recompense for a widow whose husband was killed. The department had offered just about the amount that they would be liable to under the compensation law of Quebec. We did not think the compensation allowed was sufficient in this case and we have been trying to get a larger allowance. I would not like our rights, or the rights of our clients, to be prejudiced by any legislation adopted in a House of which I was a member.

Mr. J. D. REID: The railway employees would like a Dominion Compensation Act, but that would take a considerable amount of time and I thought it would be well to simply bring in a Bill for this session putting Government railways in exactly the same position as the other railways. When the resolution is passed the Bill will be introduced and it will be printed so that every one will have an opportunity of looking it over. That is the reason I would like to get the resolution through to-night.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will this apply to pending litigation?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no pending litigation.

Mr. TWEEDIE: There is one point in connection with this Bill that will have to receive very careful consideration. Disputes have arisen between different classes of labouring men in the different provinces in regard to interference with common-law rights by reason of compensation Acts. Under the Compensation Act in the province of Ontario, if a workman is injured in the course of his employment he is brought under the Compensation Act, his right to the common law remedy is taken away from him, and his damages are limited to the amount which is fixed by the Act.

Mr. McMASTER: It is practically the same in Quebec.

Mr. TWEEDIE: There is an Act before the legislature of Alberta over which there

is the same discussion. Last year, the province of Saskatchewan undertook to amend their Compensation Act along that line, and it was thrown out. My personal opinion is that any Compensation Act which interferes with the common-law rights of the labourer is wrong in principle, because the Compensation Acts fix definitely the amount of damages which can be recovered, and they are fixed in some cases as low as $2,500 in the event of death, and the dependents receiving compensation under that Act are barred from their remedies under the common law. Now, if this Government brings railway employees under the Workmen's Compensation Acts of the various provinces, they should certainly put in a clause which will safeguard to those employees the rights which they have at common law. Until we have the particulars of the Bill before us, it will be unnecessary to discuss this matter, but I want to point this out to the Minister of Railways, because I feel that, if he takes away the common-law rights from the railway employees of Canada he will be introducing legislation which will be very unsatisfactory to them and will, I think, work injustice.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Possibly my hon. friend has not quite grasped the purpose of the resolution. I have had the advantage of discussing it with some—not all—of the labour organizations, and they are exceedingly anxious that it should be passed. More than that, this legislation would not take away any common-law right at all; it is not taking anything away, it is giving something. And in giving the right to compensation, it has been thought desirable, for the present at least, to follow the same lines which have been established under the laws of the several provinces. There is nothing given away, but a right is conferred.

Resolution reported without amendment and read the first and second time.

Hon. J. D. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 51, to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, (Minister of Railways and Canals) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act, Chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing that the stores account of the Canadian Government Railways shall be debited with the cost of materials, equipment and stores purchased, and of work preformed and expenses incurred in connection therewith, together with the cost of establishing, maintaining and conducting the railway stores; and shall be credited with the values of materials, equipment and stores as issued and charged to proper appropriations, or otherwise disposed of; and that the balance to the debit of the said stores account shall not at any time exceed six million dollars.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Railway Act of 1906 contained a section, No. 20, which reads as follows:

Stores accounts as heretofore established in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway shall, respectively, be debited with the cost of materials, equipment and stores purchased and of work performed and expenses incurred in connection therewith, together with the cost of establishing, maintaining and conducting the railway stores, and shall be credited with the values of materials, equipment and stores as issued and charged to proper appropriations, or otherwise disposed of.

Since that time we have taken over the Transcontinental railway and the International railway, that is to say we have increased the magnitude of the Government railway system. We propose to amend the clause I have just read so that it would apply to the enlarged railway system. Section 21 of the Act reads as follows:

The balance of the debit of the respective stores acounts so established, shall not at any time exceed, for the Intercolonial Railway the sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars, and for the Prince Edward Island Railway the sum of one hundred thousand dollars.

The object of this Bill is to increase the quantity of the stores that we can have on hand. Owing to the high price of coal and other necessary supplies, it is an impossiblity to operate the roads with the quantity of stores which $1,500,000 will purchase, and, of course, under the Audit Act, We cannot purchase without having a sufficient credit. For that reason this resolution proposes to increase the amount which may be invested in stores from $1,500,000 to $6,000,000. Of course, the system now requires supplies from Port Arthur to Sydney. We have to keep a supply of coal at Port Arthur, for instance, and 100,000 tons at that point at $5 or $6 a ton represents in itself a large proportion of the amount we are asking.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That explanation seems reasonable enough, Mr. Chairman. I hope the hon. minister at a later

stage will give us some statistics showing why he has selected the amount of $6,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 or $4,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall give a detailed statement showing the stock on hand at the present time.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Minister of Railways and Canals lost the Canadian Northern railway again? He does not mention it.

Mr. BUREAU: In the clauses of the Act read by the minister I notice that specific amounts are allocated to the two railways mentioned, $1,500,000 to the Intercolonial, and $100,000 to the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have now a much larger mileage embraced in the Canadian Government Railway system.

Mr. BUREAU: Will a certain proportion of the six million dollars be divided amongst the different roads, so much to the Canadian Northern, and so on?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern railway is being operated under its own charter. This resolution applies only to the railways operated by the Canadian Government and covered by the Railways and Canals Act.

Mr. BUREAU: But the Canadian Northern is the property of the Canadian Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Only when it comes to the matter of making payments.

Resolution reported without amendment, and read the first and second time.

Mr. J. D. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 52, to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.19 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, April 12, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES.

ALLEGED STATEMENT OF ARMAND LAVERGNE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to a report in the Montreal Gazette of to-day purporting to give an account of the inquest held at Quebec yesterday in connection with the Quebec disturbances. The following appears in this report as the evidence of Armand Lavergne::

> They then asked him to go and address the crowd, and as he had previously received the offer to act as chief keeper of records of the M.S.A., in Ottawa, which he had refused, he thought Col. Machin was fully authorized and accepted.

I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether Colonel Lavergne ever offered to act as chief keeper of records of the Military Service Act in Ottawa?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not heard of the matter to which my hon. friend refers; I should be very much surprised if any such statement was made. Inquiry will be made with regard to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a world of surprises.

THE VICTORY LOAN.

STATEMENT BY ACTING MINISTER OF FINANCE OF EXPENDITURE IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): Yesterday the leader of the Opposition made inquiry concerning a return asked for on 20th March last in reference to the expenses in connection with the last Victory Loan. As he evidently desires that this information be submitted prior to the introduction of the War Appropriation Bill, I ask the leave of the House to make a statement which I hope will give him the information he desires. The reason the return has not been brought down was that full statements of all expenses in connection with the loan are not available to the department; consequently it is not possible to give to the House the exact information required by the Order referred to. However, I hope to be able to give the House substantially the information asked for, so that the progress of the War Appropriation Bill may not be delayed.

All expenditure in the way of remuneration for services in connection with the loan may be divided into three classes: first, remuneration to co-operating bond dealers and brokers; second, commission to canvassers; third, remuneration to banks.

As to the first, remuneration to co-operating bond dealers and brokers, in this loan the principle of co-operation rather

than competition among brokers was adopted in order to organize and cover the whole country as effectively as possible. For this work practically the whole organization of all bond dealers and brokers was employed. The arrangement made by the Minister of Finance in reference to the remuneration of these firms was that at the close of the loan, after consultation with the Dominion Executive Committee and the consideration of any views or recommendations put forward by them, the amount to be paid would be based on the value of the services rendered in connection with the campaign by the several bond dealers and brokers. Some adjustments may yet have to be made, but on April 5th the total payment under this head was approximately $750,000. Additional payments may yet have to be made to brokers. On the other hand, only last week $30,000 was refunded by three of the principal bond houses of Toronto, and a few days ago $2,000 was refunded by the chairman of the chief committee in Saskatchewan. Possibly further refunds may be made of allowances paid to several of the committees throughout the Dominion.

As to commissions to canvassers, I may say that local canvassers were employed to solicit subscriptions and were given certain territory or lists of prospective subscribers to cover. Local canvassers were not permitted to solicit subscriptions from those who had been placed upon the special subscriptions list, which composed all prospective subscribers who, under previous loans, had subscribed for bonds to the amount of $25,000 or over. That is, any persons receiving subscriptions from those who had subscribed for sums of $25,000 or over in previous loans were to receive no commission thereon. Arrangements for the canvassing for subscriptions from these were made by the Special Subscriptions Committee, and no commissions were paid upon the same.

The Dominion Executive Committee was authorized to pay commissions to local canvassers on the following basis:

(a) In all places having a population of more than 10,000, local canvassers were to be paid a commission of ½ of 1 per cent upon all subscriptions obtained by them.

(b) In places having a population of less than 10,000 and in rural sections, canvassers were to be paid one-half of one per cent on all subscriptions obtained in their respective sections, whether secured by the canvassers or placed by subscribers directly with the banks, excluding, of course, subscriptions from the Special List referred to above.

As of April 5, total disbursements for commissions to canvassers were $1,140,813.75.

As to remuneration to banks, a remuneration to chartered banks of one-quarter of one per cent on the total allotment was paid for receiving subscriptions, payments, delivering interim certificates and definite bonds, and cashing coupons during the term of the loan—that is, during the 5, 10 or 20-year loan periods, as the case might be. The total amount paid to the banks for this purpose was $984,395.64. The allotment of the loan reaching $398,000,000 consisted of 5, 10 and 20-year bonds bearing 5½ per cent interest. The issue was made at par with the privilege of deferred payments. It is estimated that the total expenses will reach approximately 1¼ per cent of the amount allotted.

Putting the matter in concise form, the expenses of the loan up to date have been as follows:

Organization expenses	$ 376,000
For Publicity Campaign,	
(a) Through the Dominion Publicity Committee	163,000
(b) Through Canadian Press Association (disbursements to date)	207,000
For remuneration to Brokers and Bond Dealers	750,000
Commissions to canvassers	1,140,000
Remuneration to Banks	984,395
Total	$3,620,395

In addition to this, there are, of course, the departmental expenses for printing the interim receipts, for engraving the bonds, for the staff employed, numbering some 700 persons, in the Department of Finance, who have been specially engaged upon this work since last December. It is estimated that the total cost of the loan, when finally available, will approximate $5,000,000, or about one and one-quarter per cent of the whole loan, which I think may be regarded by everybody as a very satisfactory rate.

The price of the securities issued was, of course, par, but by acceleration of payments, a slight discount, equal to the rate of interest which the bonds bear, namely, 5½ per cent, was allowed to subscribers. Perhaps I may make that clearer to the House by saying that if a subscriber paid his subscription in full on January 2, last, he would pay for his bonds at the rate of 99·107; if he paid in full on February 1, last, he would pay at the rate of 99·467; if he paid on March 1, he would pay at the rate of 99·722; if he paid on April 1, he would pay at the rate of 99·909, and if he deferred his payment in full until the 1st

of May, as he might do, he would pay at the rate of 100 per cent. I trust this will give to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the House, the information desired. I shall pass over to my right hon. friend the statement from which I have read, and if there is any other information which he desires and which I can possibly give to him, I shall be glad to do so. But I trust that, with the information I have given, he will inform the Prime Minister that he may proceed with the War Appropriation Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is the total amount of the discount?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The total discount, inclusive of all expenses, will amount, we estimate, to one and one-quarter per cent.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister said that all the expenses were not available to the department. I suppose that does not mean that the department will not ultimately have a statement?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Just as soon as possible, I shall submit to the House a complete and detailed statement of the cost of the loan.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am perfectly ready and willing to go on with the Bill to-day, but before we go into committee, I should like to see the statement.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not purpose going on with the Bill to-day. I thought it was desirable that this information should be given at least a day in advance.

Mr. PEDLOW: Do the items of $163,000 and $207,000 cover the entire cost of the publicity campaign? On what basis was that allotment negotiated? Was the price paid for that publicity at the ordinary commercial rate charged for the space used, or was it on a different basis from that usually negotiated in an ordinary commercial transaction?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the information. I am simply using the figures given to me by the officers of the Department of Finance. The total amount for advertising was $207,000. I do not know how the advertising rate was fixed. I shall give my hon. friend the information to-morrow.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is the item of $163,000 not also for publicity?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. PEDLOW: The two together would amount to $370,000, which is the amount, I take it, of the cost of the publicity campaign.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the details the minister promises to give the House include the names of the firms and papers which received advertisements, and the amounts paid?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If that is desired.

Mr. MURPHY: It is highly desirable to know the amount paid to each newspaper.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That will cover all the newspapers in Canada.

Mr. MURHPY: We want the information.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 39, to amend the Yukon Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—"Section 115, abolition of Council and new Council provided for."

Mr. MURPHY: Is the Governor in Council, in regard to the selections to be made, to confine its choice to judicial officers, or are the selections to be made generally of persons presumed to be capable of performing the duties attaching to the council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure that I understand the hon. gentleman's question, but the Yukon Act provides that there shall be appointed a commissioner and also that there shall be an administrator, whose duties shall be to substitute for the commissioner in the absence or illness of the latter. Without power being given under the Act to abolish those offices, they cannot be abolished. They are, however, already abolished under the War Measures Act, but it is the intention that this legislation shall confirm the action taken, and that it shall date back so as to ratify that action. There are, in the general administrative machinery of the Yukon, other offices which have been abolished as well, and notifications have gone to all the holders of those offices that their services shall cease on the 30th of April, but the Act does not provide for the creation of those offices, and consequently it does not need to be amended in so far as those offices are concerned.

Mr. MURPHY: The Bill does not apply to the last class of officers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be said not to apply, because the action can be taken without an amendment to the Act.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 1—"Section 116, Governor in Council may abolish offices and transfer duties."

Mr. MEIGHEN: The explanation I have just made applies to this subclause, but does not apply to the previous clause. As to the previous clause, that provides for the abolishment of the Yukon Council, and that action has not yet been taken. The amendment empowers the Governor in Council to take that action.

Subsection agreed to.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Auditor General may send an officer to audit accounts in Territory when he deems it necessary, instead of yearly, as heretofore:

Mr. FIELDING: What is the substance of the clause repealed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act as it stood said that the Auditor General "shall send an officer," but he may not deem it necessary to do so.

Mr. FIELDING: This makes it optional?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SALARIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the provisions of clause two of Bill thirteen, An Act to amend the Salaries Act and the provisions for preserving the Independence of Parliament, shall be deemed to have come into operation on the twenty-third day of October, 1917, and to apply and extend to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee of Labour Problems and to the Vice-Chairman of the Reconstruction and Development Committee, and that they shall be deemed to have been named by the Governor in Council under the provisions of the said clause on the said date, and shall each receive a salary of seven thousand dollars per annum.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This resolution is necessary in order to make an amendment to the Bill for the purpose of conforming with the Orders in Council upon which the Bill is based.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We can have the discussion on the Bill.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

REVENUES OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

SUSPENSE ACCOUNT PROPOSED.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways), the House went into committee to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the receipts and revenues of the Canadian Government railways and of any railway under the charge, management or direction of the Minister may be deposited in a Suspense Account, and the working expenses of the said railways may be defrayed therefrom, and in the event of a deficit occurring at any time, the amount of such deficit shall be payable out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and in the event of a surplus the amount thereof may be transferred to the said Fund; the Suspense Account and all payments therefrom being subject to the audit of the Auditor General of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID: I wish to move that the resolution be amended to read as follows:

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

This change is made at the suggestion of the Auditor General, and is for the purpose of giving Parliament control in case there is a deficit.

Mr. FIELDING: I think this resolution is open to one objection. When I first read the resolution I was favourably impressed with it as a businesslike arrangement, but on further consideration the impression I have is that it will withdraw a very important matter of public business from the consideration of Parliament. It proposes to set apart a portion of the Government business and say that that shall not be managed as other Government business, but shall be treated as a separate account. It might be argued with some force by the minister that putting this annual appropriation in the estimates swells the total, and that it is, after all, a mere matter of book-keeping. The Government railways on the whole will probably pay their expenses, but in many years they have not, although we are all hoping for better things. It is only in the event of a deficit occurring that

Parliament would be asked to vote the money, but in the event of there being no deficit the consideration of the railway situation would probably be withdrawn from the consideration of Parliament. I hope the minister will give the matter further consideration. Perhaps the view I take of it is not correct, but it seems to me, where the appropriations for the railway will run into so many million dollars, that there is no good reason why Parliament should not have the opportunity every year of considering the appropriations, and that would necessarily open the way for a general criticism and inquiry, which, after all, is one of the chief purposes for which Parliament is assembled. There may be another side to this question, but for the moment I ask the Acting Minister of Finance whether he is not, as a mere matter of convenience—and it would be no doubt a convenience to the department—taking away from Parliament one of its most valuable and important duties.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The principle which the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) enunciates would no doubt be a sound one if it had reference to taxation. Beyond doubt Parliament should possess of itself the sole right of appropriating any moneys collected from the people of this country by means of taxation, but I submit that the revenues which are obtained by the Government railways of Canada from the people of Canada, for services rendered by that railway, are in a different position altogether from revenues received by way of taxation. I think a fair test of the fairness of the proposal contained in the resolution is this: Does the continuance of the practice of voting a general amount in the estimates after all mean anything? Last year I think we were asked to vote a sum of about thirty-five millions under the heading "Operating Expenses of the Government Railway Systems of Canada." That, of course, gives no particular information to Parliament. No questions, therefore, are ever asked under that item. The amount cannot be approximated by the Department of Railways with any accuracy whatever. I am told by the officers of the department that this year they cannot estimate within five to ten million dollars what would be the operating expenses of the Canadian Government Railway system during the present fiscal year. My objection to the inclusion of the amount in the annual estimates is that it swells our general estimates unduly, and no good purpose is served by it.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. MURPHY: What harm is done?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It leaves the impression abroad that our annual expenditure as shown to be in the estimates is greater than it actually is. I think it is only a fair proposal that the revenues of a railway system should be used to pay operating expenses, without Parliament being asked to vote that amount. If the amount could be voted with any degree of accuracy, possibly some good might come out of it, but it has never in the past interested the House, and I say it is unfair to the railway system. It is unfair to the estimates to load them with this amount. The Canadian Government are to-day the owners of the Canadian Northern railway system.

Mr. BUREAU: And they do not operate it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Our operating expenses will not be voted in this manner. They were not voted this way last year. We voted a certain amount to take care of the deficit. We shall ask Parliament to do the same thing this session. If the resolution is adopted by the House, I think the financial position of the Intercolonial will really be presented to Parliament in a better form than heretofore. If there is a deficit Parliament will be asked to vote that deficit, and a very definite and clear cut discussion may then take place upon the administration of the railroad, because Parliament is asked to vote a deficit which it has never been asked to do before. The principle is not a new one. The Intercolonial has what they call a store account. The minister is permitted to provide a certain sum for the purchase of railway supplies and material, and while there is a limitation of $1,500,000 to that account, still the principle is exactly the same. The same principle applies to the King's Printer.

Mr. W. S. FIELDING: We increased the store account to $6,000,000 last night.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The principle is just the same, and it applies to the King's Printer. The principle in the Bill is this: that the Government railway system be permitted to pay, out of its own revenue, its operating expenses. I submit that is a fair proposal, and I hope it will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose it is a surplus?

An hon. MEMBER: Do not suppose that.

Mr. BUREAU: We must suppose all kind of things now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The book-keeping system is not interfered with. Every dollar and every cent that goes to the system are credited to the Receiver General. Every cent paid out by the railway is paid by cheque at Moncton upon the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, where the Government account is kept.

Mr. CAHILL: I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance state to-day that we have the Canadian Northern, because last night apparently we had lost it.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a hide-and-seek game.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of Railways yesterday proposed a new resolution to increase the amount that might be voted for stores to $6,000,000. He told us the increase was required on account of the Transcontinental and International roads but he did not mention the Canadian Northern, and I inferred from that that he figured the Government did not at the present time own the Canadian Northern. I am further strengthened in that opinion by the fact that the Government solicitor in Toronto two or three days ago made the statement before the commission that he could not get a report of the earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway company since last October. Now, if we own the road, surely we should be able to get a statement of its earnings.

Mr. J. D. REID: I might say to the hon. gentleman that the statements were given to the solicitor immediately.

Mr. CAHILL: Why did he have to go to the Commission and ask for the statement? He said he could not get it from the proper sources. I know he got the statement the next day. Of course, he would have to get it; that is quite natural, but he could not get it up to that time. The hon. Minister of Finance states he does not want to have his estimates loaded up with a deficit. I do not think there is any question, if the railways of this country are managed by the Government as they have been, that we may forget about surpluses. It will be a question of deficits, and we want honest bookkeeping in this country. If we are making a loss on the railway, let us know it and show where we stand, and not try to cover it up by adopting some other system. If we are making a loss, it is a loss to Canada, and increasing Canada's debt, and why not show it, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) suggests?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand my hon. friend to say he is in favour of the resolution?

Mr. BUREAU: No, he is against it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The resolution proposes to accomplish just what my hon. friend says he would like to see.

Mr. CAHILL: In what way?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Inasmuch as the deficits—and he says we will always have a deficit—will be disclosed in the estimates because it must then be voted. Is my hon. friend supporting the resolution?

Mr. BUREAU: No, he is against it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not understand that he is against it. I do not know what he means.

Mr. BUREAU: He wants Parliament to control public funds.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Parliament is not dispossessing itself of the control of anything. I understand him to say, in his judgment, the operation of railways in Canada by the Government will always result in a deficit, and he would like to have these deficits put clearly before Parliament. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly? If I understood his statement rightly, this resolution, being enacted into the form of a Bill, will accomplish exactly what he wants. It has hardly been possible heretofore to know what was the actual result of the operation of the Canadian Government Railway system in Canada unless one took the trouble to go through the annual report. The Government has no desire to hide anything. I think that the Minister of Railways and Canals is perfectly justified in asking to be allowed to administer the Government Railway system in the same manner as other railways are administered.

Mr. CAHILL: Does not the resolution state that any unappropriated fund shall be drawn upon to the extent of the deficit?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Perhaps my hon. friend did not hear the amendment proposed, and perhaps I was wrong in pressing my question because he had the original resolution before him. The amended resolution will read:

That it is expedient to provide that the working expenses of the Canadian Government Railways and of any railway under the charge and management or direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be—

Mr. FIELDING: What does my hon. friend mean by " and of any railway under the charge and management or direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals?" Has he anything in his mind? Does that mean the Canadian Northern?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. I think it was intended to cover the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. FIELDING: That is part of the Canadian Government Railway system, is it not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not sure as to that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not see why my statement should occasion any merriment on the part of any hon. gentlemen opposite. If any hon. gentlemen knows what it means they might stand up and inform the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We will let the Government do that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The words " Canadian Government railways " might be limited by statute to what is known as the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway. If they are limited to those railways then I am perfectly right in my statement and hon. gentlemen are wrong in their laughter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are they so limited?

Mr. BUREAU: The question is whether all the railways owned by the Canadian Government are Canadian Government railways or whether the words are limited by the statute to the railways mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Possibly my hon. friend is right, but there need not be any discussion about the words "and of any railway under the charge and management or direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals," because that can be amended later. Let me read the amendment:

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

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. FIELDING: Touching the question of the interpretation of the expression "Canadian Government railways," the Acting Minister of Finance is perhaps unaware that his colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, last night gave his own interpretation—and I am not objecting to it—that "Canadian Government railways" includes the Transcontinental and all other Government railways except the Canadian Northern. On the faith of that interpretation we allowed the hon. gentleman to increase his stores account from $1,500,000 to $6,000,000. I am merely asking whether the hon. gentleman has anything particularly in his mind. I appreciate the point made by the Acting Minister of Finance as to the distinction between revenue which represents taxation and revenue of different kinds. But his argument will probably carry him a little farther than he appreciates when we come to apply it. If the principle of the resolution is sound, why not apply it to other departments as well? Suppose I were to suggest that we should apply it to the Department of Customs, my hon. friend would say at once: " That is taxation." So it is. But, suppose we should go to the Post Office Department. That is not taxation. The postage stamp represents payment for service just as much as the railway ticket represents payment for service. If my hon. friend's argument is good that this is a proper thing to do with regard to Government railways, the same argument might be advanced with regard to the Post Office Department. You might extend that in different directions. What it really means is that the appropriation for each railway system which has hitherto always been made by parliament is no longer to be made by Parliament and whatever opportunities the making of the appropriation offered for enquiry and discussion and criticism will not longer be available. The annual appropriation of the moneys needed for the operation of the Intercolonial railway has always presented an opportunity for widespread inquiry, criticism and discussion. The withdrawing of that appropriation from Parliament, I grant you, as a mere matter of book-keeping, may not make any difference, but at the same time I think there is no good reason why Parliament should give up the privilege of making the annual vote for a mere matter of book-keeping. I do not see that it is going to make one cent's worth of difference to the treasury of Canada one way or the other, but as a pure matter of parlia-

mentary procedure we should keep as far as possible to the principle of parliamentary control.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In reference to the case suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) of the Post Office I would submit that it is hardly analogous. The Government Railway system is a well defined and limited operation. It is administered from a single office at Moncton. I imagine that all the revenues of the road go there first and ultimately to Ottawa. All operating expenses are incurred at that point. In the case of the post office system, there must be twenty thousand or thirty thousand branches throughout Canada extending from coast to coast.

Mr. FIELDING: There are railway stations all over Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I fail to see how in any respect the cases are analogous. The money is received by the post office but there are scores and scores of offices receiving that revenue. You could hardly pay the operating expenses of the post office in Vancouver out of the revenues received, at, say, St. John, N.B. In the case of the railway system the revenues all go into the head office of the system at Moncton and from there all expenditures are authorized, all operating expenses are paid and there is established the Government Railway audit system. The Government Railway accounts are audited at Moncton.

Mr. DEVLIN: Reverting to the question asked by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), will any of the working expenses of the Canadian Northern railway come under this resolution?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern railway, although owned by the Government, will be operated in the same manner as it has been in the past by the board of directors, separate entirely from the Government Railway system unless, as there may be in the future, some arrangement by which the Canadian Northern may be amalgamated with the Government railways and the whole worked together as one system. Until that is done the Canadian Northern railway will be in no way connected with what is proposed by this resolution. What the resolution really means is that instead of putting an amount in the estimates each year to provide for the expenditure, a certain fair amount will be advanced to us for operating expenses. On the other hand, they often have to estimate what the revenues will be, and the two appear side by side. This does not affect in any way the carrying on of the expenditures in connection with the railways. It is difficult—take it this year, for example—to estimate what the operating expenses will be; they are very much higher this year than last. Then again, the revenues will not be anything near what the operating expenses are. For the past year the loss on the Canadian Government railways will be very large, amounting perhaps to five milion dollars, or probably five and a half million dolars. If this resolution passes, an item will have to be inserted in the estimates showing the loss that has occurred in connection with the operation of those railways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the objection to that?

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no objection at all, but it loads up the estimates with an amount that really should not be there. But there is no desire in any way, shape or form, so far as the Railway Department and the Finance Department are concerned, to change the method of carrying on the expenditures in connection with the Canadian Government Railway system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is simply a blind.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not a blind. I do not see how the right hon. gentleman can make such a statement. We may have to pay out probably a larger amount than we estimate at the present time, for this reason: You cannot tell at the present time how things are going to turn out, as regards the cost of labour, and so on, and it may probably involve adding a considerable amount more than was at first thought necessary in order to carry on the operations of the Government system.

Mr. BUREAU: Supposing we do. The leader of the Opposition was right; it is a blind.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will this mean an increase of the staff?

Mr. J. D. REID: It does not involve increasing the staff in any respect. It is simply a matter of book-keeping and the money will be deposited and paid out in exactly the same manner as before.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We do not want to be accused of indulging in captious criticism, because we desire to facilitate the despatch of business, but the Minister of Railways has told us that he does not want this money to appear in the esti-

mates. If that is not a blind, what is it? By all means let us have the truth.

Mr. J. D. REID: As far as having the truth is concerned, I am trying to explain to the right hon. gentleman, as clearly as I can, what is proposed. Now, what is the present system? The revenues are deposited to the credit of the Receiver General, and the cheques are issued by the railway and passed by the Auditor General at Ottawa. That system will still continue in exactly the same manner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no question about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will there be the same method of treating the revenues of the railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: Just the same as before.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No; because at the present time the revenues of the road, like the revenue of the post office, are sent to Ottawa and put in the consolidated revenue fund, but what my hon. friend proposes is collect the revenues of the Government railways and send them to Moncton and expend them there.

Mr. J. D. REID: If the right hon. gentleman has gathered that meaning from anything that I have said, he has gathered an erroneous impression. The financial representative of the Department of Railways and Canals tells me that there will be no change of the kind at all; the money will be deposited in exactly the same manner as before, and the expenditures will be made in the same way. If this resolution passes, and there should be any doubt at all as to what is proposed, when the Bill founded upon the resolution is introduced, we can make the matter very plain.

4 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The resolution as framed would not give that impression. At the present time the revenues of the road are collected from the different stations, sent to Ottawa, and deposited in the public treasury to the credit of the consolidated fund and all the payments are made out of that fund. If I understand this proposition aright, it is in contemplation to collect and expend the revenues at Moncton, and if there is any deficit Parliament will be asked to make it good out of the public treasury. It may be a mere matter of book-keeping, and it may be that the country will not lose anything, but what will happen is, as was stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that Parliament will not continue to have the same control over the operations of the road as it has to-day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Minister of Railways should not ask Parliament to pass this resolution unless there is some strong reason for it, and Parliament should not refuse to pass it unless some substantial objection exists.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If there is any substantial objection to the resolution the Minister of Railways will very gladly withdraw. Let us see if there really is any objection to it; I must say that I have not heard one yet.

Mr. BUREAU: The Acting Minister of Finance has just said that the Minister of Railways should not bring forward the resolution unless there are strong reasons for its passage. I would like to hear what those reasons are.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The right hon. leader of the Opposition has just stated that this proposition will prevent Parliament from discussing the expenditures of the Canadian Government railways. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. BUREAU: It is in one way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I submit that the argument is not founded upon fact, because there are numberless items presented to Parliament in the estimates every session which will afford the amplest opportunity for discussion of the management and administration of the system. Now, surely, that statement is correct. Surely I am correct in saying that each member of the House, under the various items which appear in the railway estimates will have in the future, as he has had in the past, the amplest opportunity for a full and free discussion of the expenditures and the method of operation of the Canadian Government railways. Therefore, I say that there is nothing in that objection, and the opposition to the proposal, if founded upon that point, must fail. I agree with my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) that Parliament should know annually what is the operating deficit of the Government Railway system, and I hope therefore that he will support the resolution. That is one of the advantages of this resolution, that it will bring before Parliament the exact financial results of the railway system during the previous fiscal year.

Mr. FIELDING: Do we not get that now?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, we do, but as a matter of fact, under the proposed system it will come up in a very concrete way. It is much better that Parliament be asked to vote under one item the sum of $5,000,000, if that sum should exactly represent the deficit in the operation of the Canadian Government system. The net result of the operations are there before you, stated in a single line, in a few figures, and the minister asking Parliament to vote that amount must explain the result. Under the present system we are asked to vote, say, $35,000,000, $40,000,000, or $50,000,000 to cover operating expenses. The amount is not estimated with accuracy; it affords no information or intelligence; nobody ever discusses the item and as a matter of business it should not be there. I cannot conceive any stronger reasons than that why the resolution should pass. The system proposed by the resolution will present to Parliament the net result of the financial operations of the road during the year. As the member (Hon. Mr. Fielding) well says, by taking the Auditor General's Report and the report of the Minister of Railways you can ascertain the total revenues of the railway system and the total costs of operation, and by simple mathematical computation you can ascertain the actual operating results. But as a matter of fact, during the years I have been in Parliament, I have heard but little discussion of the actual financial operation of the road; our time is occupied more in the discussion of the estimates presented by the Department of Railways. But this will put before Parliament more pointedly and in more concrete fashion than ever before the exact financial operations of the railway system, and I submit that that will be an important advantage.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not be possible, while maintaining the system which has hitherto prevailed of bringing down estimates to have also a concrete statement as to deficit?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We have that now, and it occasions very little discussion in Parliament.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the acting Minister of Finance is with me when I say that that is quite possible even if you maintain the present system of setting aside a certain sum of money yearly for the operation of Government railroads. It seems to me that attempts are being made to gather into the executive of the Government a great many functions which properly belong to Parliament. Order in Council after Order in Council is brought down with regard to other matters, and my impression is that this is evidence of a general attempt to assign to the executive the powers of Parliament. It has happened in the House of Commons of Great Britain, where protests have been made against it; and now the people of Canada are beginning to feel that parliamentary government is running into a certain danger through the adoption of this course by the ministry.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Can either of the ministers in charge of this proposal inform us what the practice of any constitutionally governed country, such as Australia, has been, in a matter of this kind? Australia has a much larger experience in Government-owned railways than we have.

Hon. J. D. REID: I am sorry that I cannot tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr MICHAEL CLARK: Perhaps the acting Minister of Finance can furnish the information.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I am not in a position to inform my hon. friend.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am surprised, because the Government is very strong on precedent.

Mr. PEDLOW: The acting Minister of Finance to the contrary notwithstanding, I think that the parallel case submitted by the member for Shelburne and Queens is an apt one. The minister contends that revenue received from the Post Office Department is not on a line with revenue received from the Railway Department. But in the Department of Railways revenue is received from the various stations and offices of the different systems, and the same principle applies to the Post Office Department. The other night when we were discussing a similar proposal to this, the Minister of Railways asked the House to grant him a "blank cheque" for use in the administration of his department. This is practically the same thing; he is asking to-day for another blank cheque. He did not receive it the other night, because the members on both sides refused to submit to his dictation in the matter. The minister wants us to vote an unlimited amount to be expended on the railway systems of this country; he wants carte blanche for the expending of money during the year. Instead of submitting an estimate of what he will require in the administration of his department during the current year, he asks us to give him the right to spend without limit,

and at the end of the year he will, after the money has been spent, demand from us the extra amount required. That is not good business.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I cannot for the life of me see what the object of this resolution is, unless it be to ruin the credit of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: If the Government have to make an estimate of how much the deficit is going to be, they surely will have to make an estimate of how much they will need to run the road. I should like to know from the minister whether the accounts of the Prince Edward Island railway are kept separate from those of the Intercolonial. As a matter of fact, the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways are now connected by a car ferry, and the Prince Edward Island railway is looked upon as a feeder of the Intercolonial. I understand that, from the way in which the freight rates are arranged, they can make the Prince Edward Island railway appear to owe $300,000 of a deficit every year, when, as a matter of fact, it is the biggest asset we have. I would like to know if the accounts of the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway are kept separately or not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry if I cannot answer the hon. gentleman; I could not hear him.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member asked if the accounts of the Prince Edward Island railway and the Intercolonial railway were kept separately or not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The accounts of the Prince Edward Island railway are kept separate from those of the Intercolonial railway system, but the Prince Edward Island railway is a part of the Canadian Government railways. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) says that the Post Office Department and the Canadian Government railways are somewhat analogous. There is a distinction between the railway system and the post office system.

Mr. PEDLOW: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the first place, the operating expenses of the post office system are secured from taxation, and they are voted by Parliament annually. It is true there does come back a great deal of revenue from the public by an indirect system of taxation, namely, the stamp tax, which is provided by statute. But the revenues of the Government railways represent money paid by the public for services rendered by the railway.

Mr. PEDLOW: A postage stamp and a railway ticket are practically the same thing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The one is taxation imposed by Parliament.

Mr. PEDLOW: Absolutely no.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The other is a receipt for money paid by the public to the railway for services rendered by the railway, which is run by the railway manager. In Canada there are as many post office managers as there are post offices, but there is only one manager of the Canadian Government railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Are there not many railway station agents?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: But the Canadian Government railways are under the control of the railway manager. The revenues of all the post offices in Canada are sent to Ottawa. I cannot see what else could be done with them. The revenues of the Canadian Government railways go to the Receiver General ultimately, but they go through the offices of the manager at Moncton, where also all expenses are authorized. Such a system is not of necessity applicable to the post offices, as the post offices are scattered by hundreds and thousands throughout the length and breadth of this country, and the expenditures must be authorized at Ottawa. There is, of course, some similarity between the Post Office and the Railway Department. I would not presume to take the position that there is not, but for all practical purposes, there is no similarity whatever. All this resolution purposes doing is to put the Intercolonial Railway system into the same position as other railways. It is very easy to suggest sinister motives on the part of members of Government in proposing this resolution. Any hon. member can do that. Any man outside of Parliament can do it. Men who will never be in Parliament might do it, but that does not prove that there is any foundation for the imputation of improper motives.

Mr. PEDLOW: I decidedly object to the statement just made by the acting Minister of Finance. It is not my intention, nor do I think it is the intention of any hon. member on this side of the House, to impute sinister motives to any minister

of the Crown, but we consider we are quite within our rights in criticising the actions and business methods proposed by ministers of the Crown. I criticised the action taken in this resolution, and I consider the methods proposed in this resolution are not business-like. That is the reason why I am offering this criticism. It would be much better, in the interest of the Canadian Government railways if the Minister of Railways would figure out as closely as possible the amount he thinks he would require to cover the deficits for the year, and if he would submit that proposition to the House and let us vote upon it.

Mr. BUREAU: The acting Minister of Finance, a few moments ago laid down a very sound principle. I agree with the principle, if he will only carry it out. He said that, in bringing this resolution down, the Government must have very good reason for doing so. I agree with him in that, and when those reasons are explained to the House, if the Opposition do not want to accept the resolution, they must have very grave objections to offer to it. The acting Minister of Finance proceeded, not to give us the reasons why the resolution was brought down, but to discuss the objections which had been taken. I am satisfied that this resolution has not been brought down without a study having first been made of the situation, and without a discussion having taken place between the officers of the department, the Minister of Railways, and the acting Minister of Finance of the reasons which have determined their action in bringing down this resolution. It was framed, I suppose, after mature consideration, so that the Minister of Railways would have permission from the Government to open a suspense account in which would be charged all the revenues of the Intercolonial and credited all the expenditures. If this suspense account resulted in a surplus, the surplus was to be paid over to the Receiver General; if it resulted in a deficit, the Government would then ask Parliament to vote an appropriation to cover that deficit. The resolution says:

The Suspense Account—

That includes all the revenues of the Intercolonial or of the Transcontinental, or in short, of the Canadian Government railways.

—and all payments therefrom being subject to the audit of the Auditor General of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID: The resolution has been changed. Did the hon. member hear the amendment?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes. That was the result of the mature deliberation of the Minister of Railways and the acting Minister of Finance.

Mr. MURPHY: The change?

Mr. BUREAU: No, this resolution. It was put on the Order Paper so that members could study it, and, if they saw fit, criticise it. As I said last night in regard to another matter, the Auditor General is an officer of this country; he is not an officer of the Government. He stands between the Government and the public. We have not had any reasons except one from the acting Minister of Finance. He says: Why burden the estimates with $35,000,000, when we can, by a subterfuge, or in other words, by withdrawing from the control of Parliament, an amount of $35,000,000, or even $45,000,000, by keeping accounts separately——

Mr. MURPHY: Make the estimates look that much less.

Mr. BUREAU: Make the estimates look that much less to the people. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says: You want to use a blind. The acting Minister of Finance seems to become indignant at that. The intention, however, apparently seems to be to reduce the estimates by $35,000,000. I object to this resolution because we ought to know what we are going to spend on our Government railways, just as well as on any other department. I am not going to discuss the question of the similarity or dissimilarity between the Post Office and the Canadian Government railways. Any revenue, whether it is procured from the Canadian Government railways or from the post offices, is turned into the Government Treasury, whether it is collected through the intermediary of station masters or postmasters. Be that as it may, my reason for objecting is this: If there is a deficit the acting Minister of Finance says the Government will come to Parliament and ask them to vote the money, and that will bring the question more forcibly before Parliament, and there will be a full discussion of the railway matters of this country. Since I have been in this House, it has always been the custom for my hon. friend the Minister of Railways—he was then Minister of Customs, but generally undertook the work, as Hon. Mr. Cochrane's health was never good

about that time—to make a full statement to the House of the operation of the Government railways when the railway estimates were up, so we have always had a full discussion of the railway situation. The statement made by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is absolutely true; there is undoubtedly a tendency in this Parliament to withdraw from the House of Commons control of the expenditure of public moneys, and a tendency also to withdraw from the representatives of the people in this House control of matters upon which it is their exclusive right to legislate. Furthermore. there is not only a tendency, but it is the actual fact that the Government are passing Orders in Council amending the Constitution of this country and creating conditions which do not exist even in England.

Let us suppose that after the war this country will become as prosperous as she was before, and that we have a surplus. Under the Bill based on this resolution we shall have a separate account for the Intercolonial, and this account will be under the control of the Minister of Railways and the Superintendent of Railways. The principal office of the railway will be in Moncton, and this surplus will be entirely outside of the control of the House of Commons; we shall not have anything to say about the matter; it will be entirely in the hands of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance. The only thing we will be able to say is that in 1918 we assented to a Bill giving absolute control of railway finance to the Minister of Railways. I repeat that if there is a surplus we shall have absolutely no control over its expenditure. The minister may say that it will be paid into the consolidated revenue fund, but I repeat, the House of Commons will have absolutely no control over it. If the Minister of Railways and the acting Minister of Finance have any other reason than that they are adopting this subterfuge in order that the people will not see their extravagance in the estimates, let them give it to the House. My hon. friend says that he does not know what the probable expenditure is going to be. Surely he knows that the revenue for the current year is always based on the past year's expenditure. If you will look at the estimates you will find that in every department the expenditure of 1918-19 is based on the expenditure of 1917-18, taking into account any change there may be in conditions, and I have never heard, during the eighteen years I have been in this House, that the Intercolonial or any other Government railway had to complain of being refused money for operating expenses. Under the circumstances, I think the Minister of Railways should ascertain what the probable expenditure for the coming year will be and then submit it to the House, and then next year he can ask for a vote again, and we shall have an opportunity for criticism. I do not see why we should not show in the estimates the amount of money we propose to expend on the operation of the Government railways, and I shall not support this resolution unless my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, or the acting Minister of Finance, gives some better or more substantial reason for presenting it to-day. The question was asked: Will it make any difference in the book-keeping? The answer was, No. Well, then, if it is going to make no change in the book-keeping, and if the staff is not going to be increased, I do not see any reason why we should adopt the resolution or pass any legislation based upon it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I ask the Government to believe me when I say that I am very sincerely sorry that I cannot quite take their view of this resolution. I do not think their defence of it has quite convinced me up to the present moment. This Government received a mandate from the people for a specific purpose, and that was to win the war by certain definite methods. I think I listened carefully to everything that either minister said, and neither of them said that this proposition was put forward for the winning of the war. They do not then put it forward as a war-time measure, and that being so, one is bound to look at it on sound financial principles, and on parliamentary principles, as far as one understands these principles. The only reason that either minister has given for this proposition is that they object to the loading up of the estimates. It would be a fortunate thing for Canada if its Governments all over would object to loading up their estimates. I have preached economy in this country for many years. I was sorry to hear an hon. member opposite anticipating regular deficits in connection with our Government railways. I trust that will not be the case. I trust these railways will be so managed, and I have sufficient belief in the future of Canada to think that if they are well managed they will not show deficits, but whether there are deficits or surpluses the principles of sound finance demand that the statements in regard to them should be placed before Parliament in an annual financial statement. I very well remember listening to

speeches, as well as reading all the speeches he made during my lifetime, of that great master of finance, Mr. Gladstone. There was nothing he insisted on more than that the expenditures and the incomes of a country should be presented to Parliament each year and be debated by Parliament each year. If that is a sound principle—and in every constitutionally-governed country in the British Empire the principle is one of parliamentary practice—then this is a departure from the universal parliamentary practice of all the constitutionally-governed countries in the British Empire, including the Old Country herself. Before the point was raised by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) the analogy between the Post Office and the railways occurred to my own mind, and I must say the acting Minister of Finance was very unsuccessful from my point of view in showing the analogy was not perfect. I think all he said upon the point was really making a distinction without a difference. The analogy to my mind was as perfect as one could find. What was the analogy? The post offices form a department of the public service. In so far as the government-owned railways are concerned, they constitute a department of the public service. The analogy to that extent is surely perfect. They are both departments of the public service which one might call "carrying departments." In the one case they carry letters, and in the other case they carry goods and persons. You might compare the various stations on your railroad to the various post offices. You might compare your station-masters to your postmasters. You have public expenditure in each case, and you have public incomes in each case. The analogy is absolutely perfect from alpha to omega.

Now, what has been said to justify such a departure as this proposition is from parliamentary precedent and practice? I asked the question as to what is done in regard to government-owned railways in this very matter in other countries? I asked that question for information. I have very little doubt as to the facts myself, and I would like to ask the Government to find out those precedents, and to consider this matter a little before they press the resolution upon this House. No part of constitutional government is more important than giving the people, through their elected representatives, absolute and annual command of the expenditures and incomes of the country, and I must say that I have heard nothing from either of the ministers in charge of this resolution to justify me in thinking that they are making a wise departure. I close by referring to the point with which I began. I believe we are wasting the time of this Parliament when we are taking these things up, for the reason that they do not make for the winning of the war. The mandate of this Government is for a specific purpose, and the constitution of the Government was for a specific purpose. It was to go on with the war, and I cannot see that this proposition comes under that category. It certainly is a very strong departure from the recognized practices of all constitutional governments within the Empire, and I hope the Government will proceed slowly with it.

Mr. J. D. REID: So far as the amendment is concerned, the impression is that, in regard to the operation of the railroad, it is changing a procedure, in so far as the payments for carrying on of the road is concerned. But it does not change it one particle. The Railway Department, as I understand it, is operated in this way; that all receipts in connection with that department are deposited to the credit of the hon. Receiver General at all points along the line. They go direct to the credit of the Receiver General.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought the acting Minister of Finance said they went to Moncton.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am explaining it as I understand it from the financial official of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BUREAU: Who is right?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think my information is right. The official of the department is sitting beside me, and he tells me all the money collected goes direct to the credit of the Receiver General. Then about once a month the Auditor General gives credit for the amount that has been voted by Parliament, and on that credit cheques are issued by the Railway Department from time to time, until that credit has been exhausted. Then another credit is obtained from the Auditor General, and so on, during the fiscal year. That is as I understand the way the operation is carried on at the present time. If this Bill were to go through the same procedure would follow. The Auditor General would be asked to give a credit from month to month in the same way. That was the intention when this resolution was framed by the officials of the department. So

far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, we do not want any change whatever. We want the revenues as collected to be deposited to the credit of the Receiver General, and to get from the Auditor General exactly the same credit. The only intention of this change was to place an amount in the estimates, as has been done from year to year, estimating the amount. We do not know whether it is a correct amount or not. The officials of the department get as near as they can to the amount, and of course the amount goes through the House without any criticism whatever, for the reason that the safety of it is that the Auditor General audits everything that is paid out in connection with that item. When this matter was explained to me by the officials and recommended, it was stated there would be no change whatever in any way, shape or form. The only reason I have to offer for the change in the system is that it is the custom of all the railways in Canada. Every large railway has a system of that kind. The Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern have similar systems. All moneys are paid into the head office and the head office, in so far as the Government railways are concerned, is the Receiver General, and this resolution would place the Canadian Government railways in the same position as other railways. One of the main reasons for introducing it is in order to avoid loading up the estimates with very large amounts. On account of your railway system increasing, you will load up the estimates with an amount that does not appear to be fair, when the working expenses on the other side are not shown at the particular time, which, if shown, would reduce the amount of total estimates that are being submitted to Parliament. At this particular time, when the war is on, when we must go to foreign countries and borrow very large amounts, in so far as the public is concerned, and those from whom we borrow, you are loading up the expenditure with a very large amount, while the revenues on the other side do not show the proper amount, for the reason that there is no estimate made of them. As far as the public is concerned, what happens is that your expenditures appear as a very large amount while the receipts on the other side do not show in their true proportions for the reason that there is no estimate made of them. I have no desire to submit to the House any resolution or plan for changing the system under which the railways have been operated in the past.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clarke) suggests that we should find out what is done in connection with Government railways in other countries. I will be pleased to go into the matter further and let the resolution stand in the meantime. I will make further inquiry and if it is thought better to bring in an estimate, I have not the slightest objection. But I want to impress on the House that this resolution does not change in any way the manner in which the revenues of the railways have been disposed of in the past. They have been deposited directly to the credit of the Receiver General and under this proposal the revenues would be deposited and the expenditures would be made in exactly the same way. Therefore I move that the committee rise and report progress. I will look into the matter again and I will find out what system has been adopted in other countries. After I get that information it is possible that the House may feel that the system proposed has advantages as compared with that which is at present in force.

Progress reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

LEGISLATION TO BRING THE OUTSIDE SERVICE UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. MACLEAN, acting Minister of Finance, the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to consolidate, revise and amend the Civil Service Act of Canada; and to provide that the salary of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission shall be six thousand dollars per annum; and to make provision for the readjustment of grades and salaries in the various classes of the Inside Service, and for the preparation by the Commission of schedules of the positions, duties, and salaries of the Outside Service or of any portion or branch thereof; and to make appointments to the public service upon competitive examination and otherwise eliminate political patronage in the control and management of the said service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope it may be satisfactory to the committee to discuss this matter after the introduction of the Bill. Primarily, the purpose of introducing this resolution is to amend the Civil Service Act in order to provide that in so far as possible all regulations and statutory requirements that are to-day applicable to the Inside Service shall apply to the Outside Service. Appointments to what is called the Outside Service shall hereafter be made by the Civil Service Commission and upon the basis of competitive examination.

An Order in Council was passed on the 13th day of February last upon this subject, and I assume that hon. gentlemen know the general tenor of that Order in Council. It appeared quite fully in the press of the country at the time, but, perhaps, it might be quite proper that I should just in a few words give the purport of it. That Order in Council provided that where knowledge of a professional or technical character was required on the part of any person about to be appointed to the public service the appointment should be made by the deputy head and the Civil Service Commission instead of by the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the deputy head as heretofore. The Order in Council also provided that the Civil Service Commission should, in so far as possible, make appointments to the Outside Service by competitive examination. It required all officers, clerks, and employees in the Outside Service to be appointed in the same manner as persons were appointed to the Inside Service, viz., after competitive examination. The Order in Council also provided that temporary employment in the Outside Service should be authorized from time to time as the Commission deemed necessary and the Commission were also authorized to determine the purpose for which the employment was authorized, and that it should be mentioned in the certificate of qualification to be issued by the Commission.

It also provided that promotions in the Civil Service should be made for merit upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission and of the deputy head of the department. It also provided that no transfer should be made from the Outside Service to the Inside Service under the provisions of Section 50 of the Civil Service Act unless the person concerned obtained from the Civil Service Commission a certificate. The Order in Council also provided that in all competitive examinations held under the Civil Service Act, persons who had been on active service overseas in the military or naval forces of His Majesty, or of any allies of His Majesty, and who had left such service with an honourable record, or who had been honourably discharged, and obtained sufficient marks to pass the required examination should, irrespective of the marks they obtained, be placed in the order of merit on the list of successful candidates above all other candidates. In a general way this is the purport of the Order in Council, which was more in the nature of a direction to the Civil Service Commission than otherwise. It was extremely doubtful if, under the War Measures Act, or any other statute, the Governor in Council could validly establish the regulations contained in the Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: Was there not a report made by the law officers of one of the departments that the Governor in Council had no power to enact any such regulations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really do not know if there was any such report by one of the law officers of the Crown or not. At any rate, the Government were of the opinion that there was hardly sufficient authority, under the Civil Service Act or under the War Measures Act, to establish as law the provisions of the Order in Council, and therefore it was issued more, as I say, in the nature of a direction to the Civil Service Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will you kindly read the Order in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is quite a lengthy document.

Mr. JOS. READ: Were the railway employees brought in?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No. The employees of the Canadian Government railways were exempt from the operations of the Order in Council, as were also the crews of His Majesty's Canadian ships. The reason the latter were exempted must be obvious to every hon. gentleman. I can hardly apprehend how that class of public servant could be placed under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. JOS. READ: What about the railway employees?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The railway employes were exempt from the provisions of the Order in Council for the reason that up to the time of its passage, the Government had found it impossible to work out any system of appointment to the railway service upon the basis of competitive examination. The Civil Service Commission were directed by the Government to give special study to that phase of the matter, but so far they have not reported to the Governor in Council. I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that difficulties of considerable magnitude confront the Government in applying this principle to the employees of the Government railways. However, we trust that very shortly some system can be evolved by which appointment to the Government Railways systems can be so regulated. So far as promotions

on those railways are concerned at present, I think they can hardly be
5 p.m. said to be a matter of patronage or politics; they are largely controlled by the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees, at least that is my impression.

Mr. BUREAU: Only an impression.

Mr A. K. MACLEAN: I am speaking subject to correction.

Mr. BUREAU: It is well to qualify the statement.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have never had very much experience in the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: What about new appointments?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At the present time, and since the passage of the Order in Council, the management of the Canadian Government railways has been given absolute freedom to appoint such persons as he may see fit and to disregard any representations which may be made by any persons to him.

Mr. BUREAU: By any member of Parliament?

Mr. COPP: Has he been ordered to disregard representations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know whether he has been ordered, he has authority to do so.

Mr. COPP: I tell my hon. friend that is not carried out.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That may be, but I am afraid my hon friend is trying to push the Government into the Kingdom of Heaven ahead of time.

Mr. McMASTER: The Government made an attempt to enter the Kingdom of Heaven at the time of the election by declaring that patronage was to be eliminated absolutely.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I say that that has been done by the Government so far as is possible.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Not in the case of the railways.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I admit that possibly my statement does not apply so strongly to the railway system.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It does not apply at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: However, I will say with confidence that the result of the passage of this Order in Council has been very beneficial to the public and the public service. I live in a constituency containing a population of probably one hundred and fifty thousand. Within that constituency is the city of Halifax, one of the termini of the Government railway system, and there are at that point a great number of employees of that system. Since the 20th of January I am sure I have not received three letters from anybody in my constituency, whether employed on Government railways or not, concerning the matter of appointments or promotions on that system. I may say further, that since that time I have not had twenty letters in reference to the matter of patronage from my constituency, or indeed from the whole province of Nova Scotia. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the general effect—

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman is a lucky man.

Mr. MACLEAN: A very lucky man. I attribute it entirely to the passage of this Order in Council, and I trust that the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite has been just as pleasant as my own in that regard.

Mr. BUREAU: It is more pleasant, we never get any such letters on this side of the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You are very fortunate.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman has been reading from an Order in Council passed in February last, as I understand it. Was there not a subsequent interpreting, or modifying, Order in Council passed, and if so will the hon. gentleman bring it down before we enter upon a discussion of the Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, I shall lay on the Table copies of all Orders in Council connected with this matter before we proceed with the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: Can the hon. gentleman now state what was the effect of the modifying or interpreting Order in Council?

Mr. BUREAU: Let a copy of the Order in Council in question be produced and placed on Hansard.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: I can speak as to the second Order in Council. Its object was to make clear that all boards or commissions appointed by the Government came under the provisions of the first Order, so that any appointments to the

staffs of such boards or commissions will have to be made in the manner provided by that Order in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was the second Order in Council retroactive?

Mr. ROWELL: It could not be retroactive.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It could hardly be retroactive.

Mr. ROWELL: It will apply to future appointments in the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hundreds of young men and young girls have been appointed to the staffs of the various boards and commissions.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand the President of the Council to state that the second Order in Council is a confirmation of the appointments made under the first Order in Council?

Mr. ROWELL: No. The second Order in Council—I am sorry I have not got a copy of it here—was to make clear that the provisions of the Order in Council in question applied to appointments to the staffs of boards or commissions. It was suggested that the first Order in Council might only cover other departments of the Government, whereas it was the intention of the Government that they should apply to the boards or commissions that were appointed. The second Order in Council was intended to make that point clear.

Mr. COPP: It was an interpretation of the first.

Mr. CURRIE: Has that Order in Council been brought down, and if not, will it be laid on the Table before this legislation is proceedeed with. All Orders in Council should be laid on the Table before the legislation to which they relate is proceeded with.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All Orders in Council have already been laid on the Table several days ago, when my hon. friends opposite complained about the great number of them, and they include the Order in Council in question.

Mr. McMASTER: There are so many that some of them may be lost.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This Order in Council was laid on the Table early in the session.

Mr. PROULX: Will postmasters come under this Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Was the Ottawa postmaster appointed under this Order in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: His appointment preceded the passage of this Order in Council.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Chronology.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If this Order in Council has been strictly adhered to, the country and the House have reason to be grateful. The mere instance that prior to the passage of the Order in Council some few persons may have been appointed because of party alliances is not, I submit, a matter that is fairly open to substantial criticism. I assure the committee that this Order in Council has been strictly adhered to.

Mr. McMASTER: In the month of October last emphatic declarations were made by the President of the Council and, I think, by one of the other ministers who used to function in the West, that patronage was altogether eliminated. Were the appointments of the postmaster at Ottawa and the collector of customs at Montreal made prior or subsequent to these declarations?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My information is that these appointments were made prior to the passage of this Order in Council. It is easy, of course, for hon. gentlemen who are not supporting the present Government to doubt the bona fides of this Order in Council, but the great public outside of Parliament will be interested in whether or not it is lived up to. If it can be, it is a good thing, and greatly in Canada's interest. This reform could only be possible under present political conditions. Had my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) been returned to power, I have no doubt that he could not have inaugurated such a reform in the public service. Moreover, had the present Prime Minister been returned to power at the head of a Conservative government, it would have been impossible for him to institute such a reform as this. The main purpose of the proposed Bill is to give statutory effect to the Order in Council, and having decided to do this it was necessary to change here and there many of the sections of the Civil Service Act. Particularly was it necessary to vest in the Civil Service Commission certain powers conferred upon the Governor in Council in that Act; and that necessitated many verbal changes. It was

considered desirable, therefore, to consolidate the Civil Service Act entirely and to introduce a new Bill. Some thirteen or fourteen amendments have been made to the Act. There will be other changes, but if the Committee will be satisfied with these explanations of the Order in Council, ample time will be given after the Bill is printed and distributed to enable members to become acquainted with its provisions.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman referred to an inquiry or investigation that the Civil Service Commission was making. Will the report of that inquiry be available before we proceed to a discussion of the Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That had reference to the matter of appointments to the railway service. The Civil Service Commission have not yet had an opportunity of commencing their investigation; the passage of this Order in Council has entailed upon them an immense amount of work. They will probably be able to begin very shortly, but I cannot promise that a report on this matter will be available as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MURPHY: Before proceeding to a discussion of the Bill would the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring down a statement showing how many members of the Outside Service have been transferred to the Inside Service since October 1, 1917, and how many persons have been appointed under section 21 of the present Civil Service Act since that time?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, I will produce that information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to unduly criticise the acting Minister of Finance; I think, from what I heard of him and from him when he sat on this side of the House, that he is acting in good faith and means well. He says that if the right hon. present leader of the Opposition had been returned to power he might not have been able to carry out such a reform as this. Well, one thing I appreciate in public life is sincerity and frankness. When the right hon. gentleman was Prime Minister—in the elections of 1908—he promised one great reform, a reform of the Inside Civil Service. Shortly afterwards, he passed a law which is on the statute book to-day, the Civil Service Act. The resolution was introduced by Hon. Mr. Fisher, then Minister of Agriculture, and in it there was laid down for the first time in Canada the principle of competitive examination, a principle which has been accepted in England and which has made the English Civil Service the best in the world. Moreover, that principle was lived up to by the Liberal Administration which went out of office in 1911. I am not so sure that my hon. friend will find comfort in the record of his associates as regards the operation of the Civil Service Act. It was put to a very severe test by those who came into office in 1911. So much so, indeed, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), speaking of the system of patronage said:

> It almost always causes the dry rot and disintegration that break up Government after Government and party after party. . . .If there is any canker of public corruption, in 99 cases out of 100 you can trace it to the baneful effect of political party patronage.

My hon. friend used those strong words after he had seen his own colleagues in the late Government administering the Civil Service Act. He had seen what Mr. Rogers, the late Minister of Public Works, had done in his own department, namely, appointing in defiance of the Civil Service Commission, a gentleman as chief architect of the Public Works Department, giving him a salary of $7,000, after the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission had refused to recommend him as chief architect, and also had refused to yield to the ultimatum that had been served upon him to recommend such a high salary for that official. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works of to-day has given a permanent leave of absence to that official. My hon. friend may, therefore, just as well have more faith in his old friends than in his new associates as regards the milennium which he is seeking to bring about by this legislation. Does he not know that in 1904, in 1908, and in 1911 promises of Civil Service reform were made by members of the Conservative party, and that Sir Robert Borden pledged himself that there would be Civil Service reform not only in the Inside Service, but in the Outside Service? In the month of December last the Government issued a new manifesto, in which a solemn pledge was taken before the electors of Canada that this Government would put an end for the future to patronage in the public service. At that time, however, and during several weeks afterwards, hundreds of young men and young girls were being taken into the various Government boards and departments, always under the shallow pretext of winning the war. In the city of Ottawa, although we had another solemn pledge embalmed in an Order in Council, passed in 1915, that preference would always be given returned soldiers, we found that the best

positions in the Civil Service were given, not to returned soldiers, but to party managers and ward politicians. Take the case of the postmastership at Ottawa. In the first place, I do not know why Mr. Gouin, the postmaster, was relieved of his duties. He was still hale and hearty, a splendid official, giving entire satisfaction to the public. Nevertheless, he was superannuated, and to the dismay of the people, Mr. Acres, who was the secretary of the Conservative association in Ottawa, was given the position, in defiance of the protest of the Civil Service Federation. The Civil Service Federation, which, I believe, has been consulted concerning this Bill, protested most vehemently to the Prime Minister when it became known that Mr. Acres would be appointed, because there were able officials of twenty and twenty-five years' standing in the Ottawa post office whose services were ignored. And for what purpose? To give a fat office to the secretary of the Ottawa Conservative association. I do not know Mr. Acres. I hope he will prove a good official. I know he is a respected citizen of the city of Ottawa. But why did the Government pass over the heads of old employees in the Ottawa post office, after the pledge had been given by the Prime Minister and by some of his colleagues at the beginning of the election campaign, that there would be no more patronage in the public service.

Let us take the case of the Montreal customs collectorship. I know Mr. Weldon, who will prove an excellent collector of customs. At the last session of Parliament, when we were discussing the estimates, the present Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) made a distinct promise that this office would go to a returned soldier. Yet, a few months after that solemn pledge was given, alderman Weldon was given the position. I do not object to Mr. Weldon personally. I know he will be an excellent collector of customs, I know he has served in South Africa. The fact remains, however, that a pledge was given that a returned soldier would get the Montreal collectorship of customs. There again the principle of promotion, the principle of competition, was not followed. Quite a host of other appointments from the ranks of the friends of the party have been made. An appointment was given to Mr. Nichols, half brother of the present Minister of Finance. Mr. Brabazon a former member of this House was appointed Superintendent of Works on the Ottawa river. I forget the others, but quite an array of Conservative politicians received fat appointments immediately before or immediately after the election, although at that time the Government was preaching throughout the land that there would be no more patronage at Ottawa. In the case of an appointment made at Wingham, Ontario, the principle that postmasters should be appointed only by the Civil Service Commission was again made light of, and a member of the local legislature, I forget his name, was appointed postmaster. The Acting Minister of Finance should not be surprised if we are a little dubious as to the sincerity of the Government in regard to this proposed reform. Until we have strong evidence of its sincerity, we are "Doubting Thomases." We shall, at all events, await with interest the explanation of the Government in regard to the appointment of Mr. Acres at Ottawa. I am anxious to hear what the Acting Minister of Finance has to say about that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A few moments ago I stated that I did not think the great advance proposed by the terms of the Order in Council in the Civil Service of this country could have been accomplished by the leader of the Opposition, if he were in power as leader of the Liberal party, nor by the present Prime Minister if he were in office as head of the Conservative party. I did not intend to detract in the slightest from the credit due to the ministry led by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for passing the Civil Service Act of 1908. On the contrary, I think that ministry is entitled to every possible credit for passing that Act. It was a great reform. I repeat I do not in the slightest degree wish to minimize the efforts made by the ministry of that day. because I was in Parliament myself and supported the Bill.

The Inside Service is very small as compared with the Outside Service in Canada. and the reform contemplated by the Bill which I am about to introduce was only possible by reason of the political conditions which now exist. When my hon. friend referred to the late ministry I think he meant the ministry of which he was a member himself, because the late ministry was the ministry led by the present Prime Minister and was supported by what was known as the Conservative party. My hon. friend is inclined to doubt whether the Act to be framed on the lines indicated by me a few moments ago will be faithfully administered and strictly adhered to. It is very natural for my hon.

friends opposite to have doubts as to the ability of a ministry to enforce the promised reform in respect to the Civil Service, and I do not blame them in the slightest degree for expressing this doubt. It might well have been expressed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and by the citizens of Canada. It is such a tremendous reform to undertake that any attempt in that direction by the Government deserves the sympathy and support of every hon. gentleman in this House. no matter on which side of the Speaker he sits, because that reform can only be accomplished by having the intelligent support of the people of this country. To apply the provisions of the Civil Service Act to the Outside Service was what all parties and all governments in the past have baulked at and refused to do. But the present ministry are attempting to carry out faithfully and strictly the declaration which was made to the country by the right hon. the Prime Minister some time prior to the last election.

I do not think it is fair to judge of the bona fides of the Government in this matter by appointments which were made prior to the passage of the Order in Council. As regards appointments at Ottawa and Montreal, my hon, friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) says that in each case the men appointed were excellent in every respect. I take it that he means that both Mr. Acres and Mr. Weldon will make capable and efficient public servants. If that be so, I doubt if the public are very much interested as to which party both or either of these gentleman supported.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Except that the principle of promotion was ignored.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At that time the principle of promotion in the Outside Service had not been fully worked out, and no Order in Council had been promulgated. My hon. friend must remember that the elections took place only on the 17th December.

Mr. BUREAU: We remember.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And polling overseas was not concluded until the 18th day of January this year. Some time early in February the Order in Council was promulgated. I do not think my hon. friend from Maisonneuve will impress any body in this country very strongly when he urges as a criticism of the Bill which is to be introduced, or of the proposed policy of the Government, the fact that it has happened that one or two former Conservatives were appointed to office before the passage of this Order in Council. I have no doubt that before this Order in Council was passed, some persons were appointed to office, who were Liberals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There was a stampede.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know what my hon. friend means by a stampede. They may have been pressure exerted on behalf of Conservatives and also on behalf of Liberals. But that is a matter which can be of very little concern to members of Parliament now, or to the public, who naturally should be interested in the question whether the proposed reform is in the interests of the country and in the interests of wise, sound, and efficient administration of public affairs. What the public are interested to know is whether in future there will be a strict adherence to the proposals as set forth in the Order in Council, which we propose shall hereafter have statutory effect by the Bill we are about to introduce.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that my criticism is not justified in view of the great reform that the sinners are about to effect. I am a doubting Thomas because I have observed the performance not only of the late Government but of the present one. Let me read the pledge given just prior to the election by the Prime Minister, the leader of the Union Government.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty'e name the Royal Assent to the following Bills.

An Act to provide for the Time in Canada being in advance of the accepted standard time during the summer months.

An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.

An Act to authorize re-arrangement and transfer of duties in the public service.

An Act respecting the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

An Act to amend Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914.

An Act to amend the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed consideration in Committee of the Whole of the resolution providing for the revision and amendment of the Civil Service Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was saying that the reason why we have our doubts as to the sincerity of the Government in the operation of the new Act is that the Prime Minister made a very solemn pledge in the following words on the eve of the election:

> Civil Service reform with a view to extending the principle of the present Civil Service Act to the Outside Service and thus to abolish patronage and to make appointment to the Public Service upon the sole standard of merit. The Civil Service Commission has already been directed to make a report to the Prime Minister as to the necessary steps for that purpose. Such arrangements will be subject to the existing regulations, which will give preference to the appointment of returned soldiers who are duly qualified.

And in the Order in Council passed 19th February, 1918, the Prime Minister adds the following:

> The Prime Minister observes that immediately after the announcement of this policy directions were given to each department of the Government that patronage lists in every such department should be thereafter abolished.

So that immediately after the pledge was given the Prime Minister states that directions were given to each department to abolish patronage, and in spite of that hundreds of new civil servants were appointed to the various boards, commissions, and departments, and in the Outside Service here at Ottawa, Montreal, and even, I am told, in Winnipeg. Therefore, it is not surprising if we have our doubts as to the sincerity of the Government. When those appointments were made very strong protests came from the Civil Service Federation. The following statement was made:

> The Executive begs to record its deep regret in the public interest that patronage appointments have been made since December 17th, especially those made recently in Montreal and Ottawa.
>
> (Signed), WALTER TODD, President.

And from Winnipeg came the following telegram, dated February 17, to Sir Robert Borden:

> Desire to express keen disappointment regarding recent appointments to Montreal and Vancouver customs and consequent failure of Government to fulfil promise to eliminate patronage and recognize merit.

Another from Winnipeg:

> This association most emphatically protests appointment of Acres, Postmaster, Ottawa, in direct violation of Government pledges to people and service and demands in interests of public morality and Service, that his appointment be rescinded and made for merit only.

I am told that the Prime Minister, and my hon. friend, to whom a copy of these telegrams was sent, did not even answer. What faith can we have in the promise of the Government that patronage will be abolished even after this Act? We can have none. We had similar promises made by the late Administration before the election of 1911, and what happened? My hon. friend knows only too well that twelve thousand Liberals were dismissed and 23,000 Conservatives were appointed. I am afraid, as a result of the examples we have had since the election, that the Government will find some means to go back to the same old methods in spite of the stern and unbending Liberals who have been introduced to give new life to the old Administration.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) may rest assured that his fears will not find any justification in the actions of the Government under the proposed Civil Service Bill. If my hon. friend is anxious that the Government should be aided to implement its pledge to abolish patronage, I am sure he will facilitate the passage of this resolution and the Bill to be founded upon it. My hon. friend read from the declaration of policy which my right hon. friend Sir Robert Borden made prior to the election. That was a pledge of policy to be pursued, and a statement of fact of what had already been done. It was a pledge that it was the intention of the Government to extend the Civil Service Act to the Outside Service, and the statement of fact was that the Civil Service Commission had already been instructed to made an investigation looking towards the legislation necessary for that purpose. That is my recollection of the statement as read by my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Order in Council that I have quoted contains the pledge of the Prime Minister, and he adds the following words:

> "The Prime Minister observes that immediately after the announcement of this policy directions were given to each department of

the Government that patronage lists in every such department should be thereafter abolished.

Mr. ROWELL: The declaration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister contained a statement of fact as well as a statement of policy. It contained the statement of fact which my hon. friend has read: that patronage lists in the departments should be abolished. My hon. friend knows very well that patronage lists are not lists of appointees all over the country. The patronage lists as commonly known in the departments are lists upon which purchases of supplies are made. Appointments to the public service and the patronage lists existing in the departments are altogether different matters. The statement made by the Prime Minister is absolutely true: that he had sent notice to the departments instructing them that the patronage lists should be abolished and that purchases should be made in the public interest irrespective of these lists. That policy was further implemented by the Government, just as soon as the Government could deal with the matter by transferring the purchasing for all the departments of Government to the war purchasing commission. Therefore, that feature of the policy of the Government, and the statement of the Prime Minister when he enunciated that policy, have been carried out to the letter.

Coming back to the question of appointments to the Outside Service, the Prime Minister, as my hon. friend has read intimated that the Civil Service Commission would be asked to make a report as to the steps to be taken to bring the Outside Service under the Civil Service Act. So soon as the election was over, and when there was an opportunity to take the matter into consideration, my hon. friend will see from a perusal of the Order in Council that in the absence of the Prime Minister on vacation, I asked my hon. friend the acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to take the matter up and he immediately started in with the Civil Service Commission to investigate the matter, and to see what provision should be made to give effect to the policy of the Government. My hon. friend will recollect the unfortunate and terrible disaster that happened at Halifax. The conditions following that disaster absorbed a great deal of the time of the acting Minister of Finance. Under these circumstances, it was not possible for him to make the same progress in dealing with the matter as he would have been able to do had he not been obliged to go to Halifax. It so happened, therefore, that the matter was not ripe for consideration and action when the Prime Minister returned. Upon his return, the Prime Minister took the matter up with the acting Minister of Finance and the Civil Service Commission, and an Order in Council was formulated as soon as the necessary provisions could be worked out between the members of he Government and the Civil Service Commission.

My hon. friend will bear in mind that certain appointments could only be legally made by Order in Council. Under the law as it stood, appointments to the Inside Service were made under the Civil Service Act upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, but no similar provision existed for making appointments to the Outside Service. Until new Orders in Council were passed, until the Civil Service Commission was authorized to deal with appointments to the Outside Service it necessarily followed that the old method of appointment continued. The pledge of the Prime Minister that he would have this matter investigated has been carried out, the Order in Council has been passed, and now the legislation is submitted to the House.

With reference to the number of persons involved in this change, I am sorry that I have not the exact figures here. I did not know that this matter was coming up at this time, but my recollection is that there are in the Inside Service about 5,000 persons and in the Outside Service about 35,000. You cannot make a change affecting such a large number of officials without the necessary careful consideration and preparation by the Civil Service Commission. You cannot at one stroke transfer to a commission which has been dealing with 5,000 employees in the Inside Service the burden of dealing with 35,000 employees throughout the whole Dominion. You must give consideration and serious thought to the details necessary to work out such a radical change. I think it must be conceded by all that this is the most radical proposal in the way of Civil Service reform that has ever been made on this continent at least, and I think I am safe in saying that it is the most radical that has ever been made at one stroke in any country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Acres' appointment was not so imperative.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not say that any appointment was imperative. Appointments were made under Order in Council because that was the necessary and legal course until a new policy was legally put into effect. Mr. Acres was appointed under the law that was then in force. My hon. friend, the acting Minister of Finance, is correct in saying that

what the country is interested in is the fact that this reform is to go into effect. If all the comment that has been made in reference to two or three appointments, which, it is said, were political appointments, is justified, what is the country going to be saved from when this legislation goes into effect and when 35,000 appointments from one end of Canada to the other will no longer be political appointments as they have been in the past, but will be non-political appointments under the provisions of the Civil Service Act? That indicates the character and extent of the reform.

One word more and I am through. My hon. friend referred to one appointment of which I have particular knowledge and, therefore, I wish to mention it. He referred to the appointment of Mr. Nichols as a relative of the Minister of Finance and as a Conservative appointment pressed in before the election. Mr. Nichols was not appointed because, but in spite of the fact that, he was a relative of a member of the Government, and he was appointed after consultation with gentlemen of the press, because he was represented as the best newspaper man whom we could find who would be available to become director of public information and carry on that work for the Government. He was appointed solely because he was believed to be the best man for the position, and in spite of his relationship. And I can say this further: As far as the Minister of Finance was concerned he did not know that the appointment was under consideration, or in fact anything about it, until the proposal was submitted to Council. I know that because the appointment came under my personal charge, and it was made on my own recommendation.

Mr. BUREAU: If you get your neighbour to make an appointment, it is no better justification than if you put the appointment through yourself.

Mr. ROWELL: I have already given my hon. friend my word that the Minister of Finance knew absolutely nothing about it, and that the appointment was made on my recommendation.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not improve matters at all.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know what my hon. friend means when he says "if a man gets his neighbour to do it."

Mr. BUREAU: I will tell you what it means. It means that the Minister of Trade and Commerce may appoint the Prime Minister's brother, to a Government position, and in return the Prime Minister may appoint to an office some relative of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That explanation does not justify the appointment.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It is the return of a courtesy. Here we have an exemplification of the advantages of Union Government.

Mr. ROWELL: The courtesy has not yet been returned.

Mr. BUREAU: It may be expected.

Mr. ROWELL: I repeat that the appointment of this gentleman was made after consultation with gentlemen of the press who represented him as the best newspaper man available for this important and responsible post. It was not made because he was a Conservative, a Liberal would under like circumstances have been taken just as quickly. My hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) may feign surprise, but the statement is nevertheless true.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 43, to incorporate the Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Greene.

Bill No. 45, respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 46, respecting United Grain Growers, Limited, formerly the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 47, to confirm an agreement made between Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and the Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Crowe.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT

The House resumed consideration in Committee of the resolution providing for the revision and amendment of the Civil Service Act—Hon. A. K. Maclean—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. ROWELL: I now have the second Order in Council, dated February 28, 1918, that was referred to this afternoon. It is as follows:

Whereas doubt has arisen as to whether the Order in Council of the 13th day of February,

1918, (P.C. No. 358) respecting appointments to, promotions in, and other matters relating to the Civil Service, applies to officers, clerks and employees other than those employed in the several departments, and it being desirable to remove any such doubts;

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the President of the Privy Council, is pleased to declare and it is hereby declared, that the provisions of the said Order in Council do extend to all officers, clerks and employees in the public service, whether employed in any department or under or in connection with any Commission or Board appointed or created by or the members of which are appointed by or in pursuance of any Order in Council, and any power heretofore given to any such Commission or Board or the members thereof or any of them to appoint or promote any officer, clerk or employee is hereby rescinded, except in so far as such power may be exercised subject to and in conformity with the provisions of the said Order in Council of the 13th day of February, 1918.

The purpose of this Order in Council was to make it clear that all commissions came under the provisions of the previous Order in Council.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Does that include railway employees?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: No, they were expressly excepted pending investigation by the Civil Service Commission of the conditions under which they might be brought under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: When we rose at six o'clock, the President of the Council was making statements which rather excited my curiosity. He stated—if I am in error, he will correct me, because I do not wish to misrepresent him—that Mr. Nichols' appointment was made in spite of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White).

Mr. ROWELL: I said, not because of, but in spite of, his being a relative.

Mr. BUREAU: My error appears to be a grammatical one; I think that I understood my hon. friend rightly. The appointment was made as a result of a conference between the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) and certain newspapers or newspaper proprietors. The position is a rather important one. A bureau of information was being created to deal with matters connected with the war, and it was necessary that a man of superior ability and integrity, who enjoyed the confidence of the people, should be obtained for the position. We have known Mr. Nichols as the editor of a Montreal newspaper, and as such he must be fairly known to all other newspaper editors. The member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) was talking the other night about the relations between the President of the Council and certain newspapers. It would seem that my hon. friend himself, therefore, knows something about newspapers.

Mr. ROWELL: I did not catch my hon. friend's last remark.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood the member for Russell to intimate that the President of the Council was himself connected with newspapers.

Mr. ROWELL: No, that is incorrect.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad to accept the correction. But it was important that my hon. friend communicate with other newspaper men if he desired to obtain a man who had the necessary qualifications as a publicity agent. As a matter of curiosity and of information, may I ask the President of the Council whether he consulted editors of such Toronto newspapers as the Star, Mail and Empire, News, World and Telegram; or of such Montreal newspapers as the Star and the Gazette; or of the Winnipeg Tribune or Winnipeg Free Press? Of course, down home, we do not get the coast newspapers.

Mr. SHEARD: The Orange Sentinel.

Mr. BUREAU: The proprietor of that paper, being in the House, could be consulted now, if not then. That, however, would depend on the judgment of the President of the Council. I suppose some of these gentlemen were consulted, having regard to the fact that the appointment was being pressed so strongly upon the Government in spite of his relation to the minister, because there must have been some grave reason for the appointment being made in spite of the relationship.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No. I want to know what editors or members connected with any of those newspapers were consulted.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend asks me if any editors or members connected with some of the papers named were consulted. I can say, yes, but I do not think that when a minister of the Crown consults parties with reference to matters relating to appointments in the public service, it is wise to disclose confidences, where there are confidential communications.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I just came in when the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was speaking. Was the hon. mem-

ber criticising the appointee as being incompetent?

Mr. BUREAU: No. I suppose my hon. friend was not in the House this afternoon.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was, most of the time.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, when the question arose, somebody in the House stated that the appointment of Mr. Nichols was rather shady, because he was a brother-in-law or a half-brother, I do not know which, of the Minister of Finance. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) explained that in spite of that relationship—they had to fight against this very thing that is so obnoxious to them—they appointed him on account of his super-qualities. But not only were those super-qualities in the judgment of the President of the Council, they were impressed upon him by editors of the leading newspapers of this province. I am inquiring from the minister who those editors are. I see the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) does not nod assent. I suppose he was not consulted.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That was not what I had in mind at all when I rose to speak. I am not prepared to discuss the question as to whether the apppointment was necessary or not, but I should like to say that I have known Mr. Nichols intimately for twenty years, and I desire to pay testimony to his rare ability. He was an excellent newspaper man; he is a man of splendid parts, most aggressive and thoroughly reliable. From my long and intimate acquaintance with him, I would say that if one were to search Canada, one probably could not find more than half a dozen as bright men as Mr. Nichols. If he has the misfortune to be half-brother to the Minister of Finance—

Mr. BUREAU: That was not a misfortune in this case.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Nichols and I were members of the same board for three or four years. We met weekly and it was the universal testimony of newspaper men in the West that Mr. Nichols was a man of exceptional ability. It would be very difficult to find a man more fitted for most occupations, except possibly the preaching of the Gospel, than Mr. Nichols.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While I agree with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) that Mr. Nichols is a journalist of standing, I do not accept the reasoning of the President of the Council when he says that he cannot state under what recommendations Mr. Nichols was preferred to others. I am told by reliable parties, who belong to the press, that many others could have been selected for the post to which Mr. Nichols was appointed. More than that, I am told that the position itself was not required at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That may be.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not the question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to put a question to the President of the Council. Mr. Nichols is an excellent journalist. He was at one time in Montreal publishing the Daily Mail and the Evening News. I may say, by the way, that he killed both papers. The President of the Council is, perhaps, not familiar with conditions in Montreal. I know that while he was leader of the Liberal party in Ontario he had to read many newspapers published in his own province. I may tell him that for months and months Mr. Nichols and his two organs in Montreal, the Daily Mail and the Evening News, never ceased to attack most bitterly a gentleman who was in the late Government. I refer to the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), a dear friend of mine, as hon. members all know. I have heard the ex-Minister of Militia complaining in this House to the Minister of Finance in regard to those attacks. He referred to them in many of his speeches. He said that there was a conspiracy in the Government against him and that Mr. Nichols was the instrument to carry out that conspiracy. Let us come to the point at issue. My hon. friend cannot with a wave of the hand dismiss the case so easily, because with all its glorious promises of Civil Service reform, the new Government has appointed Mr. McLean, Comptroller of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, Mr. Boyce a member of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and Mr. Brabazon as Inspector of the Ottawa Dam Works.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Superintendent of the Works on the Ottawa River. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Nichols is the very acme of the ideal journalist.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I did not say he was the ideal journalist, but he is a good man.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let me say he is just as good a journalist as my good friend from Springfield.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Then he is all right.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the President of the Privy Council justify Mr. Nichols' appointment to a post that is not required at all on the mere ground that he is a good journalist? Will my hon. friend tell us, first, the salary of Mr. Nichols; second, where his office is in Ottawa, and third, the nature of the work connected with his office? I understand, for instance, the necessity for the creation of a propaganda office in England. Whilst I do not accept the appointment which has been made and which has been so severely criticised by both political parties in England, that of Lord Northcliffe, Lord Beaverbrook and Lord Rothermere; still, in England they are not far from the Continent, and it is necessary to carry out the propaganda there. All the European governments have been carrying out propaganda on the Continent. I can understand that. But why here in Canada have an office for propaganda? What propaganda and what work has Mr. Nichols performed? Can my hon. friend show me anything that Mr. Nichols has accomplished since his appointment at the high salary of $5,000 a year? What is the nature of that propaganda? I am not accusing; I am asking. Is it a political propaganda? Does it consist in the publication of those appeals which were made during the recent election and which were spread in the press from one end of the country to the other? If that is the nature of his work, I blame the Government very seriously for the appointment of Mr. Nichols, because that propaganda was not in the public interest; on the contrary, it was to promote a political interest and nothing else, and certainly it was far from promoting national unity. But what his duties are I do not know, and I should be glad to hear from my hon. friend who brought up this subject this afternoon. We are told—and I draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to this—that we are displaying parochialism when we rise and criticise these matters. The other day I resented his telling me, when I was discussing the famous Order in Council about the borrowing powers of the provinces that I was giving vent to parochial views. This is not parochialism. Surely the duty of my hon. friend as Acting Minister of Finance is to check the expenditure of this country. If there was one thing which I admired this afternoon in the speech of another old friend now in exile on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), it was his quotation from Mr. Gladstone that a Finance Minister should never be ashamed of cheese paring. The hon. member for Red Deer said that this Government was elected with a specific mandate to win the war. If we are to win the war we must take the necessary means, and surely we must check the expenditure. I say that spending $5,000 here and $2,000 there and $6,000 elsewhere is lavish expenditure, and I do not consider myself parochial in bringing this matter before the House. I am sincere in what I say.

Mr. RICHARDSON: When I was defending the appointment, I was speaking of Mr. Nichols as a journalist. I do not know if he was required or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As one of the leaders of journalism in Canada, my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) would perhaps give me the benefit of his views. Does he believe that Mr. Nichols or any other gentleman is needed for propaganda literature in Canada at the present time? All the Germans and all the Austrians are interned, and it seems to me that propaganda of that nature can have very little influence on public opinion in this country; and certainly if the literature he is turning out is what was published during the last election, far from helping the cause it has just the contrary effect.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Nichols, of course, has had nothing to do with political propaganda in any shape or form. His work is solely in connection with the war and the matters already set out in the return brought down. Might I suggest that it would be a more convenient time to give detailed information when my estimates are up, when I shall be very glad to go fully into this matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is in my hon. friend's department?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is his salary?

Mr. ROWELL: It is $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolution before you, Mr. Chairman, is one that has my warmest sympathy and support, and if I make an observation or two concerning it, it is only that I may obtain some information as to the machinery whereby my hon. friend expects to carry it out. I notice the salary to be voted for the chairman

of that board is $6,000. My recollection is that the salary in the past has been $5,000. Am I not right?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Six thousand, I think.

Mr. FIELDING: My recollection is that the chairman has heretofore been paid $5,000, and it is now proposed to increase his salary to $6,000, but I am not complaining about that, I take it for granted that the Government have good reason for increasing the salary, and I just wanted to be sure whether my memory was correct as to the figure. One of my difficulties is in understanding how this excellent programme is to be carried out, and I am not sure that my difficulty is any greater than the Government's, because I fancy they have their own troubles in the matter. I think we are getting away from the purpose for which the Civil Service Commission was created. It was never intended to be a patronage distributing body, but a body with distinct purposes, a body to hold examinations and to take means of guaranteeing the qualifications of applicants for the Public Service. That, I think, is a correct statement of its original purpose. But now the Government seem to be obliged—I am not saying they could do otherwise—to make this commission a patronage distributing body. Now to say to A, B and C, who are members of Parliament, that they shall have no right to nominate anybody, but that D, E and F, who are called the Civil Service Board, shall nominate and appoint the men, does not seem to me to be abolishing patronage; it is simply transferring it from a number of gentlemen who, whatever their faults may be, have some knowledge of local conditions, and turning it over to gentlemen who have no knowledge of local conditions. It seems to me that is the effect of it. I happen to have a copy of the latest Order in Council that has been issued, and here is how it proposes to deal with the post office:

When the appointment of a rural postmaster is desired the Commission shall, through the responsible official of the Post Office Department—

I do not quite know who that is; there are a great many responsible officials in the Post Office Department.

—institute inquiries in the locality in which the appointment is to be made, with a view to securing a suitable person, suitably located, for such position and, having made a selection and having satisfied themselves that such person possesses sufficient education to enable him to efficiently discharge the duties of the position and that he is duly qualified as to health, character and habits, the certificate required for his appointment shall be issued.

Where is the Civil Service Commission going to get information regarding all the virtues of this man who is to fill the office of postmaster away out at Blankville in Cape Breton county? I do not know what the experience of others has been, but I have had some of the worries of my life in getting a capable man to accept the position of postmaster, and how these excellent gentlemen in the city of Ottawa are going to get a postmaster for Blankville better than any one of us I fail to comprehend.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Will the hon. gentleman suggest what method he thinks should be followed?

Mr. FIELDING: I confess my difficulty. I merely say the Government is not making it any better, that is all; I am not complaining. I said a moment ago I was very much afraid that my friends in the Cabinet are no wiser than I am. I know their object is good, and I think they are trying to find a way of accomplishing it.

I cannot understand how this Civil Service Commission located in Ottawa is going to be able to obtain any better information about a man who is qualified to be a postmaster down in my constituency than I can obtain myself. You may say I would make a partisan recommendation, and perhaps I would. You know these commissioners of the Civil Service are only human. They will get information from somebody, and he may be a partisan, and perhaps not as fair-minded a person as I hope I am myself. I only want to state that the machinery by which the Cabinet is endeavouring to accomplish their purpose seems to me to be full of trouble. I do not think it is going to work well. I do not blame the Cabinet for trying to do it; it may be the best way. With reference to the nomination for this fifty-dollar postmastership, if you are going to say a member of Parliament is not to be trusted to make the nomination—and he knows something about it at all events—and you are going to turn it over to three gentlemen in Ottawa who may know nothing about it, it seems to me it will not work out. I want to help my hon. friends to work it out. I am not complaining. I call attention to some of the difficulties they have in their way. I am not doing it in a fault-finding way. I would be glad to make it better if I could.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It seems to me the criticism of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) is unfair and

destructive. When a man rises to criticise the action of somebody else it his duty to propose an alternative. I do not think it is fair to suggest that two or three gentlemen in Ottawa are going to select the postmasters at $50 a year for Burrard Inlet or some place in Cape Breton. I think the resolution is clear on that point. It says the responsible officer—meaning, of course, the inspector in the district where the vacancy occurs—shall be the man who will make the inquiry. You will not always get just the exact and proper man to fill this position, of course. But what has been the experience in the past 40 or 50 years? All sorts of partisan appointments have been made. When the Government changed charges were made against postmasters for partisanship, and postmasters have been dismissed. It seems to me it is the absolute duty of every hon. gentleman to support this idea. The idea is to get rid of partisanship and patronage in appointments. If the hon. gentleman knows any better method than that suggested by the Government, it is his duty to propose it. He must lay some constructive scheme before this House before he will induce me, at least, to accept his criticism, and to oppose the scheme which the Government proposes. It must surely be the conviction of every hon. member in this House, as well as the conviction of every thoughtful man in this country, that if there has been one curse in connection with public administration it has been the patronage system. If the Government is making, as I believe it is, an honest effort to strike a deadly blow at patronage, then, instead of being criticized, the Government should be encouraged in every possible way. It is a Union Government, a government composed of both parties. I cannot say that they had the unanimous support of every section of Canada at the last election, but they were not so far from it. This Government, therefore, is in a position that no other government in Canada has ever occupied to accomplish such reforms as the one now proposed. If hon. members are disposed to carp, criticize and attempt to destroy the efforts of the Government, they are going to paralyze the arm of the Government. It is amazing to me that any thoughtful Canadian who has watched the working of the patronage system in this Dominion for the last thirty, forty or fifty years, should not hold up both hands in support of any effort, if this effort is being honestly made, to strike a death blow at the patronage system.

Mr. FIELDING: I have stated that I am in favour of the resolution. The effort of my hon. friend in picturing me as trying to destroy the efforts of the Government is unnecessary, and his statement is groundless. I am trying to get some information. I may not get it from the members of the Government; they may be in as much difficulty as I am. I am trying to suggest to the members the difficult position in which this Bill is placing the Civil Service Commission. When the Civil Service Commission is asked to conduct an examination, or to judge as between A, B. C and D, and award the recommendation to the man who wins the prize, that is the purpose of the Civil Service Commission, but I cannot see how the thing is to work out, or how this commission is going to get information as to petty appointments all over the country. My hon. friend says the inspector for the district will select the man. He is only a human being like ourselves. My point, with respect to that class of small appointments is that the Government is not going to make things any better. I can tell my hon. friend a better rule than the one he has laid down, and that is that if anybody proposes a change he must advocate the change and show reason for it; he cannot propose a negative. He might say: "Well, let well enough alone." I do not say, "Let well enough alone," I admit the trouble; I know the tremenduous harm that is done by patronage. But patronage may be honestly and fairly administrated, or it may be abused. The idea that every appointment that has been made under the patronage system is a bad one, is a delusion. Three out of four men appointed to office have served the country well. There have been abuses in the patronage system, and there may be abuses under this system. The only point I am asking is that it seems to me the imposition of these duties on the Civil Service Commission, is inconsistent with their original purpose, and I am trying to find out whether the system will work out well. I hope it will.

Mr. EDWARDS: I agree with very much that has been said by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, and whether his remarks are regarded as constructive criticism or not, I venture to say that in the working out of this plan much that he has said will have to be taken into consideration in order to make the plan workable. There has been a great deal said and printed in the papers in regard to the patronage evil, and in order to get rid of this supposed evil this scheme has been evolved. I take it I am expressing the

opinion of every hon. member in this House when I say no member of Parliament is anxious to administer the patronage in his constituency; we would all like to get rid of it. But I fail to see how it is possible to administer the Civil Service and make the various small appointments throughout the length and breadth of this land without receiving the advice of the man who knows more than anybody else about the outlying portions of this country, namely, the member for the constituency. Further, in regard to the patronage evil, it is my firm conviction that, notwithstanding the fact that the Inside Service has for years been under the Civil Service Commission, the Outside Service appointments which have been made, if you like, through the member or by the administration of patronage, are better appointments, and the service is much more efficient than the service in Ottawa, where the appointments were made under the Civil Service Commission. And why? Take my own constituency—and I am speaking, I am sure, for every other man in this House—there is a safeguard in regard to the appointment to the Outside Service by reason of the fact that every member of Parliament who makes a recommendation to office, whether it be a post office appointment or the appointment of a preventive officer, or some other small job, at $50 or $100 or $200 a year, knows that he has upon him the eyes of the people of that locality who are going to criticise him and watch his movements very closely. He knows also that he is responsible to his people. All this makes him careful as to the men he names to fill positions. That is a conclusion which cannot be overlooked. There have been some patronage evils, no doubt, but most of the trouble in regard to the evils of party patronage have been in connection with the large purchases of supplies or something of that kind. I do not believe there has been warrant for the criticism and the newspaper talk in regard to the patronage evil in so far as the hundreds of minor appointments are concerned. For instance, there is a vacancy in my constituency; a little position which pays the munificent salary of $150 a year happened to become vacant last fall. It was a position that did not require to be filled immediately inasmuch as there was nothing for the appointee to do until the season of navigation began. It is impossible to get an outsider to go in there. The appointee must be some person who lives in that locality and has something else to depend upon for a living. A man is necessary there and we have to appoint some one. Who knows better than the representative of the constituency who would be the best man for the position? Is not the public interest safeguarded in taking a recommendation from me, in that I know that if I name for the position some person who is not qualified and who is not entitled to it, I will bring down upon myself the criticism of the whole community? They will get after you—that has the tendency to keep you straight. How is that position going to be filled? Are you going to refer it to the Civil Service Commission? If so, what are they going to do? They have to get somebody to find out who is qualified to take that post. The same thing applies to the appointment of postmasters here and there throughout the country. It is all right enough to say that the inspector of the post office district would be asked to name a man. How is he going to name a man? My constituency is a hundred miles long. I venture to say that the post office inspector, who lives in Kingston, has never been in the northern part of my county and does not know any more about the place than he knows about Cape Breton. He has to apply to some man who is thoroughly acquainted with the riding.

I do not think that there has ever been justification for a considerable part of the criticism which has been offered in regard to party patronage and which has appeared so profusely in the press. I am not saying that the idea of the Government putting the Outside Service, generally speaking, under the commission and getting it out of party politics is not one worthy of support and consideration. But it does seem to me that the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) were very much to the point and ought to be taken into consideration by the Government when they come to work this matter out. I do not see how they are going to work it out. Are they going to refer to the Civil Service Commission the appointment of a labourer in a drain or some such little job where a man gets $150 or $200 a year? I do not think it is workable or practicable and I do not think the system should apply to these positions. The Civil Service Commission, apparently, is not asked in regard to positions when they carry salaries of $6,000 or $8,000 a year. There is not nearly as much consideration given then to safeguarding the public interest. It seems to me to be straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel when you speak of a desire to

safeguard the public interest by looking after the appointment of people to little positions worth $150 or $100 a year and putting such appointments under a commission that does not and cannot know anything about the circumstances bearing upon the case.

Mr. DEVLIN: I believe that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) has put his finger on what is going to be the great difficulty in the working out of this Act. Advice must be sought, and it is natural that the member for the constituency should be in the best position to give advice. I also agree with the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). At the same time, if I understand the idea of the resolution, it is to absolutely remove patronage from the hands of members of Parliament. I think the hon. members for Ottawa city will be willing factors in that movement. It is strange that we get in our mail, practically every day, from the Civil Service Commission, notices that certain positions are vacant, the idea of the notices being that we should send in a recommendation for the filling of these positions. Whether these recommendations will be acted upon is another matter. If I had a suggestion to make—and I do this for the benefit of the hon. member from Springfield (Mr. Richardson)—it would be that in all matters where appointments are to be made in rural districts, the advice of the municipal councils be sought and that the Civil Service Commission act upon the recommendation of those councils. I know of no less partisan bodies than the municipal councils.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favour of this resolution. I believe it involves one of the most important steps that the Union Government have taken—if they will only do it, honestly, candidly and without hypocrisy. I heard my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) say to-day that the Union Government was elected especially to win the war. In so far as that is its purpose I am prepared to tell him that every man in this House, so far as I know, is behind the Government; we all want to win the war. But, at the same time, while we are behind this Government, and while we are anxious to win the war, we want to be in a position to carry on the public affairs with honesty, economy and integrity. The Order in Council that this resolution is based upon calls for the appointment of public servants through competitive examination and otherwise eliminating party patronage. In the name of common sense, why does not this Government include in the elimination, patronage in the railway system of Canada? Canada is entering upon a great railway nationalization policy, and unless this elimination of patronage is made applicable to the railway system, the railways will own Canada and not Canada the railways; the railways will own the Government and the Government will not own the railways. I speak with some authority on this subject, as I have lived right alongside the railroad, which runs past the corner of my house, and I come from a province that was sold into the Dominion of Canada absolutely through its railway; and I say that this patronage has been the curse of the whole Governmental system in the Dominion of Canada. Now, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who, I understand, stands for "Free Trade as it is in England,"—though he should stand for "Free Trade as it should be in Canada,"—can give us better advice from the English standpoint on this question of Civil Service reform, because there is no country in the world that has solved that question so completely, so splendidly, so efficaciously, and so thoroughly, as Great Britain. I know my hon. friend from Red Deer can give us a pointer in that regard. I have had the opportunity of knowing the Old Country almost as well as our own, having visited Britain nearly every year for thirty years, and having to do with civil servants there —Customs House officers and all that class of men—directly and indirectly; and I want to say that over there they do not have any of this trouble in regard to patronage that we have had in Canada. Patronage in this country is one of the worst things that exist to-day in civil government. It is bad because it lends itself to a system of corruption. It is one of the most corrupt methods of canvassing for votes, going and promising half a dozen men an office. In that respect difficulties have been created for members of Parliament, and I am sure that every man in this House will hold up both hands to get clear of patronage, except one or two. You have heard of the prisoner of Chillon. The prisoner of Chillon was imprisoned for so long that when he was liberated he went back to the prison, he could not live with the manacles off him. And, unfortunately, there are some men like that.

I am going to vote for this resolution, and I want other hon. members to do the same. I do not use the term "hon. members" now

in the sense that Mark Antony used the word "honourable" when he said, "so are they all, all honourable men," when he was speaking about Brutus with the blood still dripping from the dagger. But I mean honourable men in the parliamentary sense of the term. Now, to show you the earnestness of some members of Parliament——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some members of the Government.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Yes, some members of the Government——on this question of patronage. I wrote one of the hon. members of the Government under date of January 9th on this subject, and asked him that now that the Union Government——

Mr. MURPHY: That was after the election.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: That was after the election. I wrote one of the hon. members of the Government to the effect that now the Union Government had been returned to power I presumed that patronage was going to be eliminated. With regard to the question of Union Government I want to say that, so far as I was concerned personally, I was, and am now, in favour of a Union Government that would have commended itself to me, but I wanted it to be a Union Government that stood for unity. However, be that as it may, I wrote and pointed out that there was a certain section in my constituency where the probability was that some men would be required in the public service, and asked if it was the intention of the Government to eliminate partisan patronage in the appointment of these people. I desired to do away with the irritation that had been rampant all over the country with regard to patronage, especially during election time. But the young gentleman I was running against, who happens to be my own nephew, when the word came down that the sheriff of the county was going to be appointed as the returning officer, sent him a list of fifty enumerators, and every one of them was a dyed-in-the-wool Tory. And yet he was calling himself a Unionist, a fifty-fifty man. That was irritating people very much and I wanted to do away with the irritation, and to tell you the truth, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to see Union Government a success. If the Union Government are not a success we should turn them out, and hon. gentlemen on the other side will help us to do that, I am satisfied. Now here is the letter:

9 p.m.

Dear Sir,—

Yours of the 9th instant duly received. As far as any patronage in connection with the Railway Department is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt but that both Liberals and Conservatives who supported the Union Government will receive every consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name, name.

Mr. READ: The writer of that letter was a member of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name, name.

Mr. READ: No, I will not give the name, because:

> While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return,

I have a letter from another member of the Government and his reply was to this effect: So far as I am personally concerned, I mean what I promised the people publicly and privately, and that was to eliminate partisan patronage.

I mention these matters because I want these gentlemen to get together and reform themselves. If we are going to have stable government they must get together on principle where honesty and integrity are the paramount issues, and where hypocrisy is absolutely eliminated. Hypocrisy in public life is nearly as bad as it is in religious life, and we know all about that.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am going to support the motion, and I hope that when the Bill comes down my hon. friends in the Government will see to it that the railway system is brought within its scope. If they do not they are going to make the biggest mistake they ever made in their lives, both in their own interest and the interest of the public. If there is any public service in this country that requires the elimination of patronage more than another, yes, five times more than any other—and I speak with authority because I know from experience—it is the railway service. That service as a Government service it is going to spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific with its branch lines and its ramifications. Talk about the Inside Service and the Outside Service, why, there will not be any comparison between them. I tell you that when this great railway system goes through the country, unless we adopt the principle of putting it under commission—not only the appointment to it, but the whole great railway system—putting it under a non-partisan commission, the members of which would have all the authority, all the sanctity and all the judicial capacity of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, there is going to be trouble.

The Civil Service Commissioner whose salary is named in this resolution should be a man of the very highest integrity. He should be above any government; like the Auditor General, he should be in a position to tell the Government to go to Hades if it does not do what was right.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: At the beginning of a new Parliament one gets many surprises. I must say that the greatest surprise I have received yet in this Parliament was in finding any disposition on the part of the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), or the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to hang on to some belief in the old doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils." The member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) put his finger on the essence of what the Government is trying to obtain in the destruction of patronage. It is, as I conceive it, to separate the member of Parliament from the appointments in his constituency. What would happen if we could accomplish that? In the first place, the people of the country who are civil servants would know that they held their positions upon their merits, and would give their service accordingly. In the second place, the whole of the people would, at election time, vote upon public questions as they conceived those questions would work out for the public good, and not for their own private emolument. That is what would be the effect upon the people; what would be the effect upon members of Parliament? Knowing that the people were going to vote upon the merits of public questions, candidates for Parliament would inform themselves upon public questions and would stand upon their intellectual and political merits for election, not upon their ability to go in for what my friend opposite has called corruption. That is the gist of the whole matter as it appears to me. Can any member of this House who considers the question from that point of view fail to see that if we carry out this principle it will immensely elevate the public life of the country? That is what I mean by the abolition of patronage in this particular aspect. As to who should make the appointments in small country post offices, in my part of the world it has been a very great difficulty to get men to take office at all. In many cases, when asked for a recommendation, I have simply written a letter to the department, saying: Ask the inspector to go there and get the best man he can, whatever his political colour may be. The member for Frontenac says that he knows the people in his district better than certain other men can know them. That is just the trouble with a great many of us; we have known the districts, and known the men. We all know—let us get rid of cant in this matter—that men have been appointed by members of all political complexions with the expectation that political services would be rendered for the appointments. Now, that should go. Men should be appointed to serve the public because of their merits, they should be promoted because of their merits, and they should be free to act for the public good at election time just as members should be allowed to stand for the public good and for the public good only, and to stand for public questions on their merits. I repeat that if that can be brought about, it will immensely elevate the public life of the country and make for the good of Canada.

I want to say this on behalf of the Government: No sane man expects them to produce in one moment a perfect scheme for this change, in all the manifold complexities of this great country and its public services. But in making an honest endeavour to begin to do it, they deserve the sympathy of every right-thinking person in the country. They certainly have my sympathy; they will have all the help that I can give them; and if they go on courageously in the way they are beginning, they will have the encouragement of all the best-thinking people in large portions, at any rate, of this Dominion. So far as the next election goes, if anybody is looking so far ahead, he will stand much better under this system than if he had hung on to the old method of giving enough jobs to get enough votes to be returned to Parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: If I gave my hon. friend the impression that I proclaimed the doctrine that "to the victor belongs the spoils," or that I was anxious to cling to the system of the distribution of patronage, then I can only say that I failed to speak with that clearness which I always endeavour to attain, though I may not always succeed. I have no desire to do either one. I have never proclaimed the doctrine that "to the victor belongs the spoils," in the sense in which the words are commonly used—though there is a sense in which the words might be legitimately applied. Nor do I desire to cling to patronage. I have had some experience of it, and it has not been exactly in the line that my hon. friend suggests. His idea is that when one is instrumental in getting one of his friends a public office, he expects to be re-

warded with political support. Well, that is not my experience. On the contrary, when I have had opportunity of recommending a man for any public office and the question of political support has come up, I have always told him: My friend, your party services have had something to do with your getting the office, but from this time forward your are the servant of the community, and I do not want you to meddle in politics. That has been my experience in the administration of patronage. The only point of my observations was to call attention to the difficult position in which the Civil Service Commission was being placed. I frankly said in reply to the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) that I could not at the moment suggest anything better. But I was pointing out that while the Civil Service Commission would be an excellent body to hold examinations, to test qualifications, to decide as between A, B, C, and D for any particular office—that is the duty they were originally intended to discharge, and they are well qualified to discharge it—yet where there can be no examination and no test, nothing more than an inquiry somewhere, the Civil Service Commission were in no better position to get information of that character than anybody else.

Mr. EDWARDS: I also, Mr. Chairman, want to repudiate the suggestion that I am one wrapped up in the theory, that "to the victors belong the spoils." I am sure that every member of this House would gladly wash his hands of appointments even to a $50 or a $150 job. It is not that we want that work, for political or any other reasons. But I say again that I do not see how it will be possible for the Civil Service Commission, sitting in Ottawa, to ascertain the proper persons to appoint to these positions without applying to those who might be reasonably expected to know who were qualified for them. I repudiate the reflection which I maintain is to a certain extent thrown upon members of Parliament generally by the wording of this resolution and by some of those who are supporting it. In effect, you are saying that no man who has been chosen as a representative of the people to sit in this House can be trusted to make an honest recommendation or to select an efficient man to fill a vacancy in the Civil Service. I have had the privilege of sitting as a member of this House since 1908, and I have honestly endeavoured, whenever it has fallen to my lot to recommend a man for a position, to recommend a man who, I believed, would perform the duties of that office efficiently and well, and in doing so I was not thinking about the next election. I believe, when I say that, I am speaking, not for myself alone, but for scores of members in this House. It is not fair to say, because it has fallen to our lot as members of Parliament to recommend men to fill vacancies in the Civil Service, that in our recommendations we were thinking about the votes we were going to get. That is putting members of Parliament on a very low plane.

Mr. TWEEDIE: If the Government succeed in placing the Outside Service under the control of the Civil Service Commission, they will have done something to justify their return to power. I wish to endorse very heartily the statements made by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). If Civil Service reform is to be a success in this country, it will not depend so much upon the Government or upon the Civil Service as upon the individual private members representing the various constituencies throughout the Dominion. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) made some reference to the Inside Civil Service in the city of Ottawa. Complaints have been heard with regard to the Inside Civil Service, but I believe the blame rests upon the shoulders of the private members. We all know how every hon. member has in the past used his influence, and notwithstanding what the hon. member for Frontenac says to the contrary, hon. members have in the past used their endeavours to secure for their political friends positions in the Government service, whether at Ottawa or in any other part of the country. The question is: Are we going to be willing to sacrifice what might be termed a political vested right and uphold the work of the Civil Service Commission, or are we going to endeavour to retain in some slight degree control of these appointments throughout the Dominion of Canada? If we undertake to retain control over the minor offices or the major offices, Civil Service reform in this country will be a failure. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) seems to anticipate there will be difficulty in connection with appointments to minor positions. I do not see how there need be any difficulty. As the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) have pointed out, we have inspectors travelling throughout the Dominion in connection with the post office, customs, inland revenue, and those

inspectors are the men who should be responsible to the Civil Service Commission in regard to seeing that appointees to minor positions are fully qualified. When you get down to the lowest class, such as the men who draw $100 or $150 a year, it may be for the position of a janitor or a porter, my contention has always been that the man who has charge of the post office, or the land office, or the customs office, in which a janitor is required, should have vested in him authority to hire a man to carry on that work. If the man who is at the head of that office has not the intelligence and good judgment to hire a janitor or a porter, that man should be removed from his position and a man capable of doing that work and making such appointments named in his stead. After an appointment of that kind has been made, it should be reported to the Civil Service Commission, and the appointee should hold his position unless he is removed from it for good cause.

I just wish again to point out to hon. members that in my opinion the success or the failure of the Civil Service in this country rests almost wholly upon the private members. If they will keep their hands off, if they will not importune the members of the Civil Service Commission to appoint friends to positions, if they will not use their political influence on behalf of those in whom they are interested, I believe the Civil Service Commission will do their work in a manner which will be a credit to that department. Otherwise, Civil Service reform will be a failure.

Mr. MANION: I have had an important matter brought to my attention in the last few days by a man of fairly high authority, that is, that the Civil Service Commission, with which I am wholly in sympathy, should, in filling positions in each district, appoint people residing in such district. I do not believe the Civil Service Commission should, at any time, except in unavoidable cases, bring from some outside district men into, say, my district, to fill ordinary positions in the Civil Service. There may, at times, be positions which require men having special training, but as regards ordinary positions carrying salaries of $100 a month or thereabouts, in the customs, railways and so on, I presume every constituency of the 234 constituencies in this country can supply men capable of filling such positions. A rule should be laid down that the Civil Service Commission should be instructed in so far as possible to fill those positions with men selected from the particular constituency in which a vacancy arises.

Mr. PROULX: In filling the positions will any regard be given to the different political parties? A vacancy might occur in one locality and many people might be qualified to fill it. It does not require high qualifications to fill the position of postmaster of a small place. When selections are being made, how will the officers of the Post Office Department be instructed to make selections?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will find out by some means or another.

Mr. PROULX: It will probably depend much on the political complexion of the officer. If he is in sympathy with the Government, he will endeavour to find a person who is known to be a supporter of the Government. If the officer is a supporter of the Opposition, he will probably want to select a Liberal. At the last election we were given pledges by the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues that there was to be no more patronage. The Premier stated there would be an equal division of the seats in the Cabinet amongst the Conservatives and Liberals. We have not reached that stage yet, but we expect to reach it. The other day the Premier said that he was going to implement his pledge, and that Liberals and Conservatives would occupy the same number of seats in the Cabinet. When he made that pledge, we expected that in appointments to the Senate, regard would be had to the two political parties supporting the Government. Since that pledge was given, about a dozen appointments have been made to the Senate, and I do not think one Liberal has been appointed. Perhaps the Prime Minister meant by that fifty-fifty basis, that fifty Conservatives would be first appointed, and then perhaps some Liberals. It might turn out the same way with the Civil Service Commission, that under the guise of no patronage and an equal share to both parties, only members of one party might be appointed. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said a few minutes ago that there was more efficiency in the Outside Service than in the Inside. There may be a reason for this. The qualifications for the Outside Service are not as high as those for the Inside Service. I am pretty much of the opinion of my hon. friend that in the case of these minor appointments it will be just as hard

for the Civil Service Commission to find properly qualified persons as for members of Parliament, and perhaps harder.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And sometimes easier.

Mr. PROULX: Perhaps.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Frequently the Civil Service Commission will fill a vacancy much more quickly than if it were left to a member of Parliament. I have known of vacancies in highly important offices remaining unfilled for perhaps one or two years because the member of Parliament in control of the patronage could not make up his mind what person he would nominate.

Mr. PROULX: So far as that is concerned I agree with my hon. friend. I am in favour of abolishing patronage. I think it would be a good thing for members on both sides of the House. But, as the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) has said, in the practical working out it might be more difficult for the Commission than for members of Parliament to make a selection.

Mr. NESBITT: If the Government will carry out this resolution as it is on the Order paper, it will be the greatest step in advance, in my judgment, that has taken place in this country for many years.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I wish to draw the minister's attention to a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved on the 18th March, 1918, as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 16th March, 1918, from the right hon. the Prime Minister, stating that application has been made to the heads of several departments for the dismissal of public officials on the ground of offensive partisanship during the recent election.
>
> The Prime Minister observes that the power to dismiss upon such consideration should be sparingly exercised.

It seems to me that that word "sparingly" is utterly opposed to the principle of the Bill. Might I have some explanation from the minister.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I understand it, this Order in Council is a direction to the Civil Service Commission that any dismissals made by them should be made only after very careful consideration, and for some offence—against the state for example, or for dereliction of duty. The last paragraph of the Order in Council reads:

> The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that in no case shall any dismissal for such a cause be made except after reference to the Civil Service Commission and with the approval of that Commission, after such inquiry and investigation as the Commission may deem desirable in the public interest. In reaching a determination the Commission shall have regard solely to the question whether the public interest will be better conserved by the retention or by the dismissal of the official in question and shall take into account his efficiency, the length of his service and the relevant circumstances which may enable them to reach a conclusion.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What are the relevant circumstances and what about the first part of the Order in Council?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not feel I should detain the Committee in explaining the Order in Council. After all, the portion I have read is the important part, because it contains the declaration of the policy of the Government in respect to dismissals.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I think the first part is just as important as the last.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The first part states:

> Application has been made to the heads of several departments for the dismissal of public officials on the ground of offensive partisanship during the recent election.

That means that since the last election very many requests have been made to the heads of the different departments of the Public Service in Ottawa for the dismissals of persons who at the last election opposed the present Ministry.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The first recommendation of the Prime Minister is important.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Prime Minister only made one recommendation, and it was contained in the portion I read, that dismissals be made only after due consideration by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Read the other part.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Reading):

> The Prime Minister observes that the power to dismiss upon such consideration should be sparingly exercised and he is of the opinion that, having regard to the policy adopted with regard to appointments to the public service, as set forth in the Order in Council approved on the 13th day of February, 1918, dismissals for such a cause should only be authorized in flagrant cases and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

I submit to my hon. friend who interjected this matter quite irrelevantly into this debate that there is nothing in that to give cause for criticism. The purpose of the Order in Council is quite obvious, I think, to any person who wishes to read and understand it. It means that since

the last election a great number of applications have been made for the dismissal of persons who at the last election opposed this Government. In my hon. friend's own province, I suppose, there was hardly a person holding a Government position who was friendly to this Government at this last election, and there naturally came to the Government requests—

Mr. BUREAU: Did the minister say that very few who held Government positions were friendly to the present Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am talking about the Government in office during the last election. The consequence was that a great many applications came in, particularly from the province of Quebec, asking for the dismissal from office of those persons who had not been friendly to the Ministry at the last election. I acted as Deputy Postmaster General for two or three weeks, and during the few hours I spent in that department I observed scores and scores of applications for the dismissal of postmasters in the province of Quebec who had openly taken part in the last election against the present Government. I think there is nothing in the Order in Council that is open to criticism whatever, but rather that it is open to commendation. It is not usually the practice to engage so much of the time of the committee upon a resolution upon which a Bill is to be founded. The Bill must be preceded by a resolution merely because it contains a section which provides for the voting of money to the members of the Civil Service. That, at least, is the practice, whether there is anything to commend it or not I do not know. Personally I have never been able to discover any good in that rule.

I now desire to say one or two words about the resolution before it is passed. It will be a very difficult thing for the Government to enact this proposed legislation unless hon. gentlemen approach it in the proper spirit. It will not interest the people in the country very much whether Mr. Acres in Ottawa or Mr. Weldon in Montreal was or was not appointed before the Order in Council was passed. The thought of the country is engaged on more important things. I imagine it would interest the country very little, even if these two appointments were purely political. Before the Order in Council passed, necessarily there must have existed some method of filling public offices. It was not the function of the commission, and these appointments referred to the Outside Service. In the absence of Union Government, and a party government being in office, they would have exercised the right of appointing such person or persons whom they saw fit to these vacancies.

I realize that there are a great many difficulties to be encountered in enacting this legislation, and there will be tremendous difficulties to encounter in its operation, but that is not a reason why we should not attempt to establish this reform in the public service of our country. It will, perhaps, be a little difficult for the commission to make appointments to vacant post offices, but that is not a reason why we should not attempt the reform. After all, I do not see why the Civil Service may not fill post office positions from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast just as well as members of Parliament. In my own experience, and I know it is the experience of almost every hon. gentleman in this House, that vacancies remained open in constituencies for weeks and months, because the member feared a recommendation, on account of the number of friends who were soliciting his support for appointment to the vacant office. The change will entail, no doubt, a large amount of work upon the commission. Possibly the commission must be enlarged; quite probably it should be enlarged. The commission, however, may avail themselves of the services of other officers of the Government. For instance, so far as appointments to the post office are concerned, they may easily utilize the assistance of the several provincial inspectors. They may advertise for applicants. In appointments to vacant offices in the country districts they may establish the principle which will govern them in the selection of appointees. They would, I suppose, establish, first, the most desirable location for the office. That having been done, I assume that they would feel obliged to appoint some respectable person who would make an efficient public officer, and who resided in close proximity to the location where the post office is to be established. Objections were raised when it was proposed in the United States to extend the appointment to office upon examination, or upon merit, or by some system of selection outside the patronage system. Still, these objections have been overcome. It has been tried in the United States, and, so far as I understand it has been successful. The appointments to the Civil Service were attempted in a similiar way in England. Its friends were apprehensive lest it be unsuccessful. Its opponents said of it the very same thing

that will likely be said of the proposals here to-night, but, at any rate, let us give it a fair trial. The Government, if it desired to be partisan in this matter, might very well keep within its control appointments to public office, just as all preceding governments have done. The Government thinks in the circumstances that neither course should be followed, and, as has been said by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to-night, if this Government goes out of office with nothing to its credit other than having put in force and made practical and operative a Civil Service Act which removed from politics all appointments for public office, it will render to this country a service greater than that which has been rendered by any Government since the Confederation of the provinces. Every hon. gentleman knows what a curse patronage is in the public affairs of this country. I am going to delay the Committee a moment to discuss that matter. I hope I reflect the views of every hon. gentleman in this House. None of us will be members of this Parliament for very many years, and therefore it should be our ambition before we leave it to go away feeling that we have done something at a time the most favourable in our history for the accomplishment of a reform of this character. This is the most interesting Parliament in Canada's history, and probably it will be the most important for the next century and a half of its history, and everything lends itself to the accomplishment of a reform of this character. My hon. friend for Shelburne and Queens said that this would entail obligations upon the commission that were never contemplated before. I think that is probably correct. The statute, however, will place upon the commission further duties, and I have no doubt the commission will gladly accept the same and will do their very best in administering the Act and performing duties which devolve upon them at the present time and the added duties which will come upon them under the amendment proposed to be made to this Act. The member for Prince (Mr. Joseph Read) deplored very greatly the fact that the Act will not apply to railway employees. I can assure him, if he can suggest any amendment to the Bill which will include in any way the employees of the Government Railway system, we shall be glad indeed to give it consideration and to give statutory effect to the suggestion if it is at all practicable. It did not form a part in the Order in Council, but I frankly say to the committee that the Government could not at the moment see just how it could be put into effect. As I said in moving the resolution, however, that particular phase of the public service will have the special consideration of the Civil Service Commission, and I hope, if not during the present session, then at some other time we shall be able to amend the Act in such a way as to give effect to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Prince.

Mr. DEVLIN: My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) must not think that any inquiries which have been made on this side meant that we were opposed to the principle of the Bill. In fact, as my hon. friend will remember, the idea of Civil Service reform has been a Liberal idea. It has been advocated on this side of the House for a number of years. The fault that has constantly been found on this side of the House is that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) who leads the Government did not implement the promises which he had constantly made before each general election for years past. It was a favourite pastime of the Prime Minister to promise Civil Service reform. The only actual Civil Service reform that has been carried out in this country was carried out under the leadership of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and is contained in the statute of 1908. We want this Act to be improved, if any improvement can be made in it, and we are back of the Government in any genuine reform of the Civil Service. My hon. friend, (Mr. A. K. Maclean) must not try to convey to the country the impression that the Liberal party is opposed to Civil Service reform because some questions have been asked from this side of the House. On the contrary, we have been preaching it for years and we are advocating it now.

Mr. MURPHY: With the principle on which this resolution is supposed to be founded I am in the most complete sympathy. Any citizen of Ottawa who has spent all his life in this city, and who has had anything at all to do with public life, will very strongly support any measure calculated to remove political patronage. I am not going to weary the committee at this stage of the discussion and at this hour of the night, with any recital of what the members for the city of Ottawa have had to undergo in the past, and possibly have to undergo even yet, in connection with patronage. But I can assure you, that, although I have not the honour to

represent the city of Ottawa, the county which I do represent in this House includes a portion of the city of Ottawa, that portion in which His Excellency the Governor General resides. He is a constituent of mine. He has never voted for me, but having regard to the resolution under discussion, perhaps it is proper for me to add that neither has he asked me for a job or to appoint anybody to a position; so that, I have no complaint about patronage on that score.

The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has said that patronage is a curse. Most heartily do I echo that designation. It is such a curse that my continual wonder has been that men on both sides of politics would put up with it for the length of time that it has endured. I remember that when I was Secretary of State I was summoned one day to the office of the Governor General of Canada, the representative of His Majesty the King, to discuss a matter of urgent public business. When the messenger entered my room I was engaged in a wrangle with an individual who insisted that I should appoint him to the position of, what do you think?—ash sifter. Ash sifter! It was useless for me to tell him that there was no such position, useless for me to tell him that I could not create such a position; he demanded it as his right as a free man and a citizen of Canada. I had never heard of or seen him before, and I never want to see him again. That man was the cause of my delaying the Governor General, the representative of His Majesty, fifteen minutes while I discussed that important question of patronage. However, that is an extreme case, but it is an experience that is liable to happen to any member of any Government should a hungry office seeker of that type succeed in invading his office. That is only a very minor example of what people have to undergo in Ottawa in connection with patronage.

During the discussion of this resolution a question was asked by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) regarding the provision in the resolution for the payment of a salary of $6,000 to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was not quite sure whether that was the same salary as had previously been paid or was an increase of $1,000. If my hon. friend will recall the circumstances connected with the creation of the Civil Service Commission and its personnel, he will remember that the commission as first appointed consisted of two commissioners, Mr. Shortt and Mr. Larochelle, each receiving a salary of $5,000. Neither of these gentlemen was appointed chairman, but by reason of dominating the work of the commission, Mr. Shortt succeeded in having the public address him as the chairman, and he never objected to the title. There was no chairman as a matter of fact. Then the personnel of the commission was increased to three, and provision was made that the last appointed would be chairman of the commission. The three present members of the commission are Hon. Dr. Roche, one of our late colleagues in this House; Mr. Clarence Jamieson, another respected colleague of ours in the late Parliament, and Mr. Larochelle. Dr. Roche is chairman of the commission. This is a provision for increasing by $1,000 the salary previously paid and it is for the Chairman.

The hon. Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in the course of his last remarks, stated that this was the most interesting Parliament in the history of Canada. By dint of repeating that they have abolished patronage, the members of this Government, or at least some of them, seem to believe that patronage actually has been abolished. I do not blame them for that but I wish to point out, particularly to my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) who expressed the belief that the Government was honestly trying to eliminate patronage, how difficult it is for those members of the committee, and particularly for any person who has lived in the city of Ottawa and who has knowledge of what is going on, to accept that statement without qualification. With the copy of a letter in my pocket written by one of the members of this Government to a correspondent telling him that he would be placed on the patronage list for orders in his line of business, I think I would be doing violence to my common sense if I should accept without qualification the statement that patronage has been abolished.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That has no reference to this resolution.

Mr. MURPHY: I propose to show that it has.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the Order in Council?

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend will bear with me I propose to show that it has, because this resolution, and the Bill to be founded upon it are designed to "eliminate

political patronage in the control and management of the said Service."

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the patronage list.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has been good enough to point out that the phrase "patronage list" appears in the Order in Council which has been brought down, which is supplementary to the resolution under discussion and which is supposed to form part of the basis upon which the new Act will be founded. Now in addition to this letter, which was written by a member of the present Cabinet, after this Union Government was formed, I heard, as I entered the Chamber, discussion as to the appointment of Mr. Nichols.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was that letter sent after the election?

Mr. MURPHY: No. It was a well-timed letter sent just before the election.

Mr. LEMIEUX: After the pledge?

Mr. MURPHY: I heard discussion as I entered the Chamber about the appointment of Mr. Nichols to the position of Director of Public Information, and I heard the tribute paid to Mr. Nichols by my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson). As far as I am concerned I do not controvert what the hon. gentleman said with regard to Mr. Nichols in the slightest degree; but the whole point is, and I was glad to see my hon. friend from Springfield qualify his observation, whether the position was necessary or not. The position, I unhesitatingly say, was not necessary. Mr. Nichols had made a failure of a newspaper enterprise in Montreal. He was, in the language of the day, "down and out." He is the half-brother of—I do not know whether he is Minister of Finance —but in any event, the half-brother of Sir Thomas White. He was a good fellow, no doubt. He was a supporter of the Government and a job had to be provided for him. The position of Director of Public Information was created at a salary of $5,000 a year to impress the public of Canada how entirely and sincerely devoted this administration is to the winning of the war. Now with that fact within our knowledge, I submit to my hon. friend from Springfield it would be doing violence to our common sense to accept unqualifiedly the declaration of the Government that they have eliminated political patronage.

In the city of Ottawa there is a publication known as the Civilian, a very ably and well written paper, which is the official organ of the civil servants under the present Government. In issue after issue since the date of the election that paper has specifically charged this Administration with the exercise of most reprehensible forms of patronage. That paper in one or two issues made, in point of fact, a most shocking charge against the Administration in connection with appointments to some of the departments, a charge to which this evening I shall do no more than allude, but to which it may be necessary for me to return later on. I have not heard, and I do not believe, that these charges were challenged by the Government; in any event if they were so challenged I have not heard that any punishment has been meted out to the person responsible for making these charges over his own signature; and certainly if the charges could not be sustained, then the man or men who made them would merit, not only public dismissal but public punishment. I have not heard that anything of that kind has been done, and so while the record in that regard remains as it is, again I say it would be doing violence to one's common sense to accept without qualification a statement that patronage has been abolished.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By word of mouth.

Mr. MURPHY: Just about the time that this Order in Council was passed to which my hon. friend the acting Minister of Finance referred this afternoon and this evening and from which he has read extracts, we had, synchronizing, as his predecessor (Sir Thomas White) would say, with its passage, one of the most flagrant exhibitions of political patronage that ever occurred in the city of Ottawa, or in the public service of this country, and that is saying a good deal. We had an exhibition of political patronage which has spread disaffection through the whole body of civil servants, not only in Ottawa, but elsewhere throughout the Dominion. Civil servants, by reason of this happening, have reached the conclusion that unless through the accident of family relationship, or by reason of coming within the favoured class so delicately alluded to in the letter which was read by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Read) they have very little hope of receiving justice at the hands of this Administration. Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) and I think my hon. friend the acting Minister of Finance also, will be aware that the former Auditor General, as well as the present Auditor General, and the members of the Treasury Board under

the last two Administrations, took no position more strongly against innovations, or violations of the Civil Service Act and the Superannuation Act, than they did in connection with attempts to add more years of service to the term of service of the civil servant who wanted to retire. And yet, Sir, this Government claims it has abolished patronage, and the members of it comport themselves in public as if they actually believe that statement. These are the hon. gentlemen who are responsible for a transaction referred to in the columns of The Ottawa Citizen of February 14, 1918, and which I propose to read to this committee. The article in question is an editorial, under the title of, "Sir Robert Borden's Prestige." The text of that editorial is as follows:

10 p.m.

The superannuation of Mr. J. W. Borden, paymaster of the Militia Department, may have been arranged without the Prime Minister being consulted about it. According to the terms of the superannuation and retirement act, in ordinary circumstances, Paymaster-general Borden would seem to have been entitled to a retiring annuity of about $1,600. By a dubious interpretation of certain provisions in the act, the retiring paymaster is being credited with five more years service than he has actually given to the state; and in this way it has been arranged for him to draw an annuity of about $2,000; practically $400 a year more than the ordinary civil service retirement allowance.

Mr. J. W. Borden is being credited with five years more than he has actually served, apparently on the pretext that the office of paymaster-general and accountant is being abolished. When, for reasons of economy and efficiency, certain offices are abolished in the civil service, the retiring official may be credited with extra years of service. But the abolition of the paymaster-general and accountant's office would seem to be something of a legal fiction, hardly in accordance with the spirit of the act. The office by a technicality may be said to have been abolished. Actually it has been divided into two offices paymaster-general's office and accountant's office.

With regard to efficiency and economy, whatever may be said for efficiency, the change could hardly have been made on the basis of war economy. In the place of one paymaster-general and accountant, Mr. J. W. Borden, at $4,000 a year, there has now been installed a paymaster-general, Col. J. G. Langton, at $6,000 a year, and one of the present officials of the department—a well qualified one, by the way—has been moved up to the position of accountant at $3,500 a year. So that, where the position formerly cost the state $4,000 a year, it will now cost, with the superannuation allowance to the retiring paymaster, $11,500.

There need be no great objection to the higher salaries. It has been one of the weakness of the Canadian civil service that the permanent officials who do the actual work have been much underpaid. It would perhaps have been more encouraging to the Canadian men overseas, if the position of paymaster had been given to an officer who had actually seen active service. It does not enhance the prestige of the Prime Minister, however, to permit such a dubious interpretation of the superannuation and retirement act as the awarding of an extra allowance to the retirement annuity of Mr. J. W. Borden.

When Sir George Murray reported to the Prime Minister in 1912, he said of this very practice:

"The provisions of section 12 of the Superannuation and Retirement Act, which enables an addition of years to be made to the actual service of certain persons, are in my opinion of doubtful expediency; and I should prefer to see them withdrawn."

As an instance of precept without example, in public service reform, the employment of this doubtful expediency for the financial benefit of Sir Robert Borden's own brother could hardly have been arranged in any spirit of friendship to the Prime Minister. It must be calculated to have exactly the reverse of a helpful influence with regard to the Prime Minister's resolution to establish Civil Service reform.

Sir George Murray says further of this mode of retirement as employed for Mr. J. W. Borden's benefit:

"Under the act the grant of the additional years is personal to the individual and depends on the view which may be taken, either at the time of his appointment or at the time of his retirement, of his qualifications, and on other considerations of a less relevant character. This involves a good deal of rather invidious discussion, which would be avoided if the grant depended not upon the individual but on the qualifications required for the office which he happened to hold."

When certain other cabinet ministers are desirous of perpetuating the business of political patronage, and debasing the Civil Service into a political machine, in spite of all the Government's pledges, they could not employ more subtle ways than by involving Sir Robert Borden personally in an evasion of the spirit of Civil Service reform, and in the countenancing of patronage influence in Civil Service changes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I hesitated about calling the hon. gentleman to order, but my impression is that the reading of this article and the making of these complaints against the administration of patronage in the past would have been more in order if brought up on the presentation of the militia estimates. However, perhaps the hon. gentleman will show whether or not he is in order by telling the committee whether he is reading this article or making these complaints as a means of presenting reasons for or against the resolution.

Mr. MURPHY: I have cited the cases to which I have directed attention for the express purpose of showing the necessity of this resolution and of affirming my intention to support it, in order that the instances to which I have referred and the evasions and breaches of the law which I have exposed may not be repeated in the future. No greater act for the purification of public life in Canada than a statute founded upon this resolution, provided it is rigidly enforced, could be passed by this or any other Parlia-

ment. I most heartily support the principle upon which, as I said, it is understood that this resolution is founded.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As to the motive of the hon. gentleman in reading the editorial to which he has referred, we can all form our own conclusions.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And we may take with how many grains of salt we may think suitable the reading of that article when the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn), who is responsible entirely for the incident to which he has alluded, is not here to make his answer. If the hon. gentleman desires to renew the discussion at the proper time—which, as he knows well, is on the consideration of the militia estimates—he will get his answer then from the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not my fault that the Minister of Militia is not in his place. Members of the Government, like other members of Parliament, are supposed to be in their places during this or any other discussion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman knows that the Minister of Militia will be in his place when the militia estimates are under consideration. He knows also that that would be the proper occasion to raise the discussion which he has just now entered upon, and that this is not the proper time.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. BUREAU: Our friends on the other side seem to have a desire to reproach gentlemen on this side with opposition to the resolution. We are all in favour of this resolution; all we want is to get information. We see by the Order in Council which I had the pleasure of procuring since six o'clock, that the Government has gone to a good deal of trouble. There have been conferences will the Civil Service Commissioners, conferences with the law officers of the various departments, and with the Parliamentary Counsel. The acting Minister of Finance seems to think that because this resolution is introduced by the Union Government, we must swallow it and say nothing; that we must regard it as the great benediction of the year. As the acting minister has said, if the purposes which appear to be aimed at by this proposed measure, accomplish the results which we hope for, it will certainly be a good thing for the country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then why not let the resolution go through?

Mr. BUREAU: We want it to go through, and that is why we want to throw some light upon it; so that my friend will be able to draft a Bill that will meet the desire of all members of the House, and so that he will go down to posterity as the choker of the great evil and curse of this country, patronage.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I prefer to have all the light my hon. friend can give me when he has the Bill before him and is in a position to know exactly what he is talking about.

Mr. BUREAU: And I prefer that my hon. friend bring down a Bill carefully prepared—he has the machinery to do it; he has the men with whom he can take counsel; he has the Civil Service Commission—and be in a position to give reasons for every clause in it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill is ready, and if my hon. friend is desirous of getting light, why does he not allow the resolution to go through—or, at least, discuss the resolution itself?

Mr. BUREAU: Instead of losing his temper; instead of singing with his mellow voice "Carried" when we get up to speak, why does my hon. friend not take notice of what we say, so that, in conjunction with his advisers, he may be able to bring down a Bill which will be satisfactory to the House and based upon such conclusions and such information as may be derived from this discussion? It is true that the Bill, if founded only on what is contained in the Order in Council or the resolution, will be imperfect; but what I got up particularly to say was that my hon. friend ought not to accuse gentlemen on this side of the House with opposing the resolution. We are in favour of the resolution, but we have a right to ask for information. Last night we passed a Bill, and we were told: wait until next Parliament; we will then provide the machinery. We do not want to support a Bill which is simply an enunciation of policy; we want to establish the machinery that will give effect to this proposed measure. My hon. friend, therefore, should go a little more into detail; if he has further information to give to the House, and wait until he brings down the Bill, it may then be too late. He will say:

why not let this Bill go through; we want to make an experiment; next year we will see where the defects are and at the next session we will bring down a new Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A moment ago my hon. friend said he was going to make an inquiry in regard to the Bill, and he has not made the inquiry. If he has not made the inquiry, I am wondering why he rose.

Mr. BUREAU: That would not be the first time that my hon. friend would be wondering, not only at my rising, but at other things.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No one wonders when the hon. member rises.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad that somebody can realize why I rise. I was going to ask if this resolution was introduced for the purpose of discussion, or if it was only introduced for the purpose of throwing it down upon the Table with the statement by the Minister of Finance: I have brought down this resolution; wait until I introduce the Bill; when the Bill is introduced, swallow it? This resolution is brought down for the purpose of discussion, so that when the Bill comes before the House we shall have a Bill containing suggestions that deserve to be taken into consideration by hon. members. Therefore, if the minister is getting impatient, I may tell him that he need not try to convey to this House or to the country the impression that we are against the Civil Service Commissions providing patronage is abolished and providing they will be a check upon the various ministers and will prevent them from writing letters such as the one which has been read here tonight by my hon. friend from Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Read), stating that everybody who is a Liberal Unionist or a Conservative Unionist may live happily because patronage hereafter will go fifty-fifty.

Mr. CANNON: The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) declared a moment ago that his Bill is ready. I am very sorry it is, because I would suggest that in this Bill should be included a measure of justice to repair the great injury committed by the late Government. During the period of six years from 1911 to 1917, when this new Union Government was formed, the evil of patronage existed; not only did it exist, but, I might say, it bloomed, and not only did it bloom, but it flourished. In the city of Quebec, in which I reside, and in the district of Quebec, a constituency in which I represent, public officials were thrown out of office. People who had worked for the Government of the country for years, people who had given satisfaction during long periods of years, were thrown out of their positions. Why? Because they had either the fortune or the misfortune to be Liberal when a Tory government was in power. In the city of Quebec, we saw the very sad spectacle of politicians who had become members of Parliament writing letters to the different members of the Cabinet at Ottawa recommending that so-and-so should be thrown out because so-and-so happened to be a Liberal and the government was a Tory government. What happened then did not surprise us in Quebec, because we knew the methods of a really Tory government. But now I understand we no longer have a Tory government; that this Government has been improved to such an extent that it is transformed, that from a Tory government it has become a Union Government. I cannot judge of the actions of the Government in the other provinces as I have not been there, but how has this new, wonderful, Union Government acted towards my province of Quebec? In the same old way as the Tory government which preceded it. I wish to recall to your memory, Sir, the very impartial way in which officials were appointed in the province of Quebec to hold the recent election. Was patronage abolished? The Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Robert Borden) at that time was touring the province of Ontario with the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), if I remember aright, and sometimes with the Solicitor-General. The promise made by the Premier in all the cities in which he spoke was: I have, since the formation of this Union Government, abolished patronage, and this Government, if elected, will introduce legislation to do away with patronage permanently. At the time the Prime Minister was uttering those words, patronage was being exercised by his own colleagues in the province of Quebec in the appointment of electoral officers. Of the enumerators appointed throughout the province of Quebec, not one, in any constituency of which I know, was a Liberal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Perhaps it was impossible to get any to act.

Mr. BUREAU: The result of the election shows that.

Mr. CANNON: I do not catch exactly what my hon. friend the minister means.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I say that probably it was impossible to get Liberals to act

Mr. CANNON: I am quite sure that if the returning officer in my constituency had wanted a list of my friends who would be willing to act as enumerators, judging by the majority I secured it would have been easier for me to supply a list than for my opponent to do so, and the same thing is true in every other constituency in Quebec. Not only were enumerators chosen from amongst the Tories, but after the election was over, after the Government was elected with a huge majority, was the system changed in our province? In the city of Quebec, has patronage been abolished? Since coming to the city of Ottawa to represent my constituency in this House, I have seen Tory supporters of the Government in the streets of Ottawa seeking jobs either for themselves or their friends. Would they be here if patronage was abolished?

I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the committee, but we on this side of the House, as the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has said, are in favour of abolishing patronage, but we want the Government to be in good faith. We do not want the Acting Minister of Finance to say to us: You have to support this measure because I have introduced it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that.

Mr. CANNON: If the minister did not say that, he came very close to saying it. Such a statement is no recommendation. We on this side of the House want more than that. The Government, from my experience, apparently has two means of defending measures; either they say: You must not talk against this measure because it is a measure to win the war, or they say: You must not speak against this measure because we former Liberals introduced it. This is no way of discussing legislation on its merits. If the Government's Bill is good, we shall support it; if it is bad, we shall vote against it. The Government, so that we may be sure that this is a good measure, has first of all to prove its sincerity. Has the Government proved its sincerity?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Wait until my hon. friend sees the Bill.

Mr. CANNON: I need not see the Bill; I have the resolution. I say that the Government, by the appointments which have been made since the recent elections, such as the appointment of the postmaster of Ottawa, which has aroused the anger not only of Liberals but of Conservatives, and similar appointments made throughout the country, has shown that patronage has not been abolished. Yet when we ask for an explanation from the Acting Minister of Finance, he does not give us any explanation, he simply says: The hour is late; let us pass the resolution, and I shall introduce my Bill. We on this side of the House are willing to support all measures which the Government prove to us are good.

The CHAIRMAN: Before reporting this resolution I should like to say that in my humble opinion, the discussion on the resolution has been entirely out of order, and I must ask hon. gentlemen not to transgress in the same way when in future a resolution is being considered in committee. The position of the Chairman was made more difficult because some of the oldest parliamentarians in the House, on both the Government and the Opposition side, transgressed the rules. A resolution is placed before the committee for the purpose of obtaining the approval of the committee to the principle of expending a certain sum of money, and for no other purpose. The discussion which has taken place on the resolution has been very interesting, and I hope it will have the effect of saving considerable time on the second reading and when the Bill is in committee. It was, however, entirely out of order and in future I shall so rule.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 53, respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) Bill No. 3, to confer the electoral franchise upon women, was read the third time and passed.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE BILL.

On motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of Naval Service) Bill No. 49, respecting the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911, made applicable to Canada:

Mr. BUREAU: Very few of us have had occasion to refer to the Naval Discipline Act enacted by the Parliament of the United

Kingdom. We do not want the details, but perhaps the minister might explain briefly what the effect of this Bill will be.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In brief, it is this: Suppose the Rainbow is on the Pacific coast, and one of its officers has committed a serious breach of discipline, necessitating his trial by court-martial. On that particular boat there may not be an officer of sufficiently high rank to conduct the court-martial. If this Bill meets with the approval of the committee and the House that officer could be tried by a senior officer on board any British, Australian or New Zealand man-of-war that happened to be in the harbour. The Canadian Naval Service would simply call upon that senior officer to preside at the court-martial. It is simply for discipline purposes. I might state that in 1911 the Imperial authorities passed what was known at that time as the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act, 1911. It did not apply to any of the overseas dominions, unless the parliaments of those dominions saw fit to pass similar legislation to that passed by the Imperial authorities. Australia passed the legislation which we are now asking to have adopted on 12th August, 1913. New Zealand passed it on 16th July, 1914. And, inasmuch as the Canadian navy is still very small but at the same time considerably larger than it was some years ago, we thought it necessary, for discipline purposes, that we should be able to have an interchange of officers between any of the ships belonging to England, Australia, New Zealand or any of the overseas dominions.

Mr. McMASTER: Will the minister infore me whether that applies in times of peace, or only in time of war, when the ships of Canada have been placed under the jurisdiction of or are co-operating with those of Great Britain?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If this Bill passes the House it will be on the statute books, and will have effect in time of peace just the same as in time of war.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne for the third reading of the Bill:

Mr. BUREAU: I understand some hon. gentlemen have further comments about the Bill being in force in times of peace, and in regard to allowing Australian officers to preside at an inquiry on a Canadian ship.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is a good opportunity to make those remarks.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Canadian officers have the same privileges as the officers of Australia. Suppose an Australian ship were in Halifax, and one of the junior officers committed a breach of discipline, and it was necessary he should be tried by court-martial, and a Canadian man-of-war had a senior officer on board, the Australian ship could send over to the Canadian ship and get that officer. It is simply for the purpose of holding court-martial—nothing more nor less. Australia has passed similar legislation, as also has New Zealand, and the only country which has not done so is Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: I can quite understand and quite approve of the provision that in time of war the navies of the different overseas dominions and of Great Britain should act as one, and that there should be this perfectly free interchange of authority between officers of the different overseas dominions, and of the Motherland, but without very careful consideration, and without strong reasons for the proposal, I am very doubtful whether the proposal tends to what we are all desirous of having, namely, the closest possible spiritual unity between the different British Commonwealths. Frankly, I do not like the idea that in time of peace a servant of the Canadian Government should be tried by court-martial presided over by an Australian. Although the hon. minister informs us Australia passed this legislation, at the same time I do not think it would tend towards unity to have an Australian tried by court-martial presided over by a Canadian. I believe the greatest unity will be brought about if, as far as possible, in times of peace we should all act as one. I desire to insist upon that. And it would be better to have Canadians, if they have made any errors or have infringed the military or naval law in any way, tried by their own fellow-countrymen, and by them alone. Suppose that in one of these trials a miscarriage of justice occurs—and it is possible—what bitter feeling might be engendered. If, say, a Canadian superior officer by some mistake condemned an Australian improperly, I think a very considerable amount of feeling might grow up between Australia and Canada. I would not like this Bill to pass without this aspect of the situation being presented, because I believe those who have thought about the relation which should exist between the different British Commonwealths have come to this

conclusion, that the tie which binds us will be strengthened in proportion as each individual Commonwealth is allowed to work out in its own way what seems best to the citizens of that Commonwealth, and I am afraid that the Bill presented to-night endangers that spirit of unity which I spoke about. I cannot aliow the measure to pass without drawing to the attention of the Government the objection which I have in mind.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has spoken and has exhausted his right.

Mr. BUREAU: This Bill was presented yesterday. Will the Prime Minister consent to have the third reading at the next sitting of the House? I understand some other gentlemen on this side of the House would like to express their views. I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is a motion that is not debatable.

Mr. BUREAU: I am asking to have the third reading Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Under the circumstances, the Bill only having been presented yesterday, I consent to the debate being adjourned. I may say, however, to the hon. gentleman who raised this question (Mr. Bureau), that the Bill only carries out the purpose, as I understand it, which was embodied in the legislation of this House as far back as 1910. There need not be the slightest anticipation of any difficulty or lack of harmony in working it out. It is merely a Bill designed to assist co-operation between the permanent naval forces in each portion of the Empire, whether in time of peace or war. As a matter of fact, its operation would be practically altogether confined to the time of war; it is extremely improbable that it should ever be invoked in time of peace. It might, but it is a remote possibility, that it will have any effect in time of peace. Its operation, in so far as it would come into operation at all, would be in time of war.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals), Bill No. 42, to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill; Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister said the other night that the Government would take the initiative in acquiring the rolling stock and materials that were necessary for the Government and other railways. I understood the minister to say that some of the material so acquired would be apportioned to the Canadian Pacific railway. Am I right in that surmise?

Mr. J. D. REID: One hundred thousand tons of rails will go to the Canadian Pacific. The Government will purchase the rails and distribute them amongst the different railways. The Canadian Pacific will get probably half of these rails. It is merely a book-keeping account so far as they are concerned. The rails will be shipped to them and they will immediately pay the money back to us; or they will pay the Dominion Iron and Steel company for the hundred thousand tons of rails that they get.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood the minister to say the other night that he had given orders to the various steel mills for steel for cars and rails?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Also that contracts for freight cars have been given, and that the companies that have received these contracts will get steel through the department for the building of steel frame cars?

Mr. J. D. REID: If there is anything that the Government can purchase for any of these companies cheaper than the companies can purchase it themselves, it will be glad to do so. The Government is able to purchase some things in the United States that a private company probably cannot purchase. In that case the Government will purchase the material and hand it direct to the car company at whatever is paid for it, in order to be sure that the cars will be completed at the earliest possible moment. Last year two or three companies had great difficulty in getting materials on the other side of the international boundary, but as the cars which they had contracted for were to be supplied to the Canadian Government for war purposes we were able, through our representative, to persuade the Washington Government to allow us to have the necessary materials, and we got them probably a little cheaper than the contractors would be able to get them. If we purchased anything of that kind it would simply be to hand it over to the company at the price we paid for it.

Mr. BUREAU: The question was asked the minister the other night if the car factories in Canada were in a position to deliver the cars as they were required by the Government. My hon. friend promised that he would bring down a statement or give us an idea of the different kinds of cars that were required and how soon they would be distributed and put in use on the Government railways. Are there in Canada sufficient car factories actually in operation to fill these orders and meet the demands of the Government? We have in Canada shipyards constructing wooden ships. I understand it is the policy of the Government to abandon that completely. I am told by the owners of shipyards now engaged in building wooden ships, that they are well equipped to build wooden ships, as well as steel freight cars. These ships will be launched in June or July and after they are launched the yards will be idle, although they have a complete equipment for building freight cars. Of course, I make that statement on the information of a gentleman who, as the minister knows, is perfectly well qualified to speak upon the subject. One of them has been the managing director of a big car factory in the United States and even in Canada. They say that within a very short time, perhaps within a month, they will be in a position to turn out freight cars at the rate of ten, twelve, and fifteen a day. Rather than see orders go outside of this country to the United States, and allowing these yards and this capital to remain idle, I suggest that in the national interest, it might be well to convert them into car factories. I may tell my hon. friend, surprising as the fact may be, that the men who are employed in the building of these wooden ships are all old men, and it is remarkable to see how actively and skilfully they do the caulking and the other different kinds of work required in shipbuilding. It seems that the wooden ship building is being revived, and it is giving a new lease of life to these old men whose business it had been in days gone by to build wooden ships. Now, as I say, I raise the question because at the time I asked my hon. friend this appropriation was not before the House, and with the money that he had at his disposal, all the orders that he foresaw to be given, I understood from him, had been given. Now, if I am not mistaken, all these cars have not been ordered, and I would submit that what I have suggested be taken into consideration when he distributes the orders for these cars.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman, as I understand, has asked me if the number of car factories in Canada is sufficient to fill these orders. My information is that there are sufficient car factories now equipped in Canada, and have been in operation for some time, to manufacture probably five or six times more than the order that we have been giving and dividing up. If I remember well, the Canada Car Company, with their several plants, could manufacture about thirty thousand box cars per annum. The Eastern Car Company and the National Car Company of Hamilton can both manufacture several thousand. There are several other factories operating; in fact, the order that we distributed would suffice only to keep one of the factories going but a short time. If I understand correctly, the Canada Car Company, to whom we have given an order for five thousand cars, distributed among the three plants at Fort William, Montreal and Amherst, have taken an order from the American Government for ten thousand cars at a higher price than we are paying. I am informed the contract has been completed, if not, I know that the negotiations have been going on; and the company were very glad to get the order to keep their factory going. The difficulty with these factories is this: Take the Fort William factory. They tell me that it is one of the best equipped car factories in Canada, and even on the continent, with a very large capacity. It was built at the time of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and other roads, and then remained idle for some time, but they were enabled with the order for two or three thousand cars which we gave them last year to start the works up again. They have also been engaged in turning out Russian orders as well. However, if they were not able to get any other orders for cars than those that we have given them, I do not think their factory would operate longer than two or three months at the most. Our orders were distributed among those factories that are well equipped and in operation, and I understand we are to have those cars by the first of September or the first of October for the transportation of wheat and other products.

I may say to the hon. member that the shortage of cars in Canada is causing us a great deal of trouble and creating uneasiness. The hon. gentleman comes from the province of Quebec. Let me tell him that I am very much worried for the reason that

11 p.m.

I could ship fifty thousand cars of pulpwood out of the province of Quebec that are now there awaiting shipment to the United States, but I have not got the cars to enable me to do so. The general manager tells me that if we send a box car over there we will not get it back. Ontario is also suffering for the want of cars; the people who are getting out pulpwood and lumber, and so on.

Mr. BUREAU: And for the want of the money?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, suffering for the want of the money also. If we could get the cars to ship these materials over it would help us out very much: I think I have fully answered the hon. member.

Mr. WIGMORE: Why is it necessary for the Government to purchase this large number of rails for a corporation like the Canadian Pacific? I can understand it being done in the case of the smaller corporations, but why should it be necessary for a corporation of the financial standing of the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason is this: The Dominion Iron and Steel company and the Algoma Steel company are the only two concerns that manufacture steel rails in Canada. Both of them had orders from the Imperial Munitions Board, and it was necessary to arrange with that board to get them to release one of the companies for a time until we could get some steel rails rolled, in order to enable the main lines to be put into proper condition. Therefore, the Government, under the terms of an Order in Council, required the Dominion Iron & Steel company to manufacture one hundred thousand tons of rails, which they purchased and immediately divided among the different railways. The rails are invoiced to the Government, the Government sends the invoice to the Canadian Pacific railway and the company promptly pay for them.

Mr. WIGMORE: Then there is no expense incurred by the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: No expense whatever. When the invoice comes to the Department of Railways and Canals we send the account to the Canadian Pacific, and they forward a cheque. That cheque is deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. It is just a matter of book-keeping, and is done in order that we may promptly get and distribute the rails.

Mr. WIGMORE: Would that also apply to the Grand Trunk?

Mr. J. D. REID: To the Grand Trunk as well. As for the Canadian Northern, they are financed by the Government, but the procedure is the same.

Mr. ROBB: During the past two years the Government have taken up a lot of rails, some of them new, and shipped them to the Allies overseas. Are these rails sold to the Allies at about the same price as the Government are paying under this large contract?

Mr. J. D. REID: I must frankly state that I have not gone into that matter carefully, but I could get the information and give it to the hon. gentleman. As I understand, the rails were taken up mostly in the West, and the cost of taking them up and shipping them is to be added to the cost and paid by the Allies. The rails were mostly taken from the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it was only a short time ago that I was speaking with the president of the Grand Trunk railway about the matter. I am satisfied that the price was adjusted satisfactorily; the amount is charged to the Allies, and there will be no difficulty about that. Of course, they are paying the same for the rails from the Transcontinental as they are for those from the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. ROBB: These rails were taken up and sent overseas, and possibly charged to the Allies on the basis of what they cost, plus transportation. The cost of these rails was considerably less per mile than the cost of the rails the minister is now contracting for; consequently, if the rails he is now buying are to be used to replace those sent overseas, so much more will be added to the capitalization of the railway and the Canadian people will have to pay for it.

Mr. J. D. REID: These rails are not to replace those taken up and sent overseas. Any replacement of this kind will likely not be done until some future time. The only rails taken from the Transcontinental and sent overseas were those in sidings and yards, and they were replaced with second-hand or lighter rails.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were rails taken up from the Hudson Bay line?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not yet decided to take them up, but if we do so, they will be replaced with lighter rails.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says he has distributed orders for cars. On what basis are the orders given? Are tenders called, or is there a set price for which the companies are to build a special kind of car?

Mr. J. D. REID: We asked all the car companies to submit tenders and we awarded the contracts accordingly. We asked the several car companies to say how many cars they could supply. The Eastern Car Company, Nova Scotia, had an order for 1,000 cars last fall. Although they had a great deal of material on hand, they were unable to get all the material required to complete the order. However, they stated how many they were able to take and we gave them an order for what they could manufacture up to next fall.

Mr. BUREAU: At what price?

Mr. J. D. REID: At the lowest price in every case. We did the same with the Hamilton Car company, which had an order for 1,000 cars about a year ago. They completed the order about the 1st of May, and then wanted a further order for 1,000 cars.

Mr. BUREAU: Was the price the same.

Mr. J. D. REID: The tender of the Hamilton company was somewhat higher than the others, but they came down to the price of the lowest tender, and we gave them another order for 1,000 cars to keep their plant going. All orders were given within Canada except a total of 50 oil and water tank cars which are not manufactured in this country. These were purchased in Pittsburg at a very low price.

Mr. ROBB: What is the approximate cost of a 60,000 pound box car?

Mr. J. D. REID: About $2,750 complete.

Mr. CANNON: Is it the intention of the Government to use the Transcontinental workshops in the city of Quebec?

Mr. J. D. REID: It would require a good deal of money to put them in working condition. Of course, the whole railway situation will have to be looked into in the near future, and that is one of the matters that will receive attention.

Mr. WIGMORE: What steps are being taken to trace the 25,000 cars mentioned by the minister as having been sent to the United States and lost track of? How many box cars have been ordered from the different firms? If 25,000 Canadian cars are in the United States, it would be good business to make a special effort to trace them.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the number of cars to which my hon. friend refers has been reduced to 11,000 or 12,000. We cannot compel the return of these cars, but I have personally by telegram and by letter to the Director General of Railways in the United States made every possible effort to secure their return. The Canadian Railway Defence Association in Montreal have also been doing all they can in this direction. Up to the last month, however, all these concerted efforts have not reduced very much the number of cars which are still outstanding. I have also taken the matter up with Mr. Lloyd Harris, of the war mission, at Washington, and he has been doing all he can to have these cars returned.

That shows that every effort has been made. In addition to that, almost every other day I am telegraphing to find out if I cannot have the cars returned to this country. Only this evening, I sent a message to the several railway companies in the United States urging them to try and let us have cars to take out the pulpwood and lumber in Quebec and other places. Everything that can be done, either by the railways or by the Government, to get the number of Canadian cars in the United States reduced, is being done.

Mr. ROBB: I hope the minister will not make the mistake that seems to have been made in the United States, of going so far as to place an embargo against Canadian cars going into the United States. The House and the country must remember that our cars do not go into the United States empty, they go there with Canadian goods for which money comes back to us. It would not hurt this country if we had a little reciprocal treatment from the United States and had cars coming into this country loaded with corn which we need so much. It is largely owing to the War Board in the United States that the railway situation has been tied up. I hope we are not drifting along into the same condition in this country.

Mr. J. D. REID: Last fall, we allowed cars to enter the United States so as to let our products move out, with the result that the cars that went across the border never returned to Canada. The number of Canadian cars in the United States mounted up to 25,000, and if we had not prevented our cars from crossing the border, the result would have been that we would not have been able to move our own Canadian products from one part of the Dominion to the other. If, at the present time, we were to load our cars with lumber, pulpwood and other products and rush them into the United States, we would not have cars for our own traffic. Instead of a surplus of Canadian cars being in the United

States, there should be a surplus of American cars in Canada. But when our cars get into the United States, the American railway companies will not return them.

Mr. MANION: The car situation is a very important matter. Can the minister impose any penalty upon cars going into the United States? If a car of goods comes here, and it is detained for twenty-four hours in the yards, we have to pay demurrage charges. Why should we not impose some charge on cars going into the United States? If we are allowing our cars to go into the United States and they are being held in the United States, and we have to buy new cars to replace them, I do not see any advantage in that.

Mr. J. D. REID: We cannot do other than allow the arrangement entered into between the railways and the Interstate Commission to be carried out. A foreign car on any railway is charged a certain per diem rate, and the railway that has that foreign car must pay that rate. At the present time, it pays the United States railway companies to pay that rate and to hold the cars. Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the reason why the United States railway detain our cars. In the United States they have given an order for 100,000 cars and 3,000 engines, which shows the shortage of cars there. Therefore, any railway that can secure any foreign cars and can keep them by paying the per diem allowance, will do so, because it pays them to do so, owing to the great shortage of cars. The United States railways are very short of cars, and there is nothing more we can do than we have been doing to get those cars returned. The Government realize that the fact of our businessmen not being able to ship goods to the United States is affecting our trade balance. The necessity of maintaining our trade balance is one thing that makes it imperative for us to do everything possible to have our cars returned to Canada.

Mr. MANION: Is any duty imposed?

Mr. J. D. REID: There is just a per diem rate. The moment a United States car arrives in Canada, a per diem rate is charged until the car returns to the United States. If a Canadian car goes to the United States, for instance, on to the New York Central, while it is on that road they pay sixty cents a day. That railway can keep that car, because there is no way of compelling it to return it. They might keep it for a year by paying, say, $180 for the use of that car.

Mr. FIELDING: How is that rate fixed?

Mr. J. D. REID: By an agreement between our railways and the United States railways.

Mr. FIELDING: A penalty might be imposed by increasing the rate. If it pays the United States' railways to keep our cars over there, we should increase the rate.

Mr. J. D. REID: In order that that might be accomplished, all the railways would have to agree to it. The Canadian railways could not do it alone, and as the United States railways are so much in the majority, it might be a little difficult to make such an arrangement. The suggestion, however, is a good one. Since last fall the Government railways represented by myself, together with some of the other railways, have been doing all we could to get our cars back from the United States; we have reduced the number from twenty-five thousand to ten or eleven thousand, and we hope in the next few months to reduce it still further. That reduction, together with the new cars we are getting, we hope, will put us in a much better position than we have been in for some time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The shortage of cars is a very serious problem, and, to a certain extent, the Minister of Railways deserves credit for this legislation, but I am amazed to learn that the same old penalty of sixty cents per day represents the demurrage when a car has been sent into the United States and has not been returned. The two Governments, having succeeded in establishing a commission on international waterways, a commission which has been working most successfully since its establishment, should establish a joint railway commission. Some years ago, when I was in the Government the then chairman of the commission in Canada, Mr. Justice Mabee, was authorized, not officially, to enter into negotiations with the commission in the United States. I do not know the result. Mr. Mabee died shortly afterwards, and I do not know if the matter was pursued further. At a time like this, it is of the utmost importance for both countries, having regard to the precedent of the joint commission on international waterways, to find a way out of this difficulty by some arrangement between the two railway boards. Since the beginning of the war the Government has been able to reach some conclusions which, before the war, were considered absolutely impossible of solution. Many arrangements that have

been made between the Ottawa Government and the Washington Government since the war commenced, are to-day considered as matters of course. This is a practical question which will affect relations between both countries for all time to come. My hon. friend, if he is a progressive minister, should see to it that we have a joint arrangement between the Interstate Railway Commission and the Railway Commission in Canada. Last winter, a company with which I am connected had most serious difficulty in securing cars because our cars were in the United States. I appealed to my hon. friend and to the Chairman of the Railway Board and got as much satisfaction as they could give me, for which I am thankful. We simply had to beg for these cars and we got them back in driblets. It seems to me that the time has come for my hon. friend to strike a bold blow and make an arrangement with the United Statets for raising the penalty. With a penalty of only 60 cents a day, the companies in the United States will keep cars for months, and probably for years.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners has been working unofficially with the Interstate Commission and has been doing everything he can to get the cars back. The organization that was established in Montreal by the railway companies has also accomplished something. Their secretary has been travelling backwards and forwards and has been working in conjunction with the American organization. The War Board in New York has also been working along the line suggested by my hon. friend. It had never occurred to me before that raising the penalty might have some effect in getting the cars back, but I am to have a meeting with Sir George Bury, Mr. Gillen and other gentlemen connected with this organization next week, and as we had intended to discuss this matter I will bring my hon. friend's suggestion before them. We are anxious to devise some means for getting our cars back and keeping the spread to a minimum, and I am glad to have my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. WIGMORE: Will the Government's purchase include coal cars?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. WIGMORE: Have the orders been placed?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. WIGMORE: I do not think any organization will be so effective in tracing cars as the Railway Departmetn itself. I think it will be good business for the Railway Department to send men over the different lines in the States to locate these cars and send them back. What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and wiring to the different railroads will not be very effective in my opinion.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT.

On motion of Hon. F. B. Carvell, the House went into committee on Bill No. 41, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Definition of work:

Mr. MURPHY: Is the present definition being widened?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. I have not the exact citation, but I think a decision was made by one of the courts throwing some doubts on whether "structure" included power lines and that kind of thing.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is an "aboiteau?" I know it was a work well known to the Acadian farmers of the old days.

Mr. CARVELL: I think it means dyke.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a very well known term in the country from which I come. It means the embankment which is made across a creek running into a piece of land that has been dyked off from the sea. There are creeks in such land, and it is necessary to build a very much heavier embankment than usual across such creeks, and they are called aboiteaux. Usually there is a sluiceway through which the water can enter to a limited extent into the creek. One supposed derivation of the word is from the two words "abattre" and "eau."

Mr. CARVELL: The whole question arises over the uncertainty as to whether the former Act covered overhead cables and wires of different kinds. The idea of this Bill is to follow the lines of the Railway Act, which prevents telephone, telegraph, electric light and power companies from stringing wires over a railway except under special plans and specifications approved by the Railway Board. The idea is that this was to be the same thing, except it was to be approved by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BUREAU: Applications have been made when wires were stretched over the St. Lawrence.

Mr. CARVELL: I dare say; I have not the exact citation here, but I know some of the courts have questioned whether the word "work," as defined in the original Act, was broad enough to cover this particular kind of structure. To take it out of any controversy it has been suggested by the officers of the department, and I think, rightly so, that this small amending Act should be passed. That is practically the only object of the Bill. It goes a little further than that however, and there is another phase of it. I refer to sections 4 and 5. The original Act provided that no work should be placed upon or built over or crossing a navigable stream except on plans approved by the Governor in Council, but this did not apply to small wharves, or small projections where the cost did not exceed $1,000. The language of section 4 is obscure and it is intended to make it perfectly plain that there can be no question that it must have the consent of the Minister of Public Works. Section 5 which is an extension of the former section, provides that if any works are constructed in, upon or along a navigable stream without the consent of the proper authorities they may be removed by an Order in Council. This goes further and provides that whatever salvage there is may be sold and credited up to the cost, and the owner can be compelled to supply the deficiency whatever that may be. That seems to me to be logical. If there be an authority in the country which has the right to say what obstructions there shall be to navigation, whether or not anything shall be built, in or upon or along a navigable stream, then if any person chooses to build any of these erections without the consent of the proper authorities he ought not to find very much fault with their removal. I think those are really the principal objects of the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: There is another change, if I remember. Under the old Act the Governor in Council, or the Minister of Public Works, had the right to order the destruction of the works if they were an obstruction to navigation. Under this Bill the right is absolute. I think the Act is all right, and I perfectly agree with the Minister of Public Works that these various works which were not completed at the time of the passing of the first Act, such as running pipes over the river to carry water, running power wires over the St. Lawrence as they do, was not contemplated at the time. But there is one case where a grave injustice is being worked, and I want to call my hon. friend's attention to it, because the matter has been hanging fire for a long while and I do not think the consent of the Governor in Council ought to be refused. The people of Shawinigan Falls could not cross the river with boats on account of the great quantity of logs which accummulated there every spring. They got together and asked the provincial government to furnish one fourth of the funds, the municipality one fourth, and the Shawinigan, the Belgo-Canadian, the Electrical Chemical company and all the companies that are using the power, to furnish the other fourth. These people did not bother about any statute. They went to work and took advantage of the ice, and started their piers. I asked them one day: "Have you permission of the Public Works?" They said, "Why? We have the permission of the provincial government, which is contributing to this bridge, and this is their river." I said to them: "The St. Maurice is a navigable river." I then made the proper application and prepared the necessary documents. At that time the false works were all up and the ice on the eve of breaking, and if it had broken, the whole structure would have come down, and there would have been a loss of $80,000 or $90,000, or perhaps more. When the advertisements were all complete, and the four weeks were over, I presented my application. Naturally the Justice Department reported that the site must be approved, although the statute said that all works constructed before a certain time shall not require such approval, but we did not come within the exception. But in this case the Department of Justice were strictly within the law. I may add en passant that we got a letter from the secretary of the Public Works Department, under the amendment of 1908, which authorized the Governor in Council or Minister of Public Works to tear down this structure, ordering us so to do. I am not sure as to the date of the amendment ordering the town of Shawinigan Falls to tear down their bridge. They were in an awful state, and I came up to Ottawa about the matter. The St. Maurice is a navigable river and it is a non-navigable river, paradoxical as that may seem. Parts of the river are not navigable. At this particular point it is not navigable, except for the alligator of the Government which runs near the falls to pull the booms in. This boat can pull itself ashore and go around the falls. The injustice is this: the municipality paid its share and the provincial government paid its share, and the companies say, "You are not in a position to

collect money from us because you are not authorized by the Government, the site has not been approved by the Governor in Council." This matter has been hanging fire for four or five years, and I have been trying to have it arranged. I think an exception should be made in this case. The construction was made in good faith. I may say the bridge was being built under the supervision of the engineer of the Public Works Department in Quebec, and if we had stopped when we were told to stop, the whole false work would have gone out and the superstructure would have been carried away.

Mr. CARVELL: Has it been completed?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, but there is that part of the money that was promised to the company.

Mr. CARVELL: Have you applied to the Public Works Department for a certificate of some kind?

Mr. BUREAU: No, they applied for leave and approval of the plans after the bridge was completed. The bridge had been commenced when it came to the notice of these people that they had no authority. It was commenced in ignorance of the law, and when we gave notice and the application was made, we had to advertise for four weeks. The ice was on the eve of breaking away, and they were ordered to stop, and if we had stopped it would have been a dead loss.

Mr. CARVELL: Was it above or below the falls?

Mr. BUREAU: Above the falls.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not suppose any one can seriously say it interferes with navigation to any considerable extent.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend will see that the amendment proposed in no way changes the previous law.

Mr. BUREAU: No, but the provision may work a hardship in cases like this.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know just how far the department would be justified in going in order to approve of plans of that kind, but a reasonable amount of common sense should be exercised in such a case, and if the hon. gentleman can convince the present Minister of Public Works that this is not an interference with navigation and that he has the power to approve the plans and specifications he will not be long in doing it.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the trouble. I do not think he has the power to ratify plans under the Act when the work is finished. The Act gives him power to approve of the site and plans. The objection that was taken by the Deputy Minister of Justice was the fact of the bridge being built, and the site occupied and plans being executed. He had nothing to recommend. It was beyond the power of the minister to do anything. But I will take it up later on.

Mr. CARVELL: I am expressing a very offhand view, but notwithstanding the very high authority the hon. gentleman quotes it seems to me there should be a large element of common sense in dealing with matters of this kind, and I would be disposed to go the whole limit in order to rectify it.

Mr. BUREAU: I am glad to hear that. I will take the matter up with my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have any applications ever been made to the Department of Public Works by any private interests concerning the project of damming the River St. Lawrence at Long Sault? For many years various attempts have been made by private interests to obtain from the Canadian Government the necessary powers to dam the St. Lawrence at that point. The water-power to be developed at Long Sault is one of the most important, if not the most important, after Niagara Falls. There are some gentlemen in the United States and Canada who are banded together in order to force the hand of this Government just as they were banded together to force our hands when we were in office. Fortunately, so far, the Governments which preceded the present one have kept these interests at bay. This syndicate has not been allowed to get control of this magnificent water-power. My hon. friend is aware that there is a strong feeling in the country in favour of the Government owning the remaining water powers on the St. Lawrence. I am not arguing in favour of the Government ownership of railways. I am not discussing that phase of the question of Government ownership, but I am speaking of water-power. Where the Government has the upper hand in reference to this question of water-power it should keep these powers, and if the river is to be harnessed it should be harnessed as a Government enterprise and for the greatest good to Canadian consumers. With the

scarcity of coal that exists, it is of the utmost importance that our water-power should be conserved for and in the interest of the public. While I believe in competition in regard to the operation of railways, and while I have yet to learn that government ownership is the best thing in connection with railway operation, I am a believer in government ownership as regards the water-powers of the country, particularly those large water-powers on the St. Lawrence river, and I hope my hon. friend will prove to be the faithful watchdog of the Canadian people.

Mr. CARVELL: I am somewhat surprised that my hon. friend digs up the old ghost that I thought had ceased to exist seven or eight years ago. We spent thirty-six or forty-eight hours' time in the old House of Commons debating that question, and I have never heard of it since.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It exists.

Mr. CARVELL: Since I assumed the duties of Minister of Public Works, no application has been made to me either officially or privately and I have never heard the matter discussed, except that I read something in the report of the Conservation Commission which was sent to me a few days ago. The secretary of that commission seemed to be chasing that phantom, the same as my hon. friend is to-night, but I can assure him that it is only a phantom and no person need lie awake at nights for fear that some of the Dominion's interests are going to be sacrificed by the gobbling up of these water-powers on the St. Lawrence. I had a big flood of telegrams from all sorts and conditions of people, municipalities and organizations, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in October last, protesting against the ratification of plans farther down the river, I think, somewhere below Beauharnois.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Cascades?

Mr. CARVELL: It was below Beauharnois.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Cedars?

Mr. CARVELL: I think it was below the Cedars, but I never looked into it. I understand that in the month of September somebody gave notice that he would apply to the Public Works Department for the approval of plans but the application has not been made. I can assure my hon. friend he can rest easy and rely upon the old doctrine that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Mr. HAY: Between the county of Selkirk and the county of Springfield there are a number of ferries crossing the Red river. They are operated by means of cables stretched across the river which can be lowered when a steamboat is approaching or passing. Would they be affected by the operation of this Bill?

Mr. CARVELL: Not by any means. The object of this Bill is to see that these ferries shall be installed according to specifications ratified by the department. The chief object of the Bill is to see that no such obstruction as a wire ferry shall be placed across a navigable stream until it has been properly investigated, a proper plan prepared and the work constructed according to this plan.

Mr. HAY: These ferries have been in operation for a great many years.

Mr. CARVELL: There is a provision regarding them in the original Act. I can assure my hon. friend that this Bill is not aimed at anything like that. This Bill is to protect things of that kind, but to see that no obstruction is put across a navigable stream without the matter being properly investigated.

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. F. B. Carvell (Minister of Public Works) the House went into committee on Bill No. 40 to amend the Public Works Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Power to dredge, etc., beds of navigable waters.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the necessity for this legislation arise owing to a judicial decision?

Mr. CARVELL: No, I do not know that it arises over a judicial decision.

Mr. BUREAU: It is confiscation of part of the bed of a river.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is right in a sense, but I would say that it is expropriation of property rather than confiscation. We have been going on for a great many years, but the only authority which the Government have for taking possession of the beds or banks of rivers for the construction of public works has been the vote by Parliament. That is, when the money has been voted for the work it is the only authority we have, and the question has arisen as to whether that is sufficient authority. The officers of the department,

and contractors and other persons working under them, have been threatened with suits for trespass, and as I hardly know a member of this House who does not want public works in his constituency, I fail to see how I am going to meet all these requests unless I can get authority to go on the land and do what is necessary. It might to some extent amount to what my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) calls confiscation, but if it so be, it is confiscation for the public good. One can hardly imagine the Public Works Department deliberately confiscating property without rendering some value to the community concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In this case the bed of the river?

Mr. CARVELL: The bed of the river or some place along the bank. You must have a place to put your wharf on, or your pier, or things of that kind, and this is really a sort of short-cut, I would say, to the expropriation of the property required. I do not think there is any question whatever but that this Parliament has the jurisdiction.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know about that.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the citation at hand, but I remember a case some years ago in which our good old friend Mr. Conmee was asking for a charter. The question arose as to the right of the Dominion to expropriate—even the right of the Crown as represented by a province—and I remember that the decision of the Privy Council explicitly stated that we had that right. Therefore, I think there is no question about our jurisdiction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was that case?

Mr. CARVELL: I have forgotten the name of the case, it is some eight or nine years since I looked it up, but I am sure there is a decision of the Privy Council to that effect. Therefore, having the jurisdiction, it seems to me very proper that we should have authority, and that is the sole object of this Bill.

Mr. COPP: Has it not been the practice to purchase land needed by the Public Works Department as the site for a wharf?

Mr. CARVELL: I think so, and this Bill does not say that we are going to confiscate; it only gives us the right to take possession. I cannot conceive that the Government will confiscate people's property, it is only a short cut to expropriation.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. BUREAU: My observation in regard to confiscation was said by way of a joke, but I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works did not consult the Attorney General for the various provinces before introducing this legislation. However, it cannot do any harm, because it is in the public interest and with the object of improving navigation. Referring to the river St. Maurice, part of that river is in the harbour of Three Rivers, and harbours, as hon. gentlemen know, are within the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The works in that part of the river St. Maurice which is in the harbour of Three Rivers are maintained by the Department of Public Works. On account of a contract made between the St. Maurice Boom and Driving company and the Department of Public Works—a contract which I think ought not to have been made, but at any rate it was done—

12 p.m. the department have been paying for all the piers, for the booms and for everything.

Now, the Canada Iron Foundries company needed a wharf on which to land pig iron and the clay for their moulds. Application was made to the Department of Public Works, who in turn forwarded it to the Marine Department, and pending the desired permission advantage was taken of the ice by the company to draw materials and go on and complete the work. Now the Department of Marine and Fisheries take the position that parties may not build a dock before getting the approval of the department, whereas the location for the dock has to be approved by the Department of Public Works. We are in this unhappy position, as between the two departments, that we do not know who has jurisdiction, and we are all at sea.

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry, but they are wonderful people at Three Rivers.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not finding fault, but I think the question of jurisdiction ought to be settled.

Mr. CARVELL: I know, the people there are willing to accept almost anything. In fact, I understand they want to build ships on dry land and then get the department to dredge a launching basin for them.

Mr. BUREAU: Sites have to be got on land, they cannot build them on the water.

Mr. CARVELL: To go back to the suggestion of my hon. friend as to the booms and piers, I do not think he should object to that. If the Dominion of Canada for forty years have been doing that which they have

no right to do, surely he cannot object to their trying to get back to solid ground and handing those booms and piers over to the people who are using them. I do not want to get into a discussion on the point now, because that raises the question as to the Gatineau river, and I think the Ottawa river also. Why on earth the Dominion of Canada should provide booms and piers for the big lumber corporations is something I could never understand. Furthermore, why Three Rivers, and the Gatineau and Ottawa rivers should be singled out from all the rest of the rivers in Canada is a mystery to me. I think it was a very wise provision indeed to get these particular piers and booms out of the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department, and the Government generally, and let the big corporations look after them the same as is done elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. CANNON: What about compensation for damages if any should arise?

Mr. CARVELL: I want to point out to my hon. friend that we have been taking this land ever since Confederation. You cannot have public works unless you have the authority to go on the land and construct them. I do not see that there is any change in principle proposed here.

Section approved of, Bill reported and read the third time.

PENSIONS.

COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER AND REPORT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the following members do compose the Special Committee, ordered by the House on the 10th instant, to consider the report upon the Pension Board, the pension regulations and the sufficiency or otherwise of the relief afforded thereunder, the pension lists in force in Canada for disabled and other soldiers and the dependents of those killed while on active service, and any other matters relating thereto or connected therewith: Messieurs. Cronyn, Green, L. A. Lapointe, Lemieux, Nesbitt, Nickle, McCurdy, Murphy, Power, Parent, Redman, Rowell, Ross, Sutherland, Turriff.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Messieurs. Fulton, Harold, Scott, Trahan, and Tweedie be appointed members of the Special Committee on Bill No. 25 in the place of Messieurs. Green, Nesbitt, Nickle, Redman and E. Lapointe.

He said: These gentlemen are to take the place of four members of this committee who have been made members of the Pensions Committee.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 12.12 a.m. (Saturday.)

Monday, April 15, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Orders in Council under the Military Voters' Act, 1917, and the War-time Elections Act.—Hon. Mr. Doherty.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Pilotage System and its administration at the port of Halifax.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

YUKON ELECTION.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have examined the special report of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in respect to the election for the electoral district of the Yukon Territory, and I have spoken concerning it with the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. It seems the proper course to refer the returns to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I, therefore, move:

That the Special Return of the General Returning Officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for Canada concerning the election of a candidate to serve in the House of Commons for the Yukon Territory be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with power and authority to consider the same and the several documents therein alluded to and to report their conclusion and determination thereon to this House.

Motion agreed to.

SECRET SESSION TO BE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Having regard to the gravity of the conditions which are confronting the Allied nations at the present time, and with the view of informing hon. members of this House in a confidential way as to certain matters upon which it is advisable that they should be informed, and as to which confidential information in regard to military exigencies could not properly be given in an ordinary session of the House, I have conferred with the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition as to the holding of a secret session of this House. The conclusion I have reached in conjunc-

tion with my colleagues is that such a session should be held in the immediate future. It will be possible when that session is held, to explain much more in detail the reasons on account of which I think it is desirable. I therefore, move:

Resolved that the sitting of Wednesday next, the seventeenth day of April, instant, shall be a secret session until the House shall then otherwise order, and that all strangers be ordered to withdraw during such secret session;

Provided however, that this Order shall not affect the privilege enjoyed by members of the Senate of being present at Debates in this House.

Resolved further that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting their Honours with the terms of this Resolution.

Under ordinary conditions, it is most unusual that a secret session of either House of Parliament should be held. However, during the past two years secret sessions of the British Parliament have been held on several occasions. There were two in the spring of 1916. There were two, I think, in the spring of 1917, one of which was held about the time my colleagues and I were leaving England. There was a secret session held by the British House of Commons in the month of December last and another in January. It seems desirable that under existing conditions the same course should be followed here on this occasion.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Prime Minister, as he stated, did me the honour of consulting me last Saturday as to the advisability of holding a secret session of this House. The Government must, of course, take the responsibility in regard to a matter of this kind as they are in the possession of information of which the public is not aware, and it is for them to decide as to the advisability of conferring with Parliament in regard to it. It is also for them to decide whether, as a result of that, it will be possible to give the information to the public. But of course, all this is upon the responsibility of the Government, who have knowledge of which the public is ignorant, and which they consider the public should not have, at all events, at the present stage. Under such circumstances there can be no objection to the course the Government have decided to take. I can add to what has been said by my right hon. friend that not only has the British Parliament had secret sessions, but the French Parliament has had secret sessions on one or two occasions.

Motion agreed to.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

HON. SIR THOMAS WHITE.

FURTHER STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO ABSENCE OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE BECAUSE OF ILL HEALTH.

On motions being called:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I made a statement to the House on the 21st of March last with regard to the reasons which had occasioned the absence of the Minister of Finance from the session up till that time, and I stated that from the Easter adjournment there would be another announcement, which I now propose to make.

After making my statement to the House I telegraphed to Sir Thomas White, and on the 24th of March received the following reply from him:

Los Angeles, March 24th, 1918.

Sir Robert Borden,

Ottawa, Ont.

I have your telegram containing the statement which you made in the House on Thursday. If you are clearly of opinion that the public interest will not materially suffer by reason of my absence until my health is recuperated, you may announce to the House that I will return at a later date and resume the duties of my office. If, on the other hand, you are of the view that the public interest may suffer through my further absence, I should prefer to be relieved immediately. My desire is to do what is best in the national interest at this critical time in our affairs. Think I can return about May 1st.

W. T. White.

To that I replied on the 25th of March as follows:

Ottawa, March 25th, 1918.

Sir Thomas White,

Los Angeles Golf and Country Club,

Los Angeles, California.

You do not need to be assured that your telegram of yesterday was very welcome and I rejoice to know that you see your way clear to remain at your post. It will be a great satisfaction to have you once more among us but I urge most earnestly, and in this all my colleagues concur, that you should not think of returning to your duties during the present session nor thereafter until your health and strength are fully restored. We do not anticipate a prolonged session, and I am thoroughly confident that you will best discharge your duty to the country by taking a complete respite from work and worry for such a period as will enable you to resume your labours with all your accustomed vigour and energy.

R. L. Borden.

It is with very great pleasure I am able to announce to the House that since the date of these telegrams there has been a very marked improvement in the health of Sir Thomas White, and I anticipate that within a few days he will leave California for the purpose of taking part in certain

conferences at Washington with regard to the financial arrangements for the present fiscal year, which demand the closest attention of the Government and which will be of great moment to Parliament and the country. I have already explained the very difficult conditions with regard to providing adequate financial arrangements for payment of producers in this country for the supplies of food, munitions and other articles which are urgently needed by the British Government and by the allied nations in general. The extent of the burden thus imposed upon this country is perhaps imperfectly realized. When the time comes for presenting the Budget to Parliament that question can be gone into more fully. In the meantime certain further negotiations are necessary, and I am very happy to know that the Minister of Finance finds himself sufficiently restored to health to take part in them in the immediate future.

THE RAILWAY BELT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 54, to amend the Railway Belt Act was introduced and read the first time.

THE NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that work has been recommenced on the new parliament building, and I would consider it a very great pleasure if the members of the House would take an early opportunity of visiting the premises for the purpose of acquainting themselves with the general layout and making any suggestions which to them may seem proper with a view to expediting completion, and which might be acted upon by the committee having charge of the reconstruction. I regret to say that it does not look as though the building would be completed for the next session of Parliament, unless very radical changes are made in the present method of construction. If it meets with the convenience of hon. members I would suggest that either to-morrow or on Wednesday, between the hours of 1.30 and 3 o'clock, I shall be on the premises with as many of the officials as possible in order to conduct hon. members over the building and explain the general layout and proposed arrangements. I also extend this invitation to the press. I think that an hour, or an hour and one-half, could be very profitably spent and might result in speeding up the work, to the advantage of the country at large. I will leave the matter of the date and hour open, awaiting suggestions from hon. friends on either side of the House, but I repeat that either to-morrow or Wednesday, from 1.30 to 3, would suit me admirably.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I take this opportunity of asking my hon. friend whether it be true that the Government have decided to erect a house on the cliff, between the cliff and the present building, for a lodgement for the Speaker?

Mr. CARVELL: The committee, who are really the only ones exercising any jurisdiction in the matter, have decided they will not provide accommodation for the Speaker within the walls of the new building, but no further decision has been arrived at.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am sorry that has been decided thus far. For the convenience of the Speaker himself, I think he had better be lodged in the building, as was done in the old building and as is the custom in Great Britain to-day. If it is decided to erect a separate building for this purpose between the present building and the cliff, I think it would be most offensive to the eye. There is not enough space between the cliff and the present building for another building, and far from enhancing the beauty of the surroundings it would have the contrary effect.

Mr. CARVELL: There has been no decision to erect a building on the cliff. Perhaps hon. members will be in a better position to discuss these matters after they have examined the building carefully.

THE QUEBEC DISTURBANCES; ARMAND LAVERGNE.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I desire to answer a question which was put on Friday last by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp). I was not present in the House when the question was put, but on the Orders of the Day the hon. member for Westmorland read what purported to be a report of some testimony given by Mr. Armand Lavergne at the coroner's inquest in Quebec, as follows:

> They then asked him to go and address the crowd, and as he had previously received the offer to act as chief keeper of records of the M.S.A., in Ottawa, which he had refused.

The hon. gentleman's question was whether Colonel Lavergne ever offered to act as chief keeper of records of the Military Service Act in Ottawa. I say in answer that there is no such office as chief keeper of records of the Military Service Act in Ottawa. I am assured by Colonel Machin of the Military Service Branch that there never was any offer whatsoever made of this non-existing position to Colonel Lavergne, nor, so far as he or any of his officers know, did Colonel Machin ever offer to fill that non-existing position. If Mr. Lavergne's testimony is correctly reported, it would appear to be an instance of the over-activity of a too vivid imaginaton.

EXCESS CIRCULATION ISSUE BY THE BANKS.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a motion on Government orders which is somewhat urgent. It appears at page 22 of the Orders of the Day. The motion is very largely of a formal character, but it has to be made within thirty days after the opening of Parliament. In order that there may be no question as to the matter having been taken up within the limitation by law, I beg to move that the House proceed to Government notices of motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance) moved:

That the proclamation of the Governor in Council published on the 20th February, 1918, in the form following, be approved:—

Devonshire
[L.S.]

Canada.

George the Fifth, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

To all to whom these presents shall come, or whom the same may in anywise concern,— Greeting:

A Proclamation.

E. L. Newcombe,

Deputy Minister of Justice, Canada.

Whereas in and by section 4 of the Act of Parliament of Canada, passed in the fourth and fifth years of Our Reign, and intituled: "An Act to conserve the Commercial and Financial Interests of Canada," it is provided among other things that in case of war, real or apprehended, and in case of any real or apprehended financial crisis, Our Governor in Council may, by Proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, authorize the several chartered banks to issue excess circulation from and including the first day of March in any year to and including the last day of August next ensuing, or during any part of such period, to amounts not exceeding fifteen per cent of the combined unimpaired capital and rest or reserved fund of their respective banks, as stated in their respective statutory monthly returns to the Minister of Finance of Canada, for the month immediately preceding that in which the additional amount is issued,—

Now Know Ye that by and with the advice of Our Privy Council for Canada We do by these presents proclaim and direct that the several chartered banks be authorized to issue excess circulation as in the said Act defined from and including the first day of March, 1918, to and including the last day of August, 1918.

Of all which Our loving subjects and all others whom these presents may concern, are hereby required to take notice and to govern themselves accordingly.

In Testimony Whereof, We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. Witness: Our Right Trusty and Right Entirely Beloved Cousin and Counsellor, Victor Christian William, Duke of Devonshire, Marquess of Hartington, Earl of Devonshire, Earl of Burlington, Baron Cavendish of Hardwicke, Baron Cavendish of Keighley, Knight of Our Most Noble Order of the Garter; One of Our Most Honourable Privy Council; Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George; Knight Grand Cross of Our Royal Victorian Order; Gorvernor General and Commander in Chief of Our Dominion of Canada.

At Our Government House, in Our City of Ottawa, this Twentieth day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, and in the eighth year of Our Reign.

By command,

Thomas Mulvey,
Under-Secretary of State.

He said: Hon. gentlemen will remember that under the Bank Act banks are authorized at certain periods of the year to exceed their normal bank circulation, particularly during the period of harvesting crops in Canada. Ordinarily their note circulation is confined to their unimpaired paid-up capital, the amount of current gold accounts, and Dominion notes which they hold in the central gold reserve, which is a banking reserve. From the 1st September to 28th February they are permitted by the Act to issue excess circulation not exceeding 15 per cent of their paid-up capital, rest and reserve fund. Under this power they are obliged to pay to the Government at the rate of 5 per cent interest for such excess circulation. Section 4 of the Finance Act of 1914 provides that the Governor in Council be further authorized to permit this excess circulation by the banks throughout the whole year; not only from the 1st of September to the 1st of March, but from the 1st of March until the last day of August. Section 4 of the Finance Act reads:

The Governor in Council may by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette:—

(c) authorize the several chartered banks to issue excess circulation, from and including the first day of March in any year, to and including the last day of August next ensuing, or during any part of such period, to amounts not exceeding fifteen per cent of the combined unimpaired capital and rest or reserve fund of the respective banks, as stated in their respective statutory montly returns to the Minister for the month immediately preceding that in which the additional amount is issued;

The Finance Act further provides that this authority for excess circulation during the entire year, or during the additional period of six months, becomes effective by proclamation, and it always provides that the proclamation shall continue in force for not more than thirty days after the beginning of the next session of parliament, unless it has been approved by resolution passed by both houses of Parliament. Parliament opened on the 18th of March, and consequently this proclamation must receive the approval of this House by resolution to-day, or possibly to-morrow. Therefore, it is, to keep perfectly within the statutory requirement, that I ask Parliament to approve of this resolution. No similar resolution was passed last year or the year before, for the reason that the proclamation issued while Parliament was in session, and the Justice Department advised the Department of Finance that the approval of Parliament was not necessary. I may say that the banks generally have exercised the powers granted under this proclamation. During the past year a total interest of $109,533.06 has been collected from the banks on account of excess note circulation. All of the chartered banks have availed themselves of the privilege given them under this provision of the Finance Act. I trust, therefore, that Parliament will be pleased to approve of the resolution. I might further say that on Friday last the Senate passed a resolution of approval.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The House would be interested in knowing whether or not the banks all require this extension of power. Has a petition to this effect been presented to the Government, or has there been a resolution by the boards of directors of the banks?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The very fact that the banks have all exercised the privilege granted by the Finance Act clearly shows that they desire the privilege, and the proclamation was made upon the presentation of the banks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, that may be so, but, since Parliament has to review the proclamation, in the nature of things Parliament should be informed in the same way as the Government was informed. I am prepared to believe that the banks have asked for it; therefore, I see no serious objection.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House returned to the "Orders of the Day."

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 9, respecting Fraser Lumber Company, Limited, and Fraser Companies, Limited.—Mr. Elkin.

Bill No. 22, respecting The Canadian Society of Civil Engineers and to change its name to "The Engineering Institute of Canada."—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 8, respecting The Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Spinney.

PATENT OF O.G.C.L.J. OVERBECK.

House in committee on Bill No. 29 respecting a patent of O.G.C.L.J. Overbeck.—Mr. Fripp. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 2:

Mr. CURRIE: What is this Bill about? I see it is one of those German patents, and I was wondering whether it was some patent in connection with munitions and whether a German firm wants to get in on it. Have you the memorandum, Mr. Chairman, which is issued on each of these Bill stating what the object is?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The man who has applied for this legislation is a British subject, although he may have a German name. He has a patent on a process to dealcoholize beer, take away the kick and leave the flavour. There was no strenuous opposition in the Committee on Private Bills, but owing to the current of the war he seems to have lost his rights, and he merely asks to be reinstated. He wants to be able to furnish the world with beer without the kick, and the committee felt unanimously that he ought to have that privilege.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many writs of Habeas Corpus have been taken out to date, in the military district

of Montreal, towards securing the freedom of conscripted men?

2. Is the Government aware that in every case where writs of Habeas Corpus were taken out said writs were maintained by the Montreal tribunals, the military authorities admitting in each case that they had no right to arrest the said conscripted men?

3. Is the Government aware that the authorities arrested men who were in possession of exemption certificates; that, in spite of protests, they were brought to barracks and not permitted to communicate with counsel?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Eighteen.

2. No. Three have been withdrawn, twelve maintained, and three still pending.

3. No. While some had papers in their possession, there were doubts that they were the rightful owners.

BUILDINGS IN OTTAWA LEASED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. How many buildings or parts of buildings under lease by the Government, in the City of Ottawa, on the first day of February, 1915, have been vacated or the leases cancelled?

2. Who are the owners of said buildings?

3. Where are the said buildings situated?

4. What rent per annum was paid for each of them?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Militia and Defence, 2; Public Works, 11.

2. Militia and Defence, J. C. Brennan and the Ottawa Ladies' College. Public Works, H. N. Bate & Son, Ltd., Thos. Fleming, J. P. Laurin, Molsons Bank, Dr. Frederick McKinnon, W. H. Martin & Co., A. K. Mills & Son, J. L. Rochester et al, Slater Estate, Edward Desmereaux and J. B. Duford and W. G. Charleson.

3. Militia and Defence: 203 Queen street and Albert street. Public Works: Building at 10-12 Albert street; brick building, 347 Sparks street; brick building, 95 George street; premises two stories, 64-66 George street; house, 72 Elgin street; basement of building, 174-176-178 Wellington street; Mills building, 188 Slater street; second, third floors and part of basement of 124-126-128 Queen street; Lot No. 11, south side of Wellington street; two top flats of building, 109 Rideau street; first and second floors of building, 113 Rideau street, with shed in rear.

4. Militia and Defence: $3,000 per annum and $6,000 per annum. Public Works: Building at 10-12 Albert street, $1,600 per annum; brick building, 347 Sparks street, $1,080 per annum; brick building, 95 George street, $1,200 per annum; premises, two stories, 64-66 George street, $1,800 per annum; house, 72 Elgin street, $780 per annum; basement of building, 174-176-178 Wellington street, $900 per annum; Mills building, 188 Slater street, $573.30 per annum; second, third floors and part of basement of 124-126-128 Queen street, $6,200 per annum; Lot No. 11, south side of Wellington street, $360 per annum; two top flats of building, 109 Rideau street, $1,677 per annum; first and second floors of building, 113 Rideau street, with shed in rear, $7,053.60 per annum.

PRESENTATION OF AEROPLANES TO BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to present a squadron of aeroplanes, as a unit in the flying corps, to the British Government?

2. Has any correspondence been exchanged between the Government and the Canadian Aviation Fund, on this subject?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Some interviews have taken place in reference to the subject matter mentioned in the question of the hon. member, and further information will be given at a proper time a little later.

PURCHASE OF HAY IN LEVIS COUNTY.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. From whom did the Government purchase hay in the County of Levis?

2. When was said hay purchased?

3. What quantity of hay was purchased, and at what price?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No information.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

CASES BEFORE LOCAL APPEAL TRIBUNALS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has an Order in Council been passed recently prohibiting the rehearing of cases before the local Appeal Tribunals in connection with the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. If so, at what date?

3. Will the said Order in Council be produced?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. March 2nd, 1918.

3. Yes, if not already produced.

CAPTAIN SAUCIER—ENGINEERS' TRAINING DEPOT OFFICERS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is Major T. C. Keefer a member of the Commission which is at present investigating the matter of Captain Saucier, at Montreal, the same Major T. C. Keefer who is attached to the Engineers' Training Depot at St. Johns, Province of Quebec?

2. What were the salaries, on 17th December, 1917, of the following officers of the Engineers' Training Depot, at St. Johns, Province of Quebec: Col. W. W. Melville, Major T. C. Keefer, Capt. R. W. Powell, Capt. J. P. Campbell, Capt.

L. Pettigrew, Lt. R. R. Knight, Lt. D. B. Armstrong, Lt. A. D. Adney, Lt. R. M. Trow, Lt. H. J. Young, Lt. H. S. Phillips, Lt. J. V. Culbert, Lt. H. Blackadder, Lt. Paul Bourget, Lt. J. C. Armer, Lt. H. P. Duthie?

3. Are the said officers at present attached to the St. Johns Training Depot, and are they being paid the same salary which they received on the 17th December, 1917?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. The pay and allowances of the respective ranks held by these officers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

3. The following officers are at present on the strength of the Engineer Training Depot at St. Johns, P.Q., at the same rates of pay:—Lt.-Colonel W. W. Melville, Major T. C. Keefer, Capt. R. W. Powell, M.C., Capt. J. P. Campbell, Capt. L. Pettigrew, Lieut. R. R. Knight, Lieut. D. B. Armstrong, Lieut. E. T. Adney, Lieut. R. M. Trow, Lieut. H. S. Phillips.

The following officers have left for overseas since December, 17th, 1917:—Lieut. H. G. Young, Lieut. J. V. Culbert, Lieut. H. Blackadder, Lieut. P. Bourget, Lieut. H. P. Duthie.

The following officer was struck off the strength on January 22nd, 1918:—Lieut. J. C. Armer.

BANKS' DEPOSIT WITH CENTRAL GOLD RESERVE.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Does the sum of $120,566,245, held as gold reserve by the Receiver General, on the 1st March, 1918, include the amount deposited with the Central Gold Reserve by the banks as a guarantee for their circulation?

2. If so, what is the amount so deposited by the said banks?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. No.

TREASURY BONDS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. How many treasury bonds have been issued by the Government since the beginning of the war, to what amount, and at what rate?

2. How many treasury bonds have been paid by the Government since the beginning of the war, and to what amount?

3. How many of treasury bonds thus issued by the Government will fall due during the fiscal year of 1918-1919, and what is the sum represented by the said bonds?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Treasury Bills to the amount of $324,955,000 at 5 to 5½ per cent.

2. $249,500,000.

3. $1,240,000.

DUE DATES OF LOANS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. How many short term loans and long term loans, irrespective of their character, will fall due during the fiscal year of 1918-1919?

2. What is the amount of each of these loans and the date of maturity in each case?

3. How does the Government intend to provide for the reimbursement of these loans upon maturity of same?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. Dominion of Canada Treasury bills to the amount of $1,240,000, as follows: May 7, 1918, $50,000; July 2, 1918, $90,000; July 3, 1918, $750,000; July 7, 1918, $100,000; July 19 1918, $250,000.

3. Out of Consolidated Revenue Fund.

SPECIE.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What was the amount of the specie at the date of the outbreak of the war?

2. How much specie has been exported by the Government from the beginning of the war to March 31, 1918?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. July 31, 1914, held by the Government of Canada, $97,136,426.88.

2. None.

BANKS' SUBSCRIPTIONS TO WAR LOANS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

How much have the banks subscribed and paid in up to date to the war loans?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

The terms of this question are too indefinite to permit of answer.

USE OF DEPOSITS FOR WAR PURPOSES.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Government used, towards the expenses of the war, funds from Postal Savings Banks, Insurance Deposits or other sums deposited with them for any purpose?

2. If so, what is the amount in each instance?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to do so?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1, 2 and 3. Under the Audit Act all public moneys and revenues form one consolidated revenue fund and expenditures are not earmarked against any source of revenue.

PROVINCIAL APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL ADVANCES.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Have any other provinces besides the Provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan applied to the Government for money advances?

2. If so, which are those provinces?

3. How has the Government dealt with these applications for money advances?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1, 2 and 3. No.

FEDERAL LOAN TO ONTARIO.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Federal Government lent or advanced the sum of $2,000,000 to the Government of the Province of Ontario? If so, under what conditions?

2. For what purposes did the Ontario Government obtain said loan from the Federal Government?

3. What rate of interest does the Ontario Government pay on said loan, and when is it payable?

4. Is there a sinking fund provided therefor?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. To meet maturing obligations.

3. Six and one-half per cent, payable half yearly. The loan is for a term of five years, or at the option of the province the principal may be paid in full at any time prior to the said date of maturity with accrued interest.

4. No information.

FEDERAL LOAN TO SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has a sum of two millions five hundred thousand dollars been loaned or advanced by this Government to the Province of Saskatchewan? If so, on what terms?

2. What reasons did the Government of Saskatchewan give when calling upon the Dominion Government for this advance?

3. What rate of interest is being paid on this loan, and when is the latter repayable?

4. Has a sinking fund been provided for?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes, February 1, 1918.

2. Loan to be utilized for the retirement of five per cent Debentures maturing February 1, 1918.

3. Six and one-half per cent payable half-yearly. The Loan is for a term of five years, or at the option of the Province the principal may be paid in part or whole prior to the said date of maturity with accrued interest.

4. No information.

PUBLIC SERVANTS AND WAR BONDS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Government compelled members of the Public Service to purchase bonds in connection with War Loans?

2. If so, in what manner, and for what reason?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. No.

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. What was the amount of Government deposits in the banks, as current account, on the 31st March 1918?

2. Was the Government's account, in the banks, overdrawn during the fiscal year 1917-1918?

3. If so, in which banks, at what dates, and for what amount?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

Name of Bank.	Rec. Gen. Acct.	War Loan A.cct
Bank of Montreal	$ 730,524 57	$6,346,376 01
Bank of B. N. America	50,628 17	1,557,794 69
La Caisse d'Economie de Québec	140,000 00	
Montreal City & District Savings Bank	93,341 86	655,311 10
Canadian Bank of Commerce	3,548,874 04	5,847,442 53
Dominion Bank	124,467 17	3,219,147 56
Bank of Hamilton	76,077 31	2,394,959 34
La Banque D'Hochelaga	96,243 39	472,244 55
Home Bank of Canada	20,394 78	520,126 02
Imperial Bank of Canada	233,117 25	2,293,860 80
Merchants Bank of Canada	423,846 57	1,480,264 68
Molsons Bank	61,508 22	1,581,377 52
La Banque Nationale	28,574 31	109,541 60
Nor. Crown Bank	27,576 25	529,634 95
Bank of Nova Scotia	387,614 18	2,412,626 29
Bank of Ottawa	67,925 21	1,280,449 70
La Banque Provinciale	38,496 48	341,482 68
Royal Bank of Canada	307,103 32	5,577,035 07
Standard Bank	46,372 93	1,173,403 27
Sterling Bank	25,721 33	342,307 29
Bank of Toronto	69,531 23	2,158,655 02
Union Bank of Canada	135,442 15	2,218,522 68
Weyburn Security Bank	25,432 58	30,287 89
Bank of Montreal, New York		8,309,352 25

2 and 3. No.

RIGAUD-ST. REDEMPTEUR MAIL.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the names of those who have tendered for the transportation of the mail between Rigaud and St. Rédempteur?

2. What was the amount of each tender?

3. To whom has the contract been awarded, and what is the amount of the contract?

4. How long has said contract to run?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Gaston Guerin, Montreal, $313; J. Hector Chevrier, Rigaud, $350; Arthur Quesnel, Rigaud, $420; Odilon Brule, Rigaud, $490; Joseph Chevrier, Rigaud, $500.

3. Gaston Guerin, the lowest tenderer, having urged his inability to perform the service owing to his residence in Montreal, the contract was awarded to J. Hector Chevrier, whose tender was the next lowest received.

4. To 30th September, 1921.

LENNOXVILLE EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. HUNT:

1. Who is in charge of the Experimental Farm at Lennoxville, Quebec?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. Does he do other work for the Government and receive a salary for the same?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. J. A. McClary.
2. $2,000 per annum.
3. No.

DRILL HALL AT BURY, QUE.

Mr. HUNT:

1. Has the Government erected a Drill Hall at Bury, Quebec?
2. If so, who was the contractor?
3. What was the contract price?
4. What amount was paid for extras?
5. How much did it cost to heat, light and maintain, each year?
6. What is the building used for?
7. Is it the intention of the Government to keep this building in repair, heat and light, each year?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. A. Cromwell, of Cookshire, Que.
3. $11,750, construction of building; $1,100, fittings.
4. $1,094.20.
5. 1915, light, $115.36; heat, $189.40; water, $25; total $329.76. 1916, light, $10.15; heat, $234.50; water, $25; engineer's services, $37.60; total $307.25. 1917, light, $10.74; heat, $247.75; water, $25; engineer's services, $15.80; total, $299.29—$936.30.
6. Used as regimental store for the 7th Hussars.
7. Yes, Government-owned.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the commissioned officers employed at Quebec at the Base Depot Battalion stationed at the Drill Hall?
2. How long have they been in this battalion?
3. What is their rank?
4. Who are those amongst them who have performed service overseas?
5. How long have they been actually at the front?
6. To which battalion did they belong when in the trenches?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1st Depot Battalion. 2nd Quebec Regiment.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
P. A. Piuze	Nov. 19, '17	Lieut.-Col.	Yes.	This information will have to be obtained from Overseas Headquarters.	150th Battalion.
R. de La B. Girouard.	" 12, '17	Major	"		22nd "
J. F. X. Hallé	Jan. 16, '17	"	"		69th "
J. A. Fecteau	" 2, '17	"	"		189th "
*I. A. Poirer	Oct. 10, '17	Captain	No.		
L. G. Morissette, M.C.	Jan. 2, '18	"	Yes.		189th "
C. E. LeBlanc	Dec. 7, '17	"	"		22nd "
*P. E. Gouin	Nov. 19, '17	Lieutenant	No.		
J. J. Marshall	Feb. 18, '17	"	Yes.		Conducting Duty.
*G. R. Bourgeault	Nov. 24, '17	"	No.		
*J. J. F. Bélanger	Jan. 2, '17	"	"		
A. N. Morin	Feb. 28, '18	"	Yes.		22nd Battalion.
*O. R. Carson	" 1, '18	"	No.		
L. des Trois Maisons	Jan. 16, '18	"	Yes.		69th "
G. Fournier	Feb. 4, '18	"	"		69th "
L. H. G. Van Borren	" 18, '18	"	"		Conducting Duty.
T. J. Morin		"	"		38th Battalion.
*J. O. Shearer	" 28, '18	"	No.		
J. A. McCallum	Oct. 24, '18	Hon. Capt. and Q.-Master.	Yes.		117th "
**I. J. Lambert	" 16, '18	Hon. Capt. and Paymaster.	No.		
**H. E. Connolly	Jan. 24, '17	Med. Officer	Yes.		Conducting Duty.

* Temporary appointment—To be replaced by returned officers when available.
** Attached.

DETENTION CAMP AT SPIRIT LAKE.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Is the Detention Camp at Spirit Lake, in the Abitibi District, being used at present?
2. If so, for what purpose?
3. How much money was spent by the Government for the organization of same?
4. Has the Government derived any benefit from the work being carried on there by the interned prisoners?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. As an experimental farm.
3. $32,500.
4. Yes, about 800 acres of land cleared for an experimental farm and buildings in connection with same, and $15,946 received from sale of pulpwood.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS' PLATES IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. What price per 100 pounds has the Government agreed to pay for the 80,000 tons of ships' plates purchased in the United States for use in building ships in Canada?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Three dollars and twenty-five cents ($3.25) per hundred pounds, base, f.o.b. mills.

PURCHASE OF LAND AT STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Has the Government bought a piece of land at Ste. Anne de la Perade for the construction of a beacon?
2. If so, in what year, and at what price?
3. Has the beacon been constructed? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.
2. In 1915, for $50.
3. No, because the light is not urgently required, and all construction, except such as is absolutely necessary, has been postponed in consequence of the necessity of cutting down appropriations.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What are the names of the physicians composing the different Military Medical Boards in the province of Ontario under the operation of the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. What are the names of the physicians composing the different Military Medical Boards in the province of Quebec under the operation of the Military Service Act, 1917?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the sums of money expended on repairs of wharf at Ile Perrot Sud, since 1911?
2. What are the names of those who have been employed on said works, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?
3. What are the names of the parties who have supplied the materials, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the sums of money expended on repairs at Hudson's Wharf, since 1911?
2. What are the names of those who have been employed on said works, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?
3. What are the names of the parties who have supplied the materials, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the sums of money expended on repairs of wharf at Ile Perrot Nord, since 1911?
2. What are the names of those who have been employed on said works, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?
3. What are the names of the parties who have supplied the materials, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the sums of money expended on repairs at St. Zotique Wharf, since 1911?
2. What are the names of those who have been employed on said works, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?
3. What are the names of the parties who have supplied the materials, and the amount of money which has been paid to each of them?

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the officers employed at Quebec on the Staff of the Military District No. 5?
2. How long have they been connected with this branch?
3. What service is each of them performing?
4. What salary and allowance is each of them receiving?
5. Who are those amongst them who have performed service overseas?
6. How long have they been actually at the front?
7. How long were they in the trenches?
8. To which battalion did they belong while overseas?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. PREVOST:

Copy of all correspondence, petitions and communications received by the Government or exchanged between the Government and any party or association in connection with farm labour in the several provinces of the Dominion.

CANADIAN FUEL DEPOSITS.

MOTION BY MR. J. E. ARMSTRONG ADVOCATING DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF FUEL RESOURCES OF CANADA.

Mr. JOSEPH E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is of great importance that the increased and increasing demand for fuel for manufacturing and residental purposes be supplied in larger quantities and at cheaper rates than are now possible; that the deposits of bituminous and anthracite coal in Canada located in the extreme

eastern and western portions thereof, be more fully and thoroughly utilized for the benefit of the residents of the central provinces; that the enormous peat and lignite deposits so widely distributed through all portions of the Dominion be also scientifically made use of for the same purpose, and further that the Government of Canada make a special effort through legislation and otherwise, to have these valuable deposits more fully and rapidly developed to the end that the people of Canada may be adequately supplied with these fuels.

He said: The hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) who was to have supported this resolution has been obliged to leave owing to illness in his family. He, therefore, asked me to read on his behalf a letter which embodies his views with respect to this resolution. The letter reads:

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Ottawa, April 12th, 1918.

—Re Your Resolution in the House—

Dear Mr. Armstrong:—

Enclosed you will find copy of letter which speaks for itself.

Owing to the illness of my aged father I arranged to go to-morrow afternoon to visit him. Train connections make it impossible for me to return here in time for Monday's discussion.

I, therefore, beg you to be good enough to point out to the House, that it is possible, in my opinion, for the Province of Alberta to supply all the coal needed in the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and even in the Province of Ontario, subject to costs and facilities of transportation.

This subject has been ably covered by Mr. Lemieux, member for Maisonneuve, and I am sure he will co-operate with you in every particular. In my opinion there is no reason why the miners of Alberta should not be kept busy at the mines during the summer months, and the coal transported and stored in such a way that only a small percentage would be lost.

If the winter demand for the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba is now supplied many of the miners could be transported to the Eastern coal fields, there to enlarge the output so as to supply from that point, at least the Province of Quebec, if not Ontario.

I regret very much that your Resolution is brought at this time because the delegation of miners who are coming to this city on the 17th instant, for the express purpose of discussing the ways and means of production, could be of material assistance to us in this discussion.

This Government, in my opinion, should not neglect to keep in close touch with the labour element so as to remedy, in this particular case at all events, the condition of things which exist. I would have suggestions to make, but not having had the opportunity to discuss with the Minister of Labour, and not knowing what he has in mind, I refrain from so doing.

Yours very truly,

H. A. MACKIE.

Enclosed with the hon. gentleman's letter was the following communication:

District No. 18.

United Mine Workers of America.

Calgary, Alta., March 30th, 1918.

H. A. Mackie, Esq.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir:—

I beg to acknowledge yours of the 25th inst. and wish to state that pretty near all the Lignite Mines are closed down as they have no Orders, Drumheller Mines and Mines in the Lethbridge Field, if you could get the Government to give us the Manitoba, and Saskatchewan market, we could work ten months in the year. Last year and all winter they were having heatless days in the East, at the same time Mr. Magrath was allowing coal from the lakes that had been shipped while the Lakes were open, sending the coal to Winnipeg, and our Mines in the Drumheller valley, closed down, during November, December and January, these mines only worked two months, that was before the strike, A committee of the Miners of District 18 will be in Ottawa on April 17th, and will see you and give you all information that is necessary.

Yours truly,

"Edw. Browne"

Secretary District 18.

The resolution which I have moved is identically the same as that which I placed upon the Order Paper last year. It is not my intention to repeat at any great length any of the arguments which I used at that time, but I do feel that the Government should then have given this matter their immediate attention. While it is true that they have during the past ten days set aside by Order in Council the sum of $400,000 for the development of the coal areas of the West, and that they also contemplate the development of some of our enormous peat deposits, I feel that a full year has in reality been wasted, and instead of being ready with a supply of fuel for the coming winter, with its anticipated still greater shortage, we shall not be in a position to supply public demands for some considerable time unless the greatest possible speed is attained. However, I cannot but congratulate the Government upon the action they have taken, and am confident that the people of Canada will uphold them in any reasonable efforts they may make to provide fuel for the winter of 1919.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. member if he will say if he knows anything of the Graham carbonizing process and if the Cabinet has taken it into consideration?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I will leave the answer to the minister; I am not positive what action they have taken. My advice to them is to speed up the organization to the utmost limit, and I am going to offer some suggestions as to how it should be

speeded up. What we need, Mr. Speaker, at the head of the Geological Survey and the Mines Branch is a man who should and would devote all his time and energy towards making it what it should be, one of the most progressive departments of this Government. He should be given a free hand to reorganize and rearrange this department. In making this statement, I do not wish in any way to criticise the present acting Minister of Mines, for I believe he is at least trying to straighten out some of the many things which need to be straightened out in that department; but the present Minister of Mines is also the Secretary of State, and in that position he cannot give the Department of Mines the attention it deserves during these trying days. Let me call your attention, for a moment, to the extent of the operations carried on in this department, and the amount of money which is spent.

Civil Government salaries, 1917 and 1918 - - - - - - - - - $321,364 67
Geological Survey Branch - - 181,091 70
Mines Branch - - - - - - - - 107,565 64
Assay Office - - - - - - - - - 19,970 16

Total - - - - - - - - $629,992 27

This amount has been expended on employees operating in the different branches of this department. The employees on April 5th numbered 276. In 1907, the Geological Survey Act was passed, and the appointment of a separate minister was considered advisable, and since that time there have been seven ministers in this department, and several acting ministers. You can readily understand, Mr. Speaker, that no definite policy could be worked out in this way. Many of these ministers did not take even a reasonable interest in their department, and some of them while they were in office never visited or inspected the branches in Ottawa to see whether those branches were living or dead—and I want to make the statement that some of the branches, at least, appear to be more dead than alive at the present time. It is surprising to me that so much has been accomplished in the last few years under the circumstances. There should not be any divided authority in this department. I am confident that there should be a general readjustment. Some men should be superannuated; others should be dismissed, and some new blood injected into this department, which, though one of the most important, has been one of the most neglected in the service.

[Mr. J. E. Armstrong.]

There is serious overlapping in this department, and a useless waste of public money as well as of the valuable time of officials. Take the matter of statistical reports; they are one or two years old before being handed out to the public. The 1917 report has not been sent to the printer yet. Some radical changes are needed if this department is to serve the public as it should in its future development. The Minister of Mines should, at an early date, call the heads of the mines branches of each of the provinces together, and devise a scheme whereby overlapping and duplication of work should be stopped. The mines branches in the different provinces should work in perfect harmony with this department, but under present conditions the very opposite is the case. This department should also get in close touch with the industries using mineral products in our country, and every encouragement should be extended to assist the development of these industries. Parliament should deal generously with this branch and provide it with every reasonable means to carry on its work. Last year, the production of our mines amounted to over $192,000,000, of which the province of Ontario produced $71,000,000. The mines of Canada are capable of far greater development, and if the Government will take the money spent by this department in useless and unnecessary work, and add to it the money used by commissions in duplicating the work already done by this department and by the Interior Department there would be a large amount available for these developments.

Canada must be ready, after the war, to manufacture, as far as possible, her raw material. Vast quantities of raw material are leaving our mines to be manufactured into finished products in the United States and elsewhere. We have only developed a small portion of our mineral area, and no country in the world can offer greater opportunities to the man who wishes to invest in mining. Canada needs a fuel controller, but she also needs a mines department that will back him up and assist him in furnishing the fuel. Why should it be necessary for the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta to import coal from Pennsylvania, two thousand miles away, when they have abundance of excellent fuel within their own boundaries? Five hundred and fifty thousand tons of Pennsylvania coal was transported to the western provinces last year, when, with proper development and distribution, the coal deposits of the West would have been quite sufficient to supply their needs. In addition to this, 2,376,934 tons of

other grades of coal from the United States were utilized in those western provinces. According to the Commission of Conservation, the total imports of coal into Fort William, Port Arthur and Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta points of entry for the years 1914, 1915 and 1916 were as follows: I will quote the 1916 figures:

	Tons.
Anthracite	533,642
Bituminous—	
Slack	258,836
Lump and run-of-mine.. ..	2,118,098
Total	2,910,576

The estimated value which the commission has placed on this coal is at least ten million dollars.

Mr. CURRIE: How much is that per ton?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: That depends on the grades and qualities. This is the statement made by the Conservation Commission:

> The foregoing valuation of the coal imported in 1916 is based on the price at the mines in the United States, and does not include the freight charges on American lines, nor the freight on that brought up by the lakes. The total amount of money which annually leaves Canada to pay for these imports represents approximately ten millions of dollars.

Practically the whole province of Alberta, and many parts of Saskatchewan, are undermined with coal. These provinces have a greater quantity of coal than any country in the world with the exception of the United States. There is no excuse for a coal shortage in Canada between Port Arthur and the Pacific ocean, nor yet is there a reasonable excuse for a shortage of coal between Montreal and the Atlantic ocean. I understand that the mines in the West would be able to materially increase production if steady employment could be given to the miners; and by producing fuel in the West for consumption there it would create a steady demand for coal and mean all-the-year-round operation of the mines. Millions of dollars would be kept in this country which is now going to the United States in payment for coal. The people of Nova Scotia should be furnished with transportation facilities in order to land their coal, iron, steel, coke, tar, and the chemicals produced from coal, in Quebec and Ontario ports, and in return would receive our flour, wheat, bacon and manufactured goods. Canada has tremendous resources in her mines, and we must commence to investigate and to utilize them. The coal areas of Canada have an estimated total extent of 109,168 square miles, and on summing up the reports of the coal deposits of the world we find that Canada has the second greatest amount available, namely, 1,234,269,000,000 tons, while the United States has 3,838,659,000,000 tons available. The actual available supply in Nova Scotia is estimated at 400,000,000 tons, and the present output in that province is 5,000,000 tons per annum. The Maritime Provinces once provided the province of Quebec with 2,000,000 tons of coal; last year they only provided 50,000 tons. It may safely be said that there will be no permanent reduction in the price of coal, rather it is reasonably certain that there will be a gradual and steady increase. The price of anthracite and other coal is advancing largely because of the exhaustion of the thicker beds, the increased cost of working and the increased freight rates. In the United States, they are digging coal dust from coal dumps and rivers and find it, after treatment equal in many ways to the best slack coal. This merely goes to show that the people of the United States are making every effort to conserve their fuel resources. They are also demanding that their people save fuel. In the anthracite region, during a period of many years, 5,000,000 tons of what is called coal slush has been dumped into the rivers. If you go through that region to-day, you will see dredges working in the rivers taking out this slush, which is afterwards sold. I understand that within the past year a considerable quantity of this material has been finding its way into Canada.

George H. Cushing, editor of Black Diamond, says:

> The United States will start this year with 125,000 fewer miners than at the end of 1916. These men have either been drafted or have drifted to industrial centres where munition and other plants pay higher wages. Car supplies have not materially increased.

Vice-president Schayer, of the Pennsylvania railroad, after a study of the car situation says:

> Only alleviation, not correction, is possible this year. It will take the railroads until the end of the war to catch up with their traffic. Apart from direct coal requirements we must supply from American coal enough by-products to support 1,500,000 troops shooting away powder.

Let me read a paragraph from a statement made by Mr. W. J. Dick, of the Geological Survey Department, to the Mining Institute in the city of Montreal some weeks ago.

> Speaking of the waste of coal in Canada, W. J. Dick said:

A large proportion of the coal mined in Canada was lost and wasted through caving of measures owing to the practice of mining lower seams of better quality first, with the result that by the caving in, the recovery of coal from the upper seams was generally impossible. In other countries leases were granted only on satisfaction being given the authorities that a proper scheme of operations was to be carried on. In Canada, there was indiscriminate leasing of coal lands without restriction, and if the mines were working to their capacity, the output would be 16,000,000 tons per annum. He deprecated the opening up of farmer or "snowbird" mines, about 400 of which had been abandoned in Alberta alone, as they had only destroyed the entrance to a coal field for large operations and were a menace to safety in the workings. He suggested that slack coal should be made into briquettes if a cheap binding could be found.

I merely read this for the purpose of calling to the attention of the ministers the need of more stringent regulations with regard to the operations carried on at the mines and the development of our coal resources.

Here is a statement made by a professor in a Saskatchewan college:

The United States wastes $500,000,000 worth of coal every year, said Dr. R. D. McLaurin, professor of chemistry at the University of Saskatchewan, in a recent letter to F. Maclure Sclanders, industrial commission of the Border Chamber of Commerce, Windsor.

Canada has been as wasteful proportionately. In view of the present necessity for fuel of all kinds, this waste of coal is nothing less than criminal.

Let me direct the attention of hon. members to a statement made by H. A. Garfield, United States fuel administrator. The article is headed "Won't You Help to Save Coal?" Mr. Garfield says:

The war has created a demand upon the United States for 100,000,000 extra tons of coal this year. Because of the congested condition of the railroads, due to war shipping, it will be impossible to supply more than half this additional demand through increased production alone. The remaining 50,000,000 tons needed to support war activities and to keep us warm will have to be saved shovelful by shovelful through care in American factories and homes.

The United States is called upon to produce 700,000,000 tons of coal this year. This is 100,000,000 more tons than we have ever produced before. The high water mark of production this year, in spite of all handicaps, will give 50,000,000 tons of this additional amount. The remaining 50,000,000 tons must be filled in by patriotic thriftiness. If in each home there was saved one shovelful of coal each day it would mean a total saving of 15,000,000 tons a year. Comfort for 7,500,000 soldiers in army cantonments. Enough to send a fleet of twenty-five battleships 3,000 miles across the Atlantic to guard our transports

This is a statement issued in New York within the last few days:

[Mr. J. E. Armstrong.]

New York, April 11.—Warnings that a shortage of bituminous coal exists were issued today by fuel authorities here. The situation is so serious, according to Harry T. Peters, chairman of the State Fuel Conservation Committee, that we will be back where we were last winter unless something is done to relieve matters.

March was the worst month in point of production during the past year and a half, Mr. Peters asserted, and some factories have been forced to continue working with barely enough fuel to meet current needs.

To show how urgent is the need for conservation of coal, the following is quoted from the United States Fuel Bulletin:

But unfortunately, the transportation of coal alone uses up 30 per cent of the entire railroad equipment of the United States, cars, locomotives, sidings, and terminals.

I read these extracts merely for the purpose of emphasizing how dependent we are on the United States for a large quantity of coal annually, and the necessity of the Government taking immediate action to endeavour to supply the people of Canada with an adequate quantity of coal for the coming winter. This is a statement made by the coal operators of the Northwest:

Production in Alberta can be almost doubled in 1918 with same labour. Alberta coal operators are anxious to supply the coal needs of the Canadian West, and thus relieve the general fuel situation in Canada. To this end the Northern Alberta Coal Operators' Association has sent two delegates to Ontario to impress this on the people and through them upon the Government. There was a meeting of the coal operators of Alberta at Calgary on February 11, said Mr. Anderson, at which possibly 75 operators were present, representing the mines of Edmonton, Drumheller, Lethbridge, and the Alberta portion of the Crow's Nest Pass field. The meeting was called to ascertain what the Alberta coal mines could do to increase production in 1918. The mines of Alberta produced approximately 4,700,000 tons of coal in 1917. At this meeting the Crow's Nest Pass field promised an increase in 1918 over 1917 of 1,250,000 tons, Lethbridge an increase of 200,000 tons, Drumheller an increase of 1,800,000 tons, and Edmonton an increase of 1,000,000 tons, if the mines were kept running continually and with labour which is at present employed.

This country is short of transportation facilities, therefore, it is short on coal One begins to comprehend the nature of the problem when confronted with this fact: the transportation of the 30,000,000 carloads of coal mined last year constituted more than half of all the freight carried by the railroads. But when to this eloquent factor is added the explanation that railroads themselves in their locomotives used last year between 125,000,000 and 135,000,000 tons of coal, and that they will this year require for their use 175,000,000 tons, it is seen that this hauling of coal is a burdensome proposition.

During 1917 the mines of Alberta worked on an average of 13.3 days per month for the year. On February 9, when a portion of Canada was ordered to close its manufacturing concerns owing to lack of fuel, a mine in the Edmonton field, having an output of 400 to 500 tons daily,

was closed down for lack of orders. Mr. Shelden represents the Humberstone Coal Company in the same field, with an output of 800 tons daily, and which has been closed several days in February owing to lack of orders. All this while Ontario is short of fuel.

I am convinced that only by the development of our own fuel resources in our western country can we expect to avert a crisis such as we had in Ontario during the last winter.

As to the question of natural gas for fuel purposes. In addition to the enormous deposits of coal, the western provinces are supplied with large quantities of natural gas; in fact, no country in the world has so large a supply. Millions of feet of this most valuable fuel are being wasted every day—wasted, to a large extent, through the carelessness of the Mines Branch of the Interior Department, in connection with the western provinces, and wasted also through conflict between the Geological Survey and Mines Branches. I can best emphasize this statement by reading a reply to a letter I sent to the Deputy Minister of Mines. It is dated Ottawa, January 8, 1918, and reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Armstrong:—

Your letter of the 2nd inst. to the Minister of Mines relative to the waste in natural gas in northern Alberta was referred to this office for attention.

There is, however, some waste both on Peace River and at other places in northern Alberta. At present the operators can practically do as they please, and it is high time that some regulations were formulated aiming at controlling their actions.

In addition to the waste of gas there is also danger of faulty or careless boring injuring or destroying gas horizons by letting in water.

The great gas field in northern Alberta is under the control of the Interior Department, and leases to bore for gas or oil are issued by them. I have already drawn their attention to the pressing need of regulations to govern boring operations, and hope some action will be taken in the matter during the present winter.

I know that this matter has only to be called to the attention of the present Minister of the Interior to receive his very earnest consideration. Our part of the country furnishes a great many of the drillers who go into the western provinces, and I come in contact with quite a number of them. I understand there are about 35 drilling rigs operating there. If these drillers are at all careless in removing the casing or not plugging the well properly and allowing the water to get into the veins, an enormous wastage of gas results. Let me give an illustration of what two wells in our western country have been wasting. I received this information from the Mines Department. One gas well on the Athabaska has been wide open, wasting gas for the past twenty or twenty-five years, and it is to-day wasting 200,000 feet of gas.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where did you get that information?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: From Dr. Dowling of the Mines Branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He does not know what he is talking about, if he says that.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This well has been wasting gas for the past twenty or twenty-five years; I have heard of this well myself a number of times, and have called the attention of the Mines Department to it. For years it has wasted over 500,000 feet of gas per day—an estimated loss of about one billion feet of gas altogether. There is another well on the Peace river wide open. These are only two of the wells that have been abandoned and are wasting this excellent fuel. I think the Mines Branch, so far as the leasing of wells and things of that kind is concerned, should be under the Geological Survey Branch. I think that was intended when the Act was passed on the 27th of April, 1907. Clause 4 of that Act reads as follows:

The department shall administer all laws enacted by the Parliament of Canada relating to mines and mining, and shall also have the management and direction of all subjects assigned to it by the Governor in Council.

Whenever, under the provisions of this section, the management and direction of any subject is transferred from any other department to the Department of Mines, the Minister of Mines and the Deputy Minister of Mines shall be substituted for, and have all the powers and perform all the duties of, the minister and deputy minister, respectively, of such other department, as defined and provided by the Acts and regulations relating to such subject.

Natural gas is the cleanest and best of natural fuels. Raymond S. Blatchley of the Bureau of Mines of the United States estimated that up to 1914 the waste of natural gas in the state of Kansas alone had amounted to 25 billions of feet, and that the state of Oklahoma had wasted a similar amount through carelessness. Abandoned wells were improperly plugged and water was allowed to enter the gas veins. A great quantity of natural gas in the United States is being used for the manufacture of gasolene. The quantity of gasolene that may be obtained from gas ranging in specific gravity from 0·64 to 1·46 varies from zero to 5 gallons per 1,000 feet of gas. With the absorption process a natural gas containing less than 1 pint of gasolene per 1,000 feet can be treated at a profit. In the year 1915, 65,000,000 gallons of gasolene

prepared by these methods was placed on the market in the United States. The production of gasolene from natural gas in 1916 in the United States was over 100,000,000 gallons.

In order that I may give some idea of the increase of consumption of gasolene as a fuel, the Bureau of Mines of the United States says that while the consumption of gasolene in 1909 was 11,000,000 barrels of 42 gallons, in 1914 it had increased to 30,000,000 barrels, in 1916 to 50,000,000 barrels, and in 1917 to 75,000,000 barrels—a total of 3,150,000,000 gallons. A similar increase in the consumption of this fuel is going on in Canada, and this is an additional reason for conserving our natural gas. The people of the United States in 1914 used 591,000,000,000 feet of natural gas in their cities, towns and factories for heating and lighting. What is Canada doing to conserve and utilize her gas fields? In Ontario, for instance, the provincial government have appointed a man whose duty it is to follow up all drilling operations in the provinces, to see that wells are carefully bored, and that no water is allowed to escape into the veins of an abandoned well through being improperly plugged.

Now a few words about powdered coal. In the United States 8,000,000 tons of powdered coal was used last year. I understand that little, if any, of this product is used in Canada.

I have made somewhat extensive inquiries in regard to the use of powdered coal in factories and on the railways, and I am convinced that we should immediately investigate the advisability of using coal in this form. In order to use coal in pulverized form it should be specially prepared, which consists of thoroughly drying and grinding. The cost of preparation is off-set by mechanical feeding, doing away with high-priced firemen; this is particularly true when applied to firing locomotives. It is blown into the furnace with a burner similar to an oil burner.

I am informed that the provincial laws of Alberta forbids the burning of the high volatile lignite coal, owing to the danger from starting fires. In the pulverized form the combustion would be so thorough that there would be no danger from this source, and, besides, it entirely eliminates the smoke nuisance which is so prevalent at busy city terminals. In talking this matter over with railroad men in Alberta, they seemed to think that the high per cent of moisture in the lignite coal would seriously interfere with the burning of it in the powdered form. However, I have secured

from Mr. John Sterling, Inspector of Mines in Alberta, analysis from seven of the largest mines, two of which I give, showing a fair average:

Lakeside Mine—	
Moisture	24·1
Ash	6·1
Volatile	26·7
Fixed carbon	42·1
Lethbridge Chinook Coal Co., Ltd.—	
Moisture	8·7
Ash	11·2
Volatile	28·
Fixed carbon	52·1

The former shows high percentage of moisture, but when this coal was submitted for analysis to J. E. Muhlfield, President of the Locomotive Pulverized Fuel Company, of New York, he at once stated that the moisture was so easily reduced that it was no detriment. I quote Mr. Muhlfield, for it is largely through his personal efforts that the use of low grade fuels in powdered form has been brought to its present state of efficiency. In 1915 the fuel situation in Brazil was in such a serious condition that the average price reached $40 per ton for best coal. There are large deposits of coal in Brazil, but it contains so great a percentage of sulphur and iron pyrites, which clinkers on the grates of an ordinary boiler, that it was impossible to get results, and for this reason had practically no commercial value.

The Brazilian Government, learning that their native coal might be used in the powdered form, sent Dr. Riberio, Locomotive Superintendent of the Central Railway of Brazil, to the United States to make a test of 50 tons of Brazilian coal on locomotives in the pulverized form, analysis of which was as follows:

Moisture, from	2 to 8 per cent
Sulphur	3 to 9 per cent
Volatile	14 to 28 per cent
Fixed carbon	34 to 58 per cent
Ash	26 to 30 per cent

The tests of the above proved that the volatile and fixed carbon percentage made this a very satisfactory fuel in powdered form, and orders were placed for 12 locomotives to be constructed to burn pulverized coal. These are now in service on Brazilian railroads and have proved so satisfactory that the Brazilian Government have placed orders in the United States for 250 more locomotives to be equipped to burn native Brazilian coal in pulverized form.

The American Locomotive Works at Schenectady, N.Y., have a powdered fuel plant, and they are using this form of fuel

under their water tube boilers, and also have substituted this kind of fuel at their oil burning furnaces in their large forge plant. Mr. R. H. White, their maintenance engineer, said that they were getting as good results in their forge plant with powdered coal as they formerly did with oil at a very much reduced cost. Mr. White also stated that some of the coal which they were using successfully in the powdered form was of such low grade that it could not be used in furnace grates.

I submit this information to the House for its consideration.

Now, in regard to electricity. The simplest way to cut down our coal imports into Ontario is to use our water-powers, when Niagara and the St. Lawrence, and their tributaries are doing the work they should do there will be little need of coal for industrial development, we will however need large quantities of coal for heating purposes. What is the Dominion doing to assist in the development of electricity? Should we leave the development of this industry to the provinces? Ontario for instance, has $50,000,000 invested in the electrical development of the province. It is estimated that Canada has 18,800,000 horse-power available from her water-powers, and has only developed 1,800,000 horse-power, leaving about seventeen million horse-power undeveloped. (Assuming a horse-power to call on an average of 10 tons of coal per annum.) This means a waste of 170,000,000 tons of coal annually, providing it was necessary to develop all our water-powers. What are we doing as a Dominion to control this enormous waste? If we did not have the development of electricity in Canada we would be compelled to import from the United States or other countries double the amount of coal we are importing to-day. Canada has the greatest amount of water-power in any country in the world, and in the future there will be tremendous developments in this direction. This Government should place the development of electricity for light, heat, and power purposes, under some minister who will take an active interest in its promotion.

Just a word in regard to our peat deposits. It is not my intention to discuss at any length the question of peat, oil shale, deposits, or producer gas. The Government officials decided that peat could be manufactured in blocks suitable for industries and private homes at an actual cost of $1.75 per ton. The officials of the Mines Branch claim that this was the actual cost per ton of producing 2,000 tons from the Alfred bog, just outside Ottawa. If the officials of the Government are correct in their calculations as to the cost of this peat, we are neglecting the development of our peat bogs. Canada has 37,000 square miles of known peat bogs, but these form probably but a small fraction of the total constituting a potential national asset of enormous value. The peat deposits of Canada are greater in extent than those of any other country with the exception of Russia. During the period from 1908 to 1914 the Mines Branch located, mapped and investigated 140,000 acres of bogs, estimated to be capable of yielding 115,000,000 tons of fuel, and 10,500,000 tons of peat moss litter. Seven of these bogs within convenient shipping distance of Toronto, will yield 26,500,000 tons of fuel, four bogs within a few miles of Ottawa are estimated to contain over 25 million tons. Seven bogs in the Montreal district could furnish that city with 23,500,000 tons of fuel, and five bogs along the St. Lawrence and convenient to Quebec, could supply 16,250,000 tons of fuel. Next winter there will be a greater demand for fuel, and the railroads cannot cope with the conditions, and handle any great quantities of this fuel. We are calling for greater production, and the railroads will be taxed to their utmost. How then can we expect to be in a better position as regards transportation? This is the time to begin to speed up coal delivery, and to urge the production of other fuels as well as coal. The Department of Mines of the United States issues a pamphlet, called "Five ways of saving fuel in heating houses."

We should educate our people in the use of lower grades of fuel. The same department issues another pamphlet called "Firing bituminous coal in house heating boilers." We educate our people in food conservation, why not in fuel conservation? A campaign of publicity, through the press and otherwise, should be instituted similar to the campaign for food conservation. Farmers, and others living in rural communities, should be urged to use wood fuel. Canada must plan for a fuel supply, not only for this year or next year, but for generations to come. The coal shortage of the United States last year was officially estimated to be 50,000,000 tons. The people of Canada in 1916 used 30,000,000 tons of coal and we only produced 14,500,000 tons.

There will be far greater shortage this year unless immediate action is taken. The demands for coal for industrial purposes have greatly increased and the demands for export purposes have increased enormously. The United States, through its fuel administration, has ordered that no

coal is to be exported from that country except to Canada. How long will the United States deplete her stock of coal to keep us warm and to keep the wheels of our enterprises going? The coal shortage in the United States will continue for the duration of the war and Canada is sure to be seriously affected thereby. Canada to-day is facing a fuel situation of great gravity, a situation created by our dependence on the United States for our fuel supply. It will be quite impossible for that country to supply our needs, and give reasonable attention to the requirements of her people.

Our present position is most unsatisfactory and can only be improved by a determined and energetic exploitation and utilization of our own vast fuel resources. To do nothing, or to waste time, must lead to misery and disaster. Drastic measures must be undertaken by this Government in order to prevent as far as possible a serious shortage of fuel in 1919. I therefore respectfully urge that every effort be put forth by this Government to provide for abundance of fuel for the coming winter, and at the same time lay the foundation for an unlimited supply of fuel for the future.

Mr. M. CLARK: I should like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) if he could give us the comparative figures as to the export of coal from the United States to Canada and from Canada to the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I regret I am not in a position to give those figures. I have no doubt the minister will be very glad to supply that information.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, provided that this House gives assent to the resolution that is proposed by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and the Government gives effect to it, it will be of such inestimable value to the section of country in which I live, that I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not give as strongly as I can my support to the resolution. I have referred to the section of the country in which I live, and I hope that my hon friend from Lambton will forgive me for taking a sectional view of what is a splendid Dominion-wide policy. If anything which I feel in connection with this policy is not any larger than the section or the province I represent I do not think the point which I propose to make would be worthy of respect. This is a Dominion wide policy and I hope that, while I am speaking of the section I represent, no one will feel that I am too small a man to take a broad view of the question.

The section of the country to which I refer is the whole east half of the province of Saskatchewan and a large portion of the province of Manitoba, in which territory, there live at least one million people and the coal supply for that one million people should naturally come from the lignite fields of Southern Saskatchewan. I believe I am correct when I say that from these fields can be taken, not millions of tons of coal, but billions upon billions of tons. I believe, so enormous is that coal field, that it will supply Canada for hundreds of years to come. Notwithstanding the fact that we have one million people living there, and notwithstanding the fact that there are billions of tons of coal, we are using only two hundred thousand tons a year out of that field.

To-day I am somewhat in a state of doubt, not in regard to the resolution, because I give it my most hearty endorsement, but in regard to my attitude towards governmental action. Doubt has come to me because of the statement which was made in this House last week by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), in reply to the motion made by the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I paid particular attention to him as he was speaking and I noticed that he spoke with a great deal of hesitancy. I know the Minister of the Interior and I know that hesitancy is not one of his characteristics. I also noticed that he was lacking in detail upon that particular occasion. I know that he is a master of detail and I rather wondered at that. I also noticed that he was not too definite in what he said and he usually is quite definite. So, I came to the conclusion, which I think was natural, that the hon. member was not too sure himself of the question upon which he was speaking. Then, in the last two or three days, taking up the western press, I have noticed that they have been dealing with his statement very extensively and I find that they are very much in doubt as to what is proposed. Some of them say that the Government has decided to vote $200,000 for the development of the lignite fields of southern Saskatchewan and that the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan would each vote $100,000, making $400,000, and that this was to be used in establishing a briquetting plant at Estevan. Then again, the press informed us that they had interviewed the local governments and that

the local governments had expressed themselves to the effect that they did not know anything about it. We are informed by the hon. member for Lambton that an Order in Council appropriating $400,000 has been passed. I hope that is so, and I hope that my ignorance in regard to the matter may be excused. I have never seen that Order in Council, but as the whole thing appears to be in a state of doubt, I feel that I should support, just as strongly as I can, the resolution of my hon. friend from Lambton, and urge upon the Government that if they have not yet decided to vote that money, they should immediately decide to do so.

About ten days ago the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), from his seat in this House, made a statement, which I took to be an enunciation of policy on the part of the Government, when he said that not one dollar of money would be expended on any unnecessary work. I take that to be a hint to all members of this House that we need not bother ourselves very much asking for local improvements. With that policy I fully agree. The seventy thousand people living in the constituency of Regina have sent me down here for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that is to remove all embarrassments from the Government of Canada until we had got this accursed war out of the way. That is the reason I am here. I am not here to make any unusual demands and I do not intend to do so. But at the same time I can say that this $400,000 would not be an expenditure at all, but it would be an investment which would return the full amount to the Government and to the people, because they are one, and under those circumstances I think I am justified in saying that such an expenditure would be entirely within the policy announced by the Minister of Public Works.

Why is it that only two hundred thousand tons of lignite coal have been mined and used annually in that section, and why is it that we are importing, as the hon. member from Lambton has said, some five hundred thousand tons of anthracite from Pennsylvania? Surely Saskatchewan is not a natural market for the anthracite of Pennsylvania? I believe most thoroughly in the policy of the exchange of products, and is not coal a commodity in regard to which an exchange can naturally be made? The mines of the maritime provinces might find their natural market in the eastern United States, and the United States might send us their coal without hindrance. But when it comes to Saskatchewan, I cannot imagine any one saying that Saskatchewan is the natural market for anthracite from the Pennsylvania coal fields, when we have billions of tons of coal in our own territory. Why, then, is it that it is being sent there? I think some of the hon. members of the House will be interested in knowing the results of the experiments which were made in the city of Regina last year because of the coal shortage, and the result of which will show that governmental action is absolutely necessary and advisable, and would be profitable if it were undertaken. Last year, in connection with our municipal power plant, we entered into a contract for twenty thousand tons of Greenhill coal, and Greenhill coal is the finest coal that is mined on earth, and it comes from the province of Alberta. But the Government authorized the breaking of the contracts, with the result that we had to increase the price. More than that we were confronted with the possibility of not getting coal at all. So we decided to authorize our commissioners to purchase two thousand tons of this lignite coal to use in our plant as an experiment in order to see how it would compare with the other coal, and whether it could be used advantageously or not. Now, I will give you some of the results of that test in order to demonstrate what the conditions are, and to show you that governmental action is necessary if we are going to be able to use the coal from this immense coal field.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Where did you get your lignite?

Mr. COWAN: From Estevan, which is ninety miles, as the crow flies, from our city. As I say, we agreed to purchase twenty thousand tons of western coal, which had to be brought a distance of six hundred miles to Regina. The Estevan mines are only ninety miles, as the crow flies, south of Regina, but when we came to purchase the Estevan coal we found that in order to get it to Regina—and the same thing applies to the natural market for this coal—we had to bring it to our city in a very roundabout way. Instead of it being a matter of ninety miles, we had to ship the coal west and then double back, involving a distance of one hundred and fifty miles all told. The freight rate for the six hundred mile journey required to bring the Greenhill coal from the Alberta mines to Regina was $3 a ton, whereas the freight rate from Estevan by the roundabout way of a hundred and fifty miles was $1.50 a ton.

That is to say, bringing in the Estevan coal by the roundabout way cost twice the rate per ton per mile involved in bringing in the Alberta coal. Hon. gentlemen will readily see that is a very great handicap indeed. I would point out to the Minister of the Interior and to the Minister of Finance that in order to make their investment of $400,000 in coal development a profitable one, it will be necessary to build a seven-mile railway from the Grand Trunk Pacific railway in order to tap these mines. In that way a direct line from the mines to the natural market will be provided. I do not know what interest the present Government has in the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, but I fancy that sooner or later it will have a very substantial interest in the deficits of that line, and the easiest way to get rid of those deficits would be to build the little spur line which I have suggested and this would permit of the public getting ample supplies of coal by direct route.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What would that make your distance to the mines?

Mr. COWAN: Less than one hundred miles. It would save about sixty or seventy miles and make the distance to be covered between ninety and one hundred miles. The building of the suggested seven-mile spur would give easy access to the whole of the north and north east country, and bring these coal mines into direct communication with the natural market.

Well, we found that not only did we have to pay double freight rates on this lignite, but when we came to experiment with it we proved conclusively that it carried a water content of thirty-one per cent. Now the usual water content for the western Alberta coal is less than two per cent, so hon. gentlemen will see how we were handicapped. We had to pay double freight rates on coal thirty-one per cent of which was water, and the House will readily understand it is a rather difficult thing to burn water.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): There is evidently as much water in the coal itself as there is in the stock of some of these coal companies.

Mr. COWAN: If the hon. gentleman is inviting me to express an opinion about water in the stock of some of the coal companies I might be inclined to say some very harsh things, but I will not do that at present. In addition to having thirty-one per cent of water in this coal, we found ourselves further handicapped when we came to burn it; it took eleven per cent of the heat of the coal to drive out the thirty-one per cent of water content already there. Hon. gentlemen will therefore see that we were handicapped from the beginning with a forty-two per cent loss. Even in the face of all these handicaps we found we could use this coal with a loss of only eighteen cents per ton, which proved to me conclusively that if we could secure one or two things we might use it with success. Those things are: To get a direct route so that the freight rates would be computed on the shortest route to point of destination, or a reduction equivalent to the rate per ton per mile obtainable on the main line.

Now what can we do to remedy the existing state of affairs, and that is the question, I think, which confronts the Government to-day if it is going into the development of our coal resources? We thought probably we could dry this coal, and it can be dried pretty conveniently, but when you have the dried product you have a rather dangerous commodity; it is very explosive, as a matter of fact, and I would not care to recommend it. In addition to that, after the lignite is dried and left exposed for any length of time, we found that in twenty-four hours it again carried a water content of twelve per cent, having absorbed that amount of moisture from the air during one day. It is therefore evident that the drying of the coal is not sufficient to meet the difficulty. There is one thing that can be done, however, and that is briquette the coal, for it can be briquetted very successfully. I am not speaking of my own knowledge on this point, I have before me the report of the Government of the province of Saskatchewan, which has gone into the subject pretty extensively. In quoting this report, I do not wish to be accused of being actuated by party or political bias. The Government of Saskatchewan has, ever since the province was created, been of the Liberal persuasion, and I have always been —at least until the war broke out—a very ardent Tory, and I certainly am not ashamed of it. I am therefore not speaking with any party bias, and I can say—notwithstanding the fact that the Government of Saskatchewan is always wrong, except when it is right—that the reports which it publishes are quite reliable, and the report in question not only contains a good deal of common sense, but displays evidences of enterprise. In the matter of briquetting the Government's investigations have been very extensive. Their tests were not merely

laboratory tests, although they have carried those out of course, but they have sent a very substantial quantity of this lignite coal to places where briquetting is done, and brought it back, and they have given the product the most severe test which could be given. They use a certain quantity of the briquettes in their own plant built for the purpose, and the balance of it was distributed in small lots among several hundred families of the province, in order to be tested in domestic circles. I think you will agree with me that if this fuel is to be used by the people for domestic purposes that was the proper kind of test to give it; to send it out amongst the people and let them test it for themselves, and let their opinion prevail. I have a great deal of faith in public opinion, and when that public opinion comes back in the form in which it has here, and in the shape of reliable Government reports, we must accept that opinion. The conclusion was that the briquettes had given entire satisfaction. Now if we can briquette this coal for several hundred families and give entire or universal satisfaction I think I am safe in saying that we can briquette it for several thousand families, and also give universal satisfaction. If it can be done, and it has been done on a small scale, why can we not do it in a more extensive way, and thus save ourselves from importing these hundreds of thousands of tons into an unnatural market? I will read one or two extracts from the report to which I have referred, which will show conclusively that this is a very sound proposition.

The briquettes made from the Saskatchewan carbonized lignite have 11,500 to 12,000 British thermal units per pound. They burn with a short flame, no odour, no smoke (except a very little resulting from the volatilizing of some of the pitch binder when first thrown on the fire), and no clinker. They can be used wherever anthracite or bituminous coal is burned. They retain their structure in the fire until completely consumed. They do not disintegrate or lose value in the weather, and can therefore be stored for any length of time and shipped any distance without loss.

Now, I want to know what better product for use by our people you could have than that?

They do not disintegrate or lose value in the weather, and can therefore be stored for any length of time and shipped any distance without loss.

That makes it a staple product, and if it can be produced in quantities at a commercial rate, I say that the proper thing for our Government to do is to immediately provide it. The article goes on:

As a domestic fuel they are fully equal to the anthracite that is marketed here ton for ton. While the anthracite averages approximately 13,000 British thermal units per pound, a little higher than the lignite briquettes when compared in a laboratory, there is no clinker from the lignite briquettes, no loss in burning, and they can be used nicely in kitchen ranges, which is impracticable with hard coal. They make an exceptionally fine fuel for fireplaces.

And in another place, I find this:

Carbonized Lignite Briquettes. These have proved excellent for domestic service and are equal in fuel value, ton for ton, to the anthracite marketed in this territory.

Now, I need not proceed further, I think that you will agree that that is sufficient proof that this is a practicable process.

Mr. CURRIE: What is meant by carbonized briquettes? Is it the raw coal passed through a press?

Mr. COWAN: Yes, it is passed through a press. That is what I am urging, that these presses be adopted; that is what we want to have established there. I will just refer to that here.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the binder used in making these briquettes?

Mr. COWAN: They have been experimenting with a number of binders. The one which they are using makes an absolutely safe briquette. There is very little pitch in it, so that there is no odour. When they are first thrown on the fire there is a bright flame, lasting only a moment or two. I am speaking from personal knowledge, because I have burned them in my own house. They burn until completely burned out.

To find out whether this is a commercial proposition or not. You can establish as many units as you wish. One unit will cost some $75,000, that is, it would have cost about that when this report was issued, but I suppose the price will be somewhat increased now, for in the last year and a half the cost of everything has increased very substantially. But a $75,000 unit will produce in one year 50,000 tons of briquettes. The $400,000 which is now to be expended could establish, as I understand it, about five of these units, and of course, you could add as many units as you saw fit. Would that be a profitable thing to do?—to spend $75,000 to produce fifty thousand tons of briquettes? You may look at in this way: I will begin by taking the city in which I live as an example. In that city, fortunately, it so happens that we use fifty thousand tons, or thereabouts, every year, of Pennsylvania anthracite coal, so that we consume an amount equal to what would

be produced by one of these units. That coal sells in Regina to-day at $15 a ton. As a matter of fact, it is such an inferior quality of coal which we are now getting that, compared with the price paid two or three years ago, we must be paying between $22 and $25 a ton for it; the coal is really not fit to be imported into that country at all. The excess freight rate from Pennsylvania to Regina—by that I mean the amount of freight on this coal additional to what it would be if shipped from Estevan to Regina—is a little over $4 a ton. So that we are paying $200,000 per year in freight rates alone over what we would pay if we got the coal from our own mines one hundred miles away. Is it profitable to spend $75,000 and thereby save in one year the sum of $125,000, which is the difference in freight rates, and at the end of the year be possessed of the plant which has been established?

But it is not only that. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) drew attention to the fact that there was a very keen coal shortage in eastern Canada last year. I do not think that there was so much a coal shortage as a shortage of freight cars, engineers and conductors. If I mistake not, the shortage was in the matter of transportation. Now, let us look at it that way. We in Saskatchewan are two thousand miles away from the Pennsylvania coal fields; we are three times as far away from the anthracite mines as they are in the central part of the province of Ontario. Now, take the fifty thousand tons of coal and multiply it by three, making 150,000 tons, representing the increased possible haulage, and you will have some idea of the number of cars that would be available to ship coal to the settled portions of the province of Ontario. Or, take the 500,000 tons of coal delivered annually in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and multiply it in the same way, and the result is 1,500,000 tons. Would the release of that transportation have been of any value to the province of Ontario last winter, or it may be, in the coming year? That is the question. If you can remove the loss due to the long transportation, cut it in three, and enable the transportation officers to concentrate their attention upon delivering coal to their nearest or natural market, you will have done something well worth while in the matter of assisting our country at this particular stage of its history. I do not know that I can add anything more to this subject, excepting, in a general way, to give strong support to the resolution which the hon. member for Lambton moved. I cannot imagine why these coal fields were put in Canada unless to be developed by the Canadian people. I cannot imagine what the Canadian people are in Canada for unless it is to develop the natural resources of the Dominion. Anything short of that falls far below the ideal of a genuine Canadian policy, and for that reason I support this resolution as strongly as I can.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is to be congratulated for bringing this matter before the House.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand you called upon the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would have recognized the hon. member on my left, but he yielded the floor to the hon. member for West Toronto. The custom ordinarily is that I should alternate from one side to the other.

Mr. HOCKEN: I understood it that way, Mr. Speaker, before I started to speak. I want to congratulate the hon. member for Lambton, and to say that if the thermometer registered 30 degrees below zero to-day, perhaps this question would receive more attention from the House than it appears to be getting. With the weather as mild as it is to-day, perhaps fuel production and conservation are not quite as popular as they might be if the thermometer had been 30 below. Last winter all through western Ontario the people were existing for days on two or three scuttles full of coal. They were standing in queues before the coal dealers' offices and at the city halls trying to get coal, and there was a good deal of suffering all through the province, especially in western Ontario, because of the shortage. Now, it appears to me that any proposition which is going to relieve such a situation should receive the attention of this House. When the member for Lambton suggests that the western coal fields should supply the West I think he is on sound and safe ground.

That might interfere with the operations of some of the transportation companies, but the transportation companies ought to yield on a matter of that kind, because, in my judgment, it is important that in the distribution of coal from Canada to the United States and coal from the United States in Canada, we should endeavour to

maintain a balance that will ensure an adequate supply to those sections of Canada which cannot be served from our own deposits, that is, practically the whole of the province of Ontario. Western Canada can be served from Alberta. Eastern Canada can be served from Nova Scotia. Large sections of the United States are, I understand, supplied from British Columbia. The province of Ontario, however, must be supplied from Pennsylvania; it cannot get coal economically from any other source. If, therefore, the 2,000,000 tons, or whatever the quantity is, of coal which goes into the western provinces from Pennsylvania, were diverted into the province of Ontario, that would very materially relieve the situation in this province.

I have always been surprised that this Government had not given greater consideration to the development of hydro-electric power. If we should develop all the hydro-electric power that is capable of development, an enormous saving in coal could be effected by operating our railway systems with electricity. I understand there is in existence a report which goes to show that in northern Ontario there is enough hydro-electric power capable of being developed to operate the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway and the Transcontinental railway in that section of the country. I have that information from a gentleman who is on intimate terms with the commission that operates the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. If that be the case, a tremendous saving of coal can be made by the development of those water powers in northern Ontario. I have no doubt that on the rivers running into lake Superior there are water powers sufficient to develop electricity to operate the Canadian Pacific along the north shore. That railway, to operate along that shore, must bring its coal supply a long distance, and the transportation of the coal necessary to operate its trains is a considerable item in itself.

This Government should take the matter in hand in co-operation with the province of Ontario and carry out and amplify the policy which that province has adopted and has been carrying along so successfully. In the city of Toronto we have as local fuel controller a very capable man, Mr. R. C. Harris. Mr. Harris has taken steps to require the manufacturers of western Ontario to convert their steam plants into hydro-electric plants for power purposes in order that coal may be conserved. He has shown a great deal of judgment and good sense, and if he can effect a large number of conversions from steam to electricity in the factories of western Ontario, he will enable us partly to solve the question. There is still a tremendous quantity of power that can be developed at the Niagara Falls and also at Queenston Heights on the Niagara river. There is also power to be developed at the Chippewa Falls, the Long Sault rapids and along the Trent canal. If all those water-powers were developed, a sufficient quantity of electricity would be secured to operate nearly all the railways of western Ontario. The Government ought to go into that policy very seriously. While some considerable outlay may be involved in putting in generating systems, in the long run the scheme would certainly prove economical and give great satisfaction to the people of Canada, who would be saved from a possible fuel famine. I am not familiar with conditions in the West. In addition to developing hydro-electric power, the Government ought to go into every question of fuel development. They should look into the peat deposits. I have not sufficient information to enable me to form a judgment as to whether any great relief can come from that direction or not, as all that I have read on the subject leaves some doubt in my mind. But whether it is a question of peat, or oil, or natural gas, or native coal deposits, it is the duty of this Government —and in my opinion they should co-operate with the provinces in the matter—to develop all those deposits, so as to secure the supply of coal for fuel and power purposes that the country needs.

My own province has given to the world an outstanding example of the possibilities in the way of developing hydro-electric power. Speaking broadly, I believe all the water-powers are still in the possession of the country. Some of them may have been alienated, but not a very large proportion. Therefore, when we develop electric power which will take the place of fuel, we get it under the control of the Government and the people, and we have this great force under public ownership to be sold to the people of Canada at cost. How has the development of hydro-electric power worked out in the province of Ontario? Under the Hydro-Electric Commission, of which Sir Adam Beck is chairman, we can get power for an ordinary factory for less money per annum than the rental of the space that would be occupied by an engine and a boiler capable of producing the same

amount of power. In my own plant, I am using only about 120 h.p., but the rental of the space that it would take to put in a 120 h.p. boiler and engine would be more than what I pay for that power for the year. I presume my experience does not differ very much from that of many others. This development, which after all is a fuel development, has been of inestimable value to the people of Ontario. I should not like to see this Government over-ride the province of Ontario in its handling of hydro-electric power; I should rather like to see it co-operate with the provincial government. The provincial government has a great deal of experience which would be of value to those who would have the matter in charge. If the Government would take up this question, and if all the provincial governments could be inspired and encouraged to do what they can in the development of the different forms of natural power, that would be to the benefit of the whole country.

If the conditions in the Mines Branch are as bad as the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) states, a special committee of this House should be appointed to make an investigation; or if not, an efficiency expert should be appointed to go through that branch of the service and make whatever recommendations he thinks necessary. I have no knowledge of the matter myself, but certainly the importance of the work to be done by that branch makes it advisable for us to take steps to make it efficient, because this is going to be one of the big questions before the Dominion of Canada, not only at the present but in the future.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion this afternoon, and I will re-echo the statement of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) that I too am sorry the House is so depleted when such a vital question is being debated. It is true we have extremely fine weather to-day, but only a few weeks ago there was a great deal of misery, suffering and hardship in this city of Ottawa. As I said the other day in presenting a motion on similar lines, the summer will soon pass away, and the same hardships will be felt throughout the central part of Canada. Sir, the House and the Government especially should recognize the emergency and face the issue squarely, and take proper measures to save the country from the consequences of another more serious fuel shortage which may confront us next winter.

I am not exaggerating at all when I say that central Canada—the province of Ontario and a large part of the province of Quebec—is absolutely dependent on the United States for coal. The West can take care of itself, and so can the extreme East, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and the Mariime Provinces generally, but Central Canada is absolutely dependent on Pennsylvania. The fuel controller in the United States has just issued a statement in which he says: "the United States is short in transportation facilities, and therefore it is short in coal." Then he gives a series of figures and averages, and concludes by saying that the war has created a demand upon the United for 100,000,000 tons of coal more this year than is normally produced. Because of the car shortage and the congested condition of the roads it will be impossible to increase the supply by more than 50,000,000 tons. The remaining 50,000,000 tons will have to be filled in by conservation in the homes and industrial plants of America.

Hon. J. D. REID: That explains why our cars are kept on the other side.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is a shortage of cars and a shortage of labour. As I said the other day, this emergency exists because of war conditions and because of a lack of transportation facilities and the labour situation. As it does exist in the United States, our chief source of supply, we in Canada must look around and see what can be done for next winter. The coal shortage last winter was felt in many homes and industrial plants, and though I do not wish to be unduly pessimistic, it will be more severe next winter. What is the Government going to do about it? My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has passed the Daylight Saving Bill; that is a step forward, but there is still something to be done. The Government have appointed a fuel controller, the best available man in the country. Mr. Magrath is a conscientious and most painstaking gentleman, and I am sure he will do his duty. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has given us his theories about the briquetting of lignite in the West. Whilst I admit the value of these experiments, still they are only experiments, and in this emergency the country cannot afford to wait on experiments. I saw in the press the other day that the Government has voted $400,000 to experiment with briquetting lignite coal in the

West, and I am pleased if that is true; but as my hon. friend from Toronto said a moment ago, there is something more to do. Perhaps removing the duty on coal during the war would help, but that is not the point I wish to make just now. The point is this: the Government, in addition to encouraging as much as possible the conservation of coal, should also encourage the intensified production of wood fuel for next winter. I read a letter in the Ottawa Citizen not long ago from a man who is certainly an authority on that question; I refer to Senator Edwards. He said that in this country there are such large forest reserves that in view of the coal famine next winter the Dominion Government should bring about a more intense production of wood for fuel purposes. That is what they are doing in the United States. I see that a conference has been called by Mr. J. J. Storrow, the federal fuel administrator for New England, who says:

A serious shortage of coal threatens New England this winter. The situation does not warrant neglecting any possible measure of preparedness. For this reason it seems advisable to make a New England campaign for the production of wood on a large scale. Good hardwood properly prepared and dried can be used extensively for domestic purposes as an emergency measure. Wood cut in November can be burned the latter part of the winter, when the coal situation may be more acute. The campaign should also look ahead toward a large supply of wood for next winter when the coal situation may be more serious than this year.

Here we have the fuel administrator for New England saying that in his section of the United States, not so far from Pennsylvania, they will have to look for a more intense production of wood fuel to replace the coal they will be short of within a few months. If that is the condition in New England, surely there is all the more reason for us in central Canada to produce more wood. We have mill waste, generally speaking, in the large centres, but we all know that the production of the mills has been reduced considerably of late. The farmers, too, are not making such a large cut as formerly, because they are much more interested in their crops this year. There is, besides, the further handicap of lack of transportation facilities. I believe that the Government, jointly with Mr. Magrath, should have a forestry inspector appointed to encourage concurrently with the conservation of coal, the production of wood for next winter's fuel. This could be done by first of all encouraging the municipal authorities, on the lines adopted in Ottawa and Winnipeg last winter, to accumulate a reserve of wood fuel. Then there should be a commission of publicity directed by the fuel controller to restrain people from using coal between the 15th of April and the 15th of December. The farmers should be encouraged to make a larger cut, and the provincial governments should be asked to assist materially from the Crown lands. There is no doubt that the emergency exists. I also agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from Toronto in regard to the water-powers of this country. While I do not wish to discuss what some people call the confiscatory policy which is laid at the door of the Ontario Hydro Commission, I must say that the policy of the province of Ontario with regard to water-powers is very commendable, and I should like to have this Government see that the water-powers of this country are conserved for the consumers of Canada. I was surprised the other day to read of the enormous amount of power that could be developed in and around the city of Montreal. Our water-powers constitute one, if not the biggest, asset of Canada. The Montreal Herald says:

Montreal has an enormous source of supply right at her doors. For instance there is the supply developed at the Cedar Rapids. Although this supply is developed in Canadian territory 65,000 horse power, out of a total of 100,000 h. p., is being exported to the United States. "Few people," says Mr. White," have any conception of what the 65,000 h.p., now being exported to the United States from the Cedars, could do if widely distributed to customers of light and power. In 1916 a little less than 50,000 h.p., met the requirements for light and power of the 40,000 customers of the Toronto Hydro-Electric Power Commission. Including the requirements of the Toronto Street Railway, the Toronto Electric Light Company, and the Toronto Hydro-Electric Power Commission, 120,000 h.p., is now required for light and power in the municipality of Toronto. Therefore, the 65,000 h.p., exported from the Cedars would, if retained in Canada, supply, at cheap rates all the light and power required for a manufacturing city of 300,000 inhabitants. If distributed through Canadian municipalities it would supply light and power to some 35 manufacturing cities of 10,000 inhabitants each; or it would practically take care of one-third of the present demands of the Niagara system of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, which supplies over 100 municipalities and 100,000 purchasers of electricity.

The water-power development in Canada has been marvellous, and I am pleased to say that in my own province of Quebec it has been on a par with that in Ontario. Those of you who have lately visited the St. Maurice valley must have been surprised at the number of industries which have been established in that district, due to the intelligent work done by the Quebec government in conserving the water-powers of that

river. Reading a report of the Laurentide Company, I observed that the president, Mr. Aldred, stated that some industries, which formerly had manifested a desire to establish themselves not far from the Niagara power, had changed their plans, and were now establishing themselves at Shawinigan and Grand Mere. My hon. friend knows these facts. It shows that with a comprehensive and aggressive water-power policy, a government can accomplish much. I say that by giving free hand to our fuel controller by a very aggressive campaign of publicity, we may conserve our coal; by the appointment of a forestry inspector, so as to accentuate the production of wood next winter, and, by adopting the policy of conserving and developing our water powers in the interest of the Canadian consumer, we may still be able to face the emergency of the future.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Mines): My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), has brought up a resolution dealing with a subject of great interest to this House and the country, as he did last year, when he made a very valuable address to this House which was fully discussed. The gist of his resolution is that there should be more rapid and scientific development of our resources, and of our fuel supply, and especially in this time of war, the Government should take speedy action to utilize all the resources; and, as far as the resolution is directed to that end, I think the Government must be strongly in accord with its terms. My hon. friend ventured on somewhat severe criticisms of the department over which I have the honour to preside at the present time. I am quite convinced that any criticism which has been directed at the department were only designed to strengthen the weak spots that existed, and I am quite sure he did not intend his remarks to be taken as seriously as they appear to be taken by the hon. gentleman from South Toronto (Mr. Hocken), who suggested the appointment of a committee. I have had the honour of being Minister of Mines for a comparatively short period, and at the time when I took charge of that department it was decided to make a general appeal to the country and the ministers were called upon to leave their posts at Ottawa and absent themselves for several months. I do not think the hon. gentleman would imagine that under those circumstances the minister would be able to become quickly settled in the administration of so large a department. I wish to assure my hon. friend from Lambton that, in spite of the facts which I have stated, I can conscientiously say that I have given a considerable portion of my time and energy to the Department of Mines, which I think is of immense importance to the country, and which should render an enormous service to the country at all times, and especially in times of war. I am in accord with the hon. gentlemen that there is a certain amount of duplication in the department in reference to mining matters. Probably that is the case with all departments under democratic forms of Government. I would not have to go far afield to illustrate that. However, it should be our absolute duty to cut out these duplications, as far as we can, and corelate the work of the departments in such a way that there would be no waste of energy, for, I assure my hon. friend, I will endeavour to do my duty as far as my department is concerned. I wish to assure him we are endeavouring to keep in touch with what is being done by the provincial governments, and in other ways in the country. I had the pleasure of attending the meeting of the Mining Institute in Montreal, at which gentlemen from all parts of the country interested in mines were present, and very valuable discussions took place, in which we came in touch first-hand with the people doing the work from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I would also point out that we have kept in touch with the broader aspects of these matters. There has been, during the last two or three years, a good deal of legislation and discussion in the British Parliament in regard to minerals and mineral legislation. They are now forming what is known as the Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, dealing with all the work of all the governments in the Empire, and with the endeavour, as far as possible, to keep within the Empire a control, as far as possible, of all the minerals essential for the war, and they asked us to send over a representative to act on the advisory board of that bureau. After taking the matter up with the Mining Institute and other bodies from other governments, we decided to send over a gentleman from Ontario, Dr. Miller, provincial geologist, a man of very wide information, a geological and mining expert, who will render a great service to Canada, when he goes over to represent Canada on that board. May I say to the House that the Department of Mines was only created as recently as 1907. The Geological Survey, which is now a part of the Department of Mines, has, of course, been in existence for a long time, in fact, since 1842. Six provinces own their Crown lands and

deal with all these matters of administration and legislation in connection with the Crown lands and the minerals of their respective provinces. In Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and in the railway belt of British Columbia matters are different, because the Crown lands are in the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has to do, therefore, with the minerals and the Crown lands. But the administration of those have been left, and always were left, in the hands of the Department of the Interior. Therefore, the Department of Mines, as it exists now, and as it was created in 1907, is not administrative in character. I make no pronouncement as to whether some of the functions of the Department of the Interior should be handed over to the Department of Mines or not—I am not dealing with that question now—but I want to point out to the House that the work of the Department of Mines is not administrative but is investigational and educational exclusively in character.

The Geological Survey, a very important part of the Department of Mines, deals of course with the occurrence in various districts of minerals, secures accurate information in regard to our mineral resources in the way of exploration. Where development has taken place there are a large number of requests for detailed information and detailed work, such as deciphering the local geology, structure of ore deposits and problems connected with their form and extent and other work of a geological character. Anybody who knows the western country knows what happened in the great camp at Rossland. When they thought that they had practically exhausted their ore bodies at a certain level, owing to the work of the Geological Survey they discovered that larger bodies could be successfully developed at lower levels and since that time, largely due to the work of the Geological Survey, there has been a marvellous development in that camp.

Half of the work of the department, as it is done at this time, is practically concerned with problems of the war. The department is devoting itself to the working out of problems that are placed before it, sometimes by the Imperial Munitions Board and sometimes by the War Trade Board or other bodies. I could give one or two illustrations. In connection with ferro alloys, the laboratory work of the officers of the Mines Department has been such that the British Government and the War Office accept the decisions and judgments of those officers in connection with the selling and purchases of ferro alloys in Canada. In the chemical division there is a lot of very valuable work going on in connection with the analysis of fuel values of coal, of lignite, oil shales, peat, etc., and also in connection with the testing and analysis of gases from coal. There are other things that I would like briefly to touch upon that are important at this time. We are now endeavouring to make an effort to discover additional sources of platinum. The platinum supply of the world has been practically derived from the Ural mountains in Russia and that supply has, of course, been absolutely cut off during the war. Platinum, as hon. gentlemen know, has a value about five times that of gold and it is getting so scarce that the war authorities in all the allied countries are getting somewhat seriously alarmed. There is very little in the United States, there is hardly any in Canada and comparatively few ounces produced. Some of this has been discovered in the nickel matte from Sudbury in the refining process carried on. A small amount occurs in the ultra basic rocks in British Columbia and a small amount in some of the nuggets recovered from the placer diggings in the creeks of that province. We hope to make a special investigation of this work and have detailed some of our officers to examine the rocks in place in the hope of, if possible, getting a greater production of platinum which is an imperative necessity in connection with the war.

Pulp manufacturers have had great difficulty in getting suitable stone for their business. It was imported formerly by them. We have investigated carefully a large number of quarries to ascertain whether the stones in those quarries were suitable for this purpose and as a result we have brought the quarry owners into touch with the manufacturers of stones and have been instrumental in seeing a very large number of orders placed for pulp stones which were formerly brought from other countries.

I need not touch on other matters not directly connected with the war but which are of immense value to the country because the department is not only devoting itself to work in connection with the war but also to work which will be of importance in peaceful times after the war. We are taking up very vigorously the question of road materials. At the request of the provincial governments of Canada we are making an investigation of and testing an enormous number of the different road de-

posits on many of which we have reported. At the instance, especially, of the Ontario and Manitoba Governments, we are dealing with the question in connection with the construction of important highways such as that between Montreal, Toronto and Hamilton, and Ottawa and Prescott. Then, work is progressing and progressing along very suitable lines in connection with making a fuller examination of the limestone deposits throughout Ontario in the belief that we can relate these to the industrial activities of the country in a more comprehensive way than has been the case in the past. Another field of activity in which we have accomplished some useful work has been in the dry belt of southern Alberta. This work has been carried on by the Geological Survey branch. As hon. members know, there has been such a scarcity of water that it has presented one of the greatest difficulties that the ranchers had to deal with. The Geological Survey came to the conclusion, after mapping out the dry belt and giving close study to the question, that at certain levels north of the Milk river artesian wells could be successfully bored. One artesian well was bored to a depth of 600 feet, with the result that there was a flow of 4,000 gallons a day and about six weeks or two months ago another well was bored to a depth of 640 feet that gave a flow of 30,000 gallons in twenty-four hours. We are trying as far as possible to delimit the areas in which these operations may be successfully conducted.

I do not want to deal with all of the other activities of the department, but what I have said will show that this is not in any sense a perfunctory department. There is one phase of their work that I want to mention, and that is in connection with the ore dressing laboratories of the Department of Mines that were established some years ago. The result of that work has been of such value that the machinery has had practically to be quadrupled, and I think I am quite justified in saying that the value to the country of that work has amounted to millions of dollars. There is a complete plant for carrying on milling tests, analysing, assaying and so on, in both large and small quantities. When a test is made in small quantity we want to have not less than from two hundred to six hundred pounds, but if the test is to be carried out on a large, commercial scale, we want five tons or over. All the samples have to be sent to the department free of cost, these tests are thoroughly made, the results are made known to the people, and a lot of problems are tackled that probably could not be tackled or solved in any other way. As a result of the work of the Mines Department, we have practically placed the molybdenite industry on its feet in Canada. We have taken the molybdenite ores and treated them in our own laboratories and we have practically started a great industry, which will be of immense value to the country later on.

I would like to give one other illustration of the work carried on at these ore-dressing laboratories. In the fall of 1917 large scale experiments were carried through successfully on the problem of concentrating chromite ores, which are of great value in the production of high grade steel. They were carried out for the Quebec Asbestos & Chrome Co., St. Cyr., Quebec. The concentrates produced by the laboratory were of such high grade that the directors of this company have been encouraged to proceed immediately with the installation of their own milling plant. Incidentally, this work is of importance as chromium is an essential in the manufacture of armour plate, armour piercing projectiles, and various steel products that require a quality of extreme hardness and toughness. It may be noted that Canada, South Africa, New Caledonia and the United States are at the moment the principal producers of chromite in the world. I give these two illustrations as an example to the House of the very valuable work that is being carried on in this particular branch of the Department of Mines, and I express the hope that in the near future, if we can establish them, there may be branch laboratories built in Nova Scotia, and more especially in British Columbia, because the expense of bringing down large samples of ore from these two provinces, more particularly the latter, is so great that there are a great number of problems remaining unsolved simply because the prospectors and small mine owners cannot themselves undertake the expense of transporting ores for such great distances. I am convinced that if we can find the means of doing so we ought, at a very early date, to establish well-equipped laboratories for this purpose, and that if we do so we shall have the means of solving problems that present themselves to a greater extent than we have at the present time.

Before I resume my seat, and I do not wish to unduly occupy the time of the House, I would like to deal to some extent with the question of peat, which my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong)

raised last year, doing a good service thereby, and which question he has again touched on this afternoon. I may say that when I came to the Department of Mines, which had charge of this matter, it was one the first things that attracted my attention. I had some correspondence with my hon. friend about it, and promised that I would go further into the matter, and I want to assure the House that we are taking steps that we hope will go a long way towards solving the vexed question of when the great peat sources of this country can be commercially utilized, a question to which the high price of anthracite coal this year has given an added interest in the minds of our own people. The central provinces of Canada—classing as such Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec—practically, as we know, have no large coal deposits of economic value, but they do contain very large peat bogs, and peat does constitute a fuel of very great value. Numerous attempts have been made, involving the expenditure of very large sums of money, to convert peat into a commercial fuel possibility. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that there have been at least four million dollars spent in various experimental lines, and in the formation of peat companies to develop peat as a fuel, and that the sums thus spent have been practically wasted. It is true that peat cannot be satisfactorily substituted for anthracite coal in all its uses, but it has been found in practice to be a satisfactory substitute both in cooking ranges, in such stoves as Quebec heaters, and the stoves in use in British Columbia, and also in furnaces in mild weather and more particularly in open grates. It is very largely, however, a matter of education and of getting the peat cheap enough. We have been assisting in developments along both these lines. Some years ago the Department of Mines undertook a lot of work, both of an investigating and an experimental character. As the hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) has already stated, the Department of Mines investigated and mapped out, both as regards quality and depth, about one hundred and forty thousand acres of peat bogs, that will be suitable for the manufacture of peat, and we estimated the total tonnage from these bogs, and there are a great many others that have not been touched at all, as one hundred and twenty million tons. In addition to this a lot of work was undertaken at Alfred, about forty miles from Ottawa, where peat manufacturing machinery was installed and a number of experiments undertaken to see whether peat could be manufactured on a profitable and commercial basis. I do not want to go into the details of this work except to mention one or two things, for the reason that there has been great misapprehension in the minds of the public in regard to the matter. The peat supplied to this plant was excavated entirely by hand labour, and, of course, hand labour is not considered a serious handicap in countries like Sweden and Russia where they have developed the peat industry on a very large and successful scale. During the two seasons of 1910 and 1911, during which the Government operated this plant, 3,100 short tons of twenty-five per cent moisture peat fuel were manufactured. The cost of manufacturing peat fuel, as determined by the last season's operations, was $2.60 per ton on the field; $3.04 loaded on cars, and $4.04 per ton f.o.b. Ottawa. These figures were based on the assumption that the entire output was sold. I believe that exaggerated statements have been circulated as to the expenditure on this work, but the total of $18,000 represents the entire expenditure by the Mines Department on the whole operation at Alfred. I have heard people state that as much as $100,000 was expended, and that this money was all wasted. I think, therefore, it is well to have the correct figures put on Hansard.

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott): Does the Government still possess the land at Alfred?

Mr. BURRELL: I was just coming to that point. In 1910 or 1911, operations were discontinued. The price of anthracite then was very much lower than it is at the present time, and the difficulties in connection with the problem—to demonstrate that peat fuel could be manufactured—having been solved, the department deemed its work to be done. It was thought proper not to proceed further, but to leave the rest to private enterprise. In the summer of 1911 a large part of the plant was taken over by Mr. Shuttleworth of Brantford, who also approached the Government with a view of purchasing the bog and the railway siding in order to erect an improved peat manufacturing plant. These were transferred to him in 1912, and he then began the construction of a mechanical excavator to do away with hand labour, hoping thereby to place the enterprise on a more economical basis. Mr. Shuttleworth constructed a mechanical excavator after the design of A. Anrep, Sr., of Sweden, who had been identified with peat development in Russia and Sweden for thirty or forty years, and his plant was

finally ready for operation in 1913. It is too long a story to go into the whole of these details, but the gentleman who advanced the money for this enterprise went to England. In 1914 the war broke out. The promoters could not get sufficient capital, and, although for a certain time the manufacture of peat was successfully undertaken, a certain number of defects developed in the machinery, and owing to the shortage of capital and other conditions the company at last went into liquidation, and the bog was again sold. The bog and some of the plant was taken over by a syndicate which is still in possession. That was the position of affairs up to this winter.

It seemed to me, therefore, when the matter was brought to my attention, and considering the mounting price of anthracite, and the severity of a winter like last which brought home the fuel question to every one's mind in a startling way, that it was desirable to look into this more thoroughly; and for that reason we took the peat question up again, because the main difficulty in the way was the great expense of handling it and the absolute necessity of finding some kind of improved peat machinery that would do away with the large amount of hand labour, the whole question coming down, not to the matter of being able to make fuel—we can do that beyond question—but of handling the raw material, in the cheapest possible way, of getting it to the point of consumption so that it could reasonably compete with anthracite. With that idea, I consulted with Mr. R. A. Ross, the engineering expert who is on the advisory council, and with the experts in my own department, and later on I found that the Government of Ontario was very keen on the same subject and we went into the whole thing with them, and had a conference or two, the result of it simply being this: we came to the conclusion that it would be desirable to have two types of peat machines, or what we may call units, first, to take again the old plant that was used in 1911, which was based on the Anrep design, and improve it as far as it could be improved, utilizing such methods as were utilized at that time; and, in the second place, to try and bring out some entirely new type of machine, which Mr. Moore, the engineer who had been associated with Mr. Shuttleworth in 1911 had in partial process of design. The matter was taken up with him, and as a result of the whole discussion with the Ontario Government and the officers of my own department and Mr. Moore we have entered into an agreement with the Ontario Government to co-operate on some further peat experiments, building two types of peat machinery and operating them either at the same bog as before or some other bog, which matter is yet to be determined, each department of the Government, both federal and provincial, to bear equal proportions of the cost as to getting out designs, and the construction and installation of the machinery, for the purpose of seeing if we cannot once and for all solve the question as to whether peat can be handled in a cheap way in order to put it on the market if anthracite coal were to go down one or two dollars a ton from its present price. Unless we can do that, there is no stability or promise for development of peat manufacture on a very, very large scale. I would like to say frankly that anything that can be done this year cannot possibly do much to offset any possible fuel shortage next winter. Hon. gentlemen will understand that. But if we can get this machinery out in time to operate, or any information as to how to do it, even next year—but I hope to do it this year—if we can get it out and show that we can produce peat by this sort of machinery at a price which will justify its development on a larger scale, we will have done enough to justify the expenditure of the time and money spent on this subject which, as the hon. member for Lambton has said, is of immense importance to the country.

Mr. FRIPP: Has the minister investigated the Graham process?

Mr. BURRELL: I know very little about Mr. Graham's process. I have heard of him as being a great enthusiast on the peat question. Some time ago he submitted certain suggestions and processes to the department, which were not thought at all practicable by the officials. I believe Mr. Graham dissents from that view. Certainly, if he wishes to submit any other processes we shall be only too glad to give them our consideration. I understand he wanted some substantial assistance in the way of development, but we did not intend to do anything more than what I have mentioned, because that is enough for this year.

I want to say in conclusion that I appreciate what my hon. friend from Lambton has said. I would like to say that, as a comparatively new Minister of Mines, I quite admit it has been unfortunate for the department that there have been so many ministerial changes, because I quite understand that such conditions do not promote

continuity of policy or of work or enthusiasm on the part of the officials. But, so far as my knowledge goes, in that department there are a very large number of exceedingly able men, thoroughly well trained, enthusiastic, thoroughly keen about their work, and just as anxious to help their country in these war times as anybody else. Where the department is weak, it will be my duty to strengthen it. If there are any mouldered branches they should certainly be lopped off. I shall bear in mind any criticism that the hon. member has made, and if, as a result of that, we can speed up our work, his resolution, as far as I am concerned, will not have been useless.

At six o clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries I wish to make a few remarks, not wholly upon the motion but upon a phase of the address of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), and possibly of some of the addresses that followed. When I spoke on a similar subject on a motion by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) about a week ago, I did so merely as a substitute, called hastily to the task, for one of the other ministers, and speaking in that capacity I naturally did observe what I thought was a becoming reserve and, perhaps, hesitancy. What I shall say to-night will be entirely on that phase of the addresses that constituted something in the nature of an attack on the Mines Branch of the department over which I preside, and, consequently, I suppose I can speak with that freedom and clearness to which the House is always entitled. In order that hon. members may not have the question of responsibility confused, may I first of all draw this distinction: The Mines Department is a department under the ministry of the Secretary of State. As to that, I have, as a minister, nothing further to do than as a colleague. The Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior is an entirely different organization. That branch has to do with the administration of mining properties in so far as they belong to the Government of Canada; that is to say, wherever mines are found on lands, the property of the Dominion, those mines themselves are administered by the Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior. Consequently, Hudson bay lands, Canadian Pacific lands, and all lands granted before a certain date some years ago, in regard to which lands the patent carried with it all the minerals and mines, are in no way under the Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior, and with them, of course, we have no concern. These lands having been alienated and being now private property, their administration as such comes wholly within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. The Mines Department is an entirely different institution from the Mines Branch. Not only is it a distinct entity, but its character and its purpose are wholly different. Its object, as I understand it, is the development and the fostering of the mining industry in this country, the encouragement and the help of that industry. The Branch of Mines under the Department of the Interior has to do with mines themselves in so far as they are the property of the Dominion. That being clear, first of all, hon. members will have no difficulty in determining what are the references to which it is my duty to reply.

It has been alleged by the hon. member for East Lambton, not on his own responsibility—for his courtesy I wish to give him full credit and thanks—but on the responsibility of others, including two officials of the Mines Department, that there was laxity in the administration of the Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior, resulting in a very serious waste of gas in mines in the province of Alberta under the control and administration of the department. In this connection, the hon. member read a letter from the Deputy Minister of the Mines Department. That the quotation may be fresh in the memory of the House, I will read the letter again:

Ottawa, January 8, 1918.

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

Your letter of the 2nd instant to the Minister of Mines relative to the waste of natural gas in northern Alberta was referred to this office for attention.

I have consulted with Mr. D. B. Dowling of the Geological Survey, and from him I learn that the waste of gas is not nearly so large as you have been told.

There is, however, some waste both at Peace River and at other places in northern Alberta. At present the operators can practically do as they please, and it is high time that some regulations were formulated aiming at controlling their actions.

In addition to the waste of gas, there is also danger of faulty or careless boring injuring or destroying gas horizons by letting in water.

The great gas field in northern Alberta is under the control of the Interior Department, and leases to bore for gas or oil are issued by them. I have already drawn their attention to the pressing need of regulations to govern

boring operations, and hope some action will be taken in the matter during the present winter.

Yours very truly,

R. G. McCONNELL.
Deputy Minister.

This official draws attention to what he calls the absence of regulations to prevent the waste of gas by mining operators in Alberta, to his efforts to secure those regulations, which efforts were all a failure, and to the resulting consequences, as he describes it, of operators doing practically as they pleased. Were that the circumstance in the Mines Branch under the control of our department there would be ground for criticism. And in referring to this letter, may I say, I do so with reluctance, but I owe a reference to the Mines branch, I owe it to myself in so far as the administration is reflected upon by the Deputy Minister of Mines. The fact of the matter is that the very regulations the absence of which is complained of in this letter are in effect fully and specifically, and have been in effect for some four years past. I will read our regulations at this point. Regulation No. 29, passed on the 19th of January, 1914, and ratified by Order in Council, reads as follows:

> In case natural gas is discovered through boring operations on a location, the lessee shall take all reasonable and proper precautions to prevent the waste of such natural gas, and his operations shall be so conducted as to enable him, immediately upon discovery, to control and prevent the escape of such gas.
>
> Failure on the part of the lessee to comply with the above requirements, or to comply with such other requirements as the Minister may consider necessary to impose in respect of boring and operating, will render the lease subject to cancellation in the discretion of the minister.

That is the regulation the absence of which is lamented in this letter upon which the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong) relies. The House may be astonished to learn—I give it on the authority of head of the Mines Branch of the Interior Department—that in the framing of those very regulations the writer of this letter was consulted and the regulations received his approval. Further, no communication has come from him in relation thereto since the regulations were framed, which is four years ago on the 19th of January last. The regulations have been and are put into force to the extent that it is possible to put them into force, with the result that they have been as substantially and fully observed as such regulations well can be.

There was a reference in the speech of the hon. member for East Lambton to a waste of gas in the Athabaska district. As a matter of fact, in all the years of the administration of the mines of this country under my department, there have been drawn to the attention of the department only three cases of the escape of gas. One was as far back as about twenty years ago, and that is the case referred to by the hon. member, particulars of which he gave on the authority of Mr. Dowling, an engineer of the Department of Mines. Mr. Dowling lamented very seriously the escape of gas in that quarter. There has been some escape. The House may be amused to learn that the well in question was put down about twenty years ago by the very department in which Mr. Dowling is and in which he was then, and being put down, it was not so protected as to prevent the escape of gas which Mr. Dowling now so much laments. The Geological Survey is the department that put down that well, and it is the department that now makes the complaint.

Efforts, however, were made notwithstanding the faulty condition in which the well was left, to stop the outflow of the escaping gas, and very considerable expense was gone to in the way of cementing, but such is the porous state of the earth that carefully as the contractors had done their work, it has not been wholly successful. It is a matter of very considerable difficulty in a country of this sort to make anything in the nature of an absolute success in closing a mine like that. Different plans have been evolved and presented for taking care of and effectually coping with that well, and a late minister of the department, not in the late Government, but in the Government preceding, took those proposals into serious consideration, had a computation made as to what would be gained by putting them into effect, and the cost of the proposals themselves, and came to the conclusion, which he annotated in a record of the Branch, that the cost was so great that the amount to be gained was not sufficient to warrant the expenditure. There is some escape still, but that is the record of the minister of the department, and from that record there has appeared no decision at the hands of the officials derogatory to it. We are only too anxious to have a practical proposal that will effectually stop what was wrongly done twenty years ago under the officials who now make the complaint. I say this, as I said before, with reluctance, but I think that by common consent I might lay down this principle: It is not only very improper but highly dangerous for the officer of one department to take such a step with refer-

ence to the administration of another unless at least he thoroughly surveys the ground and knows fully what he is talking about first; and I can only hope that the officer who wrote this letter will show himself more efficient in the activities of his administration of his work than seems now to be in his understanding of the proprieties of his position.

There have been two other cases brought to the attention of the department recently. One was in the city of Medicine Hat, and I do not think it was referred to by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). As the members of this House, at all events those from Alberta, will know, a very large reservation has been made for the benefit of the city of Medicine Hat and placed within their administrative power, so far as the product of gas is concerned. Contained in that are, of course, the gas rights within the boundaries of the city itself and within those boundaries in connection with the gas rights which they now control—subject, of course, to the regulations of the Mines Branch—a well was put down in such a manner as to result in an escape of gas. That was brought to the attention of the department by our own officer just as was the other case, and immediately on that being done steps were taken and communication had with the mayor of Medicine Hat with a view to closing up that well. The department followed it up, very soon had a report that a number of men were being engaged and right steps being taken, suggested by the Branch itself, to secure the desired end; and it is only a few weeks since I heard from the mayor of Medicine Hat in my office that they were quite hopeful the gas would be wholly stopped in a short time.

The other case, in another district, was successfully coped with, but was of minor importance. I will dwell no further on the subject except to assure the House that the department realizes—and indeed the minister of any department would be unfit for his post if he did not realize it—that the gas resources of our Dominion lands are an asset not to be dissipated but to be conserved and developed for the public advantage, and wherever it appears that any step is within our power that will tend to that end we shall be only too glad to address ourselves to the task of achieving it.

With reference to a speech made, I think, by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Hocken) I may say that if it is his desire or the desire of any hon. member that a committee of the House look into the matter of mines administration I will be the last to object; but being a new member he may not be aware of the fact that we have had a committee on mines in this House ever since I can remember the proceedings of Parliament. There was a committee on mines composed of members of this House in existence through all the last Parliament. I do not know whether my hon. friend from East Lambton was a member of that committee or not.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At all events, there was such a committee, and I am told that in the whole six years of the last Parliament they met on only two or three occasions, so that unless the committee were to attend more sedulously to its work, or unless it had more work to do than had the last Standing Committee on Mines, I do not see how they would accomplish very much towards bringing the Mines Branch to a sense of its obligations.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Lethbridge): The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) has made allusion to the existence of natural gas in northern Alberta and has dealt with the statements made by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). I do not intend to make much reference to the natural gas resources of northern Alberta further than to say that in perhaps the most productive coal region of Alberta there is also a great quantity of natural gas, and that in the city of Medicine Hat practically all the fuel is natural gas; and the same may be said of the cities of Lethbridge and Calgary. In the city of Lethbridge there are also the greatest domestic coal mines of Alberta; so there is no doubt we have plenty of fuel resources in that part of Canada.

I feel it my duty to-night to allude to the coal resources, particularly of western Canada. I am not going to give any figures, but I would like to point out that there is no doubt that the mines in existence in western Canada at the present time are capable of supplying all the needs of the western provinces, and undoubtedly they could supply some of the needs of eastern Canada. I am not quite sure, however, that it is feasible to ship western coal to the eastern market, because western coal up to the present time has been used wholly for the western market and it has not yet been established that it could be shipped and successfully compete with other coals in the eastern market. Its fuel quality is lost by storage and also by

transportation, and from information I have I believe it would be a very costly coal by the time it reached Ontario. But I do feel this, that western coal could supply the market of western Canada and enable the eastern provinces to use a great amount of the coal that comes at the present time from Pennsylvania into the West. But difficulties are immediately met with. I do not know whether the members of this House realize that shipments of coal from Pennsylvania to western Canada have something to do with the rate on grain on the Great Lakes. The ships leave ports at the head of the lakes with grain from western Canada, but they want something to carry back, and at the present time they are carrying back Pennsylvania coal at a very cheap rate. If they were unable to carry Pennsylvania coal it might mean an increase in the rate of grain going east along the Great Lakes; there is that fact to be considered in this matter. There is no question, however, that the coal resources of western Canada are quite capable of supplying the western Canada market. I have frequently seen in the constituency I represent a field of grain, and with it a coal mine—not a large mine, but a mine that was supplying a good many farmers in that particular district.

We have mines of that character spread all through southern and Central Alberta, and I presume, also, through northern Alberta. Our western coal deposits start in Saskatchewan. We have in Alberta the Lethbridge fields, the Drumheller fields, and the Crow's Nest fields, which are largely steam coal and coking coal. Then we have anthracite coal west of Calgary and west of Red Deer. There are also great deposits of coal in the Edmonton district and west of it. So that Alberta is particularly rich in its coal resources, and no province of western Canada is more capable of increasing production of coal than Alberta. I might point out that during this past season, when there was a demand for Pennsylvania coal for eastern Canada, there was a greater export of it into western Canada than the year previous.

I have had occasion before in this House to refer to the difficulty in connection with the operation of the mines regularly during these years. You are always going to have difficulties with labour, because labourers demand steady employment, which they do not secure in the mines of Alberta, because the demand upon the mines of Alberta is made largely in the fall and winter months. The season slackens off in the early spring and summer, and the mines are not worked except on half or quarter time. Consequently hundreds of miners are out of employment during those months. If it were possible to store coal so that the mines could operate all through the year and store a supply of coal in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, it might be possible to operate the mines during the whole year, and provide steady employment for the miners, and I think the Government should direct its attention largely to this question of storage, because if it can solve that matter it will add a great deal to the production of coal the year round in Alberta. It is claimed that the coal produced in Alberta loses its fuel value when stored. But a number of propositions have been advanced which seem to me to be quite feasible, by which this can be overcome, and if it were overcome it would mean that the mines in that province could ship coal in the spring and summer months to large cities to the east of us and have it stored for use in the early winter; and this would enable them to keep up with the demand during the winter months. That is a matter to which I think the Government should pay considerable attention, and as there have been what appear to be very useful inventions made in connection with this matter of storing coal, I would suggest that the Government give the matter consideration. I have been discussing this question on several occasions in the House, and I do not know that I can say anything further. But I do not want the people of eastern Canada to run away with the idea that it is yet feasible to use western Canada coal in the eastern provinces. At the same time I would like to have that fact established, because the greater markets we have for our coal, not only in western Canada, but in eastern Canada, the greater would be the output from our mines, the more steady the employment of our miners, and the greater our wealth. But it is doubtful whether western Canada coal can be shipped to compete with Pennsylvania coal in the markets of eastern Canada.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I desire to congratulate the mover of this resolution on bringing this very important subject to the attention of the House. I do not, however, desire to follow him in the various aspects of the subject with which the resolution deals, but more particularly to consider that portion of the resolution which reads:

> That the deposits of bituminous and anthracite coal in Canada located in the extreme eastern and western portions thereof, be more

fully and thoroughly utilized for the benefit of the residents of the central provinces.

I take it that, in that connection, the most important, or at least one of the most important, duties that to-day devolves upon the Government is in regard to the increase in the production of coal within our own country. If there are three things most important for us I submit, they are the question of the supply of men, the supply of food, and the supply of fuel; and it is difficult to put any one of these propositions as first ahead of the others. But it is to the production of coal, particularly in eastern Canada, that I wish, for the time being, to direct the attention of the House. It is said that Canada consumes about thirty million tons of coal annually. Approximately one-half of this is produced in this country, and of that production of coal in Canada approximately one-half is produced in the far western part of the country, and the other part, approximately seven million tons, is produced in the extreme eastern part of Canada. Coal production in eastern Canada is confined almost exclusively to the counties of Pictou, Cumberland, Inverness and Cape Breton. Further analyzing it, it is confined, in a large measure, to one single county in eastern Canada, namely, Cape Breton. It becomes particularly pertinent to inquire at this time whether or not everything is being done that ought to be done by the fuel administration and the Government to secure increased production of coal in eastern Canada. What I desire to submit for the consideration of the House is this: if the fuel controller, with his manifold duties, is charged only with the responsibility of borrowing coal from the United States, I would be inclined to think that, perhaps, he has not been entirely unsuccessful in his efforts; but if, as I take it, the prime duty of the fuel controller is to see that we in Canada produce our quota of coal and of fuel, then I say that, as far as eastern Nova Scotia is concerned, the fuel controller has not measured up to the occasion and to the conditions as they obtain. The facts are these: since 1913 the coal production in Nova Scotia has been gradually but surely diminishing. The coal sales in Nova Scotia for the five years past have been as follows:

	Tons.
1913	6,478,709
1914	6,164,600
1915	5,757,907
1916	5,933,710
1917	5,143,074

In other words, Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of war, the results, with regard to production, during the four-year period from 1914 to 1917, were as follows:

	Decrease.	Increase.
1914	198,469 tons.	
1915	626,001 "	
1916		117,009 tons.
1917	692,811 "	

And, taking the estimate for the provincial fiscal year of 1918, we find that the decreased production of bituminous coal in eastern Canada in comparison with the previous year will reach 600,000 tons. There has been a decrease in the production of coal in eastern Canada since the war broke out of upwards of 2,000,000 tons. Since the fuel controller took office in July of last year, there has been a decrease in production of 600,000 tons, and there is the estimate of a further reduction in output of 600,000 tons in 1918. Viewed from the standpoint of increased production—and that is one of the greatest questions that we should be dealing with at the present time—the fuel controller and the administration, in regard to fuel, have not been entirely successful. The decrease in output, in five years, amounted to 1,400,000 tons, and adding this to the decrease that is expected by the operators and the Mines Department in Nova Scotia this year, the total will exceed 2,000,000 tons.

The great question then, that we have to deal with in this connection is how we can increase the coal output in eastern Canada. This subject naturally divides itself under two heads: (1) Increase in the production of the mines now producing coal, and (2) the reopening of collieries not now producing coal. The collieries now operating might be made to produce a very considerable quantity of coal over that which is now being produced. You may ask me what is the reason why the Nova Scotia mines are not keeping up to their normal output. The reasons are well known, I am sure, to some hon. gentlemen here. I would say, that (1) production could be increased by compelling the coal companies and operators to more equitably deal with the employees under them; (2) by increasing the wages of certain classes of labour, particularly the underpaid men who are working in the collieries; and (3) by reducing the large overhead charges to which most of these companies are subject. I have one instance in mind of a company that produces 500,000 tons of coal and pays to its general manager a salary of $100,000. In other words, for every ton

of coal produced by this company, the general manager receives twenty cents. Or, to put it in another way: this company does not market all its output; it consumes 400,000 tons itself; it has a little less than 100,000 tons of coal to be sold in the markets, and its general manager receives as salary one dollar for every ton of coal produced by this company and sold in the market. Can you wonder that, under these conditions, there should be such unrest as has characterized the coal mine operations in eastern Canada for the last few years and particularly for the past few months?

I further submit as a suggestion that improved mining machinery should be brought into the various operating mines in Nova Scotia. Some of the coal companies are making exhorbitant profits while some of them are merely getting along under present conditions. I submit as a principle, these being war-time profits, that the companies that are making profits should be obliged to put back into the operation of their collieries by improved development and by improved mining machinery the amounts that they have received in excess of what would be normal profits under normal conditions. More encouragement should be given to the miners in the line of production and instructions whereby they might be made more competent to carry on the several operations in connection with mining.

It may be said by hon. gentlemen, as it is said by operators, that one of the prime difficulties encountered is the shortage of labour. It is true that there is a shortage of labour for mining operations, but that is not the only reason why there has been such a decrease in production. I submit that in the course of the three and one-half years during which we have been at war there should have been ample time for the making of miners. You can train men to work on the farm, and it is not any more difficult to make competent and skilful miners although it may take a little longer time. Nevertheless, there is a shortage of skilled miners that might be offset by the fact that we have men of good physique growing up in the various occupations connected with mining who are capable of producing coal, running machines and performing the other operations in connection with mining. A man with a coal-mining machine can produce as much as 52 tons of coal a day. A hand-pick miner gets out a very few tons of coal per day in proportion. Why should there not be more mining machines introduced into the mines of Nova Scotia? As far as transportation is concerned, why should the companies not be obliged to have box car loading apparatus? I am told that one of the difficulties in connection with the shipment of coal is that connected with transportation. The mining companies say that they are unable to get coal cars and consequently are obliged to load their product into the box cars that are supplied by the railways. A small expenditure for the equipment of box car loaders would reduce the cost of fuel by from twenty-five cents to thirty cents per ton. The coal companies should modernize themselves and get improved machinery with the profits they are getting which are largely war-time profits. It is the duty of the Government and of the fuel controller to see that increased production is brought about in the mines of Nova Scotia.

What is needed in this country is a speeder-up. Just as they have in certain portions of the mining sections in England a speeder-up they ought to have a speeder-up here, a man with broad powers who is able to see that regulations, properly framed, are carried out with a view to increased production.

When you consider that the normal production of coal in Nova Scotia increased at the rate of ten per cent every year for the last fifty to one hundred years, and that only when war broke out the collieries of that province did not even maintain their usual output but went behind to the extent of at least ten per cent per annum, I venture to say that if a speeder-up, with power such as I have suggested, is placed in charge of the situation in Nova Scotia, he will bring back its coal production to the normal figure. He will not only do that, but he will gradually restore the increase of ten per cent which was witnessed for many years anterior to the war. I make that suggestion to the House, and I trust that the Government and the fuel controller's department, which is charged particularly with the responsibility of increasing the production of fuel, will give their best consideration to it.

Not only has speeding up been successful in England, but it has met with equally gratifying results in the province of Alberta. Owing to labour difficulties, Mr. Armstrong was placed in charge of the operations in one of the coal sections of Alberta, and what has been the result? I understand that there has been a great increased production in that section of the country. Bearing in mind the results obtained in England and Alberta, and with the prevailing situation in Nova Scotia, where

there are two million tons less coal produced to-day than before the war broke out, it becomes a pertinent matter that the Government should be properly advised, and it becomes their paramount duty to consider the appointment of a satisfactory man to speed up production in that part of Canada. Not only does that apply to the mines now operating, but there is also a situation to be met with respect to the mines that are not producing coal. These collieries might probably be divided into two classes: first, the collieries that closed down before the war broke out, and second, the collieries that closed down owing to the war panic and to other reasons. Take the former class, and I submit that with proper encouragement they could be made producing collieries within a very short time. Let me give you one instance in support of that statement. The Greenwood Coal Company, incorporated with a capital of $50,000, last year produced forty thousand tons of coal as a result of the Nova Scotia Government advancing them the sum of $25,000 to open their property. Within two years they have been able to refund the amount so advanced by the local Government with interest, and last year, as I say, they obtained an output of forty thousand tons. I think that this year, with the daily output now exceeding three hundred tons, they ought to produce for the twelve months ninety to one hundred thousand tons of coal. The same policy if applied to other companies should be followed by equally gratifying results.

It may be said, what has this to do with the matter of increasing coal production or the re-opening of coal mines? Under normal conditions, I admit, it is properly the duty of the provinces to deal with matters pertaining to mines, and particularly to coal; but when we are dealing with war conditions, I submit, as a reasonable proposition which will be accepted by the House, that it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to develop a proper policy for the increased production of fuel. I could give many specific instances where increased production would be obtained; where in one case one hundred thousand tons of coal would be secured within twelve months, and in other cases lesser amounts. Suffice it to say that in the counties of Cape Breton and Inverness there are collieries not now in operation that could be made, within a year, to produce from three to four hundred thousand tons. So that I say there are two problems facing the fuel administration: one is to increase the production of the mines now operating, and the other is to put the mines that are not operating into a condition where they may be made to produce; and I think I am not over-stating the matter when I suggest to the fuel controller and his department that a man, almost an autocrat in the powers conferred upon him, should be appointed to take hold of the coal situation in eastern Canada—a man with power to make advances, to take over and operate collieries, to have supervision of methods of mining and so on. These suggestions, Mr. Speaker, I have made having in view increased production which I regard as one of the great essentials in connection with the war administration at the present time. I have not attempted to deal with the general subject, and perhaps my remarks have been largely of a local nature; but they have to be largely of a local nature, in view of the fact that one third of the coal that is produced in Canada is produced locally— practically in the town in which I live. So that if there is a local aspect to my treatment of the subject it is due merely to that fact; but on the broad, national question of increased production, I submit, the Government and the fuel administration should see to it that increased production is obtained by the appointment of an energetic man with large and broad powers, in order to ensure that in 1918 our output will be greatly increased over that of the past year.

Mr. H. H. HALLADAY (Bow River, Alta.): I had hoped that when the hon. minister at the head of the department having control of this subject was speaking this afternoon he would mention coal in some way in his discourse. He took up the gas and pulp question, but I failed to hear the word coal mentioned in his speech. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan), when he says that Alberta is quite capable of furnishing western Canada with all the coal it requires; and this can be done without opening up a new mine or increasing the capacity of the present mines. The hon. member who introduced this motion gave us figures this afternoon of coal production in Alberta which are quite correct. We can produce in that province with the mines we have at present, twice as much if not three times as much with one extra shift. The scarcity of coal is not the fault of the mines, but is due to lack of transportation, as far as the Red Deer valley is concerned. We say that

during the last three weeks we have been unable to get trains from Calgary to Drumheller, the spot where the Red Deer Valley coal mines are. This railroad has been operating some five years and every spring it has been held up from one to three weeks. They have not had a train over that railroad for three weeks on account of twenty small bridges being washed out. In conversation with the coal operators at Drumheller a short time ago, they advised me that with the present shift they could double their output if the Canadian Northern Railway would furnish the cars. They also said that if they were able to secure mine-operating machinery, such as box car loaders and diamond cutters, I believe they called them, they could double their output with the same number of men. It is not a question of opening up mines, but of being able to operate the mines we have and ship the coal. I would like to call the attention of the ministers to the fact that the operators need this coal-mining machinery, which is not manufactured in Canada. If some inducement could be offered to these people they would be able to purchase this machinery, but at the present high rate of duty they claim that they are unable to do so. I would go further: if they are unable to purchase this machinery, even with the duty off, it would be good business for the Government to purchase that machinery, sell it to the operators, and take payment in the shape of royalties. Coal is going to be needed. I understand that England shipped over to the port of New York some time last fall two shiploads of coal in order to coal vessels which were waiting to take back munitions. Now, if by taking the duty off this coal-mining machinery, or even by purchasing it to be installed in our western mines, and so bringing about the desired effect, I would very much favour that course.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have been for nearly ten years in the Chamber, a colleague of my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) who introduced this resolution, and gave one of the ablest speeches, so far as form and delivery are concerned, that I have heard from him. I have listened to him frequently with pleasure, and have always admired his activity, energy and attention to detail, but I have scarcely ever been able to agree with his conclusions; and the resolution of to-day is no exception to what has been the unfortunate experience of the past. I sincerely and profoundly wish that my hon. friend, with his great ability, would devote himself to the study of economics fundamentally and I am quite sure that I should soon have a very powerful colleague in the advocacy of free trade in this House.

Having for years endeavoured, with indifferent success, to carry economic light into the dark places of the other side of the House, I am not unwilling to make a slight attempt to explore the country which may be more thick and more difficult still. Mr. Speaker, a resolution like this and a debate like this on general principles are only possible in a protectionist country. The problem which seemed to engage the minds of the introducer of the motion and of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) who followed him, was the problem of scarcity in the midst of abundance. And when one comes to think of it, Sir, it is a problem. We have enough coal in Canada, I heard some one say during the reciprocity debates—to last the world two thousand years. Perhaps that was a slight exaggeration. In those same debates I used to say that if that was the case we need not bother much about certain of the arguments against reciprocity, because, unless protectionists mended their ways, they would be getting their fuel cheap enough long before that time. With all that coal, Sir, in the earth, we nevertheless have had circumstances during the past winter in which the people have been strained to death to get coal to keep themselves warm, in a climate that frequently goes to forty below zero. Well, now, Sir, that is a problem. And it strikes me that thoughtful men, approaching that problem with an open mind, would at once see that there is something radically wrong with the economic thought of the people of the country, and that is exactly my theory about what is wrong. My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Douglas) has just told us that we have the melancholy spectacle in Nova Scotia of the amount of coal produced declining from year to year. There was a fine old member of this House, Mr. Carmichael, who enjoyed in an eminent degree the friendship of the right hon the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and he objected to a duty being put on coal and lost his seat for it in the province of Nova Scotia. Well, he would have had a better chance to keep his seat in western Canada. we have more enlightened people economically there. Personally, I prefer the heresy—if it was a heresy—of Mr. Carmichael to the present motion. You have, according to my hon. friend from Cape Breton, decreased production under a tariff. And yet we have a proposal brought before the House here

to-day that another form of protection should be applied in the shape of what is practically a bounty. The tariff has decreased the production—no getting away from that fact; we have just heard it stated by a man who knows. You say: we cannot do it by tariff; let us give them some money to do it. Well, I daresay that any industry would be the better of any money you gave it, but my friend who advocates that, in what was a very able speech from his point of view—if you do not pay too much attention to what he said—also told us that it is more important to produce food even than fuel at this time. If I put it to him as to what he would say to me if, representing the western constituencies, I came here to-night and said: Let the Government go into mining wheat on a large scale we need food more than fuel—he would say: That is absurd, we are producing the wheat anyway. That is exactly the proper answer. If you will allow capital to take its own course under freedom you will produce, and produce all that your capital is capable of producing, by giving them markets in which to sell. There is no subject in the world on which there is so much confused thinking as on this question of protection and free trade. I remember during the reciprocity debates that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in a very long speech, a speech of four hours duration—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, my!

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: —objected to reciprocity on one particular ground, and that was that the United States would exhaust the resources of Canada—our raw material would all be sent over to the United States. The other side of the confused thinking is that hon. gentlemen come to this House to-day, and they get into an awful state about a little bit of coal finding its way from Pennsylvania to Saskatchewan So that they on their part object to exhausting the resources of the United States. I am so good a patriot and so much a believer in cheap coal that I would say: Take the duty off coal altogether and get all your coal from the United States, and then you will conserve the Canadian product for future generations. You will keep all our coal; you will be all that to the good. You will get cheap coal from the United States. You will exhaust the United States supply, and then you will have all this 2,000 years' supply left. My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan), defending himself needlessly in a very able speech against the charge of being parochial, said that he would desire to approach this subject not only from the local point of view, the provincial point of view, but as a Dominion-wide subject. Well, I thought to myself, my hon. friend is very near the kingdom; he needs to take just another step and he will become a bigger man than his thought, and his programme will be a better one. He wants to make his creed world-wide, and then he will become a free trader.

A tariff is, inevitably, an artificial restriction of production. We have had the results stated to-night, so that we have to give a bounty as well as have a tariff. What is the real promoter of production? Trade is the real promoter of production. People produce only what they can sell, if they are right in the top story. You cannot promote production by artificial means. Not only is trade the real promoter of production, it is the only promoter of wealth. We sometimes, and indeed, we continually hear at the present time of production as if it were an end in itself. Production is not an end in itself, and it is not even the source of wealth. Trade is the source of wealth and the only source of the development of great wealth. Let me give the House an example. A few years ago we produced in this country 300,000,000 bushels of wheat in one year. We use in this country only 60,000,000 bushels of wheat in one year. Clearly, the 240,000,000 bushels of excess product over what we were able to use that year in this country was not wealth until we could send it abroad and exchange it. It is only by being able to exchange it or trade it for something else that it becomes wealth. You have a still more striking illustration of that in Australia at the present moment. You have the product—wheat—of two years' crop stored in bags, and owing to the difficulties of transportation it cannot be exchanged, with the result that it is growing musty and rotting, and being wasted from the bags by rodents which are having access to it. It is so far from being wealth that it is an incumbrance in the hands of the people. Trade is the real promoter of production and the real and only promoter of wealth. I do not know, but I would suggest that the reason why they are not mining that coal in Saskatchewan, about which the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) has told us, is that they found it more profitable to mine wheat there. You do not need to give them money to make them wheat miners there. The market and the supply make them mine the wheat. It is possible in this connection to reduce the protectionist theory to an absolute absurdity.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman not believe in any such thing as control, food control, for instance?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I believe in control of my speech when I have not something wise to say. I was saying, Sir, that it is possible to reduce to an absurdity the theory of protection that was advanced in this debate, by inference, if not by absolute statement. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of this resolution have, all of them, gone on the theory that we should, if possible, produce in Canada all the coal we need. We do produce in Canada all the wheat we need. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) would certainly believe in producing in Canada all the agricultural implements we need, and the protectionist, who has any other goods to peddle, would believe in producing in Canada all of anything that we can use. But in that case, if it were possible to succeed, you would have a huge excess of all your products. Under the protectionist theory, what would you do with your excesses? The thing is so absurd on the face of it that I do not yet despair before I die of getting some light into this House. It is hard work, but I do not despair.

This is a serious, practical question for the people of this country at the present time, and while I am, as everybody knows, in favour of producing all we can for the conduct of the war, I do not want to go about the matter in a senseless fashion. I think my hon. friend suggested that free mining implements would be a good thing in this country. We are very slow in this country. In the Argentine Republic they have not had a duty on mining tools for years, or if they have a duty at all, it is merely a nominal one. Just imagine the wisdom of people who think they will mine coal more easily if they make dear the implements with which they do their mining. I would say: Have a trial of freedom along the line of mining implements, if the question of production be so important. There is the road to production. I pointed it out the other day in connection with food. The first step in increasing the production of food is to have free agricultural implements. I point it out again now, quoting the example of the Argentine Republic in connection with coal. Free the implements with which you produce coal; take off all the restrictions, but do not try to increase the production of coal by giving money away where the tariff has failed. The giving of money for the specific purpose of building up any specific industry by way of bounty, or whatever you call it, would, with the present demands on the public purse, be little short of an economic crime.

With regard to the coal question, I want to put in a word for the consumer. The protectionist is always looking to the producer. The only sound way of looking at this economic question is always to look to the consumer, because we are all consumers. We consume one hundred things where we only produce one, and if you look to the consumer and let capital take its free course, it will always find the line of least resistance. You will produce most in that way of all that your country is capable of producing, compatibly with marketing the produce.

At the present juncture, I am looking at this from the point of view of the consumer, and if one goes into the houses of Ottawa and talks to the rank and file of the common people, one finds that the hardships of the war are coming very close to them in this matter of fuel. I cannot imagine any more insensate folly than to keep a duty on coal in a country like this, where the temperature goes down to forty and fifty below zero, and where the people in the capital city last year had to suffer almost privation for the want of material to keep themselves warm; I cannot imagine anything more absurd. The geographical position of the two countries makes it an ideal case for no tariff. You have an imaginary boundary line between the United States and Canada of 3,000 miles. At one part of the boundary line you have coal to the south and you have not coal to the north, and at another part of the boundary line you have coal to the north and not coal to the south. Could anything be more foolish than to prevent the exchange across the line, and to endeavour to keep carrying the long distances in both the countries concerned? I cannot imagine anything more foolish under the sun, I repeat, than keeping a duty on coal at the present juncture.

Our people are beginning to feel the burden of the war. Why increase it to them? We are looking forward to a winter in which the privations of the people of Ottawa may be greater than they were last year. I recommend to the House that instead of giving away money along the old sweet path for the artifician promotion of any industry whatsoever, we should try first the simpler plan. One remembers in this connection the lines:

Oh, how unlike the complex works of man,
Heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan!

Free your implements. Free your coal; let it go across the border. The difficulties of the war, of course, enter into one's consideration; we cannot alter them; they are with us. But we can help them out, and if I wanted to make sure, so far as I can see into this question, that I was going to make it easier for the consumers of coal in this country next winter than it was last winter I would say, take the duty off coal altogether, and let them go at this coal in the United States, and keep our own for future generations if capital has not found it profitable up to date to mine it.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterboro West): Might I say in a brief and somewhat presumptous reply—if I may call it so—to my hon. friend from Red Deer, that he has proceeded on an entirely false assumption which utterly and absolutely invalidates his argument. If this world were composed of one nation; if the people were identical in their interests; if the different nations that exist at the present time were only different states of the same union his argument would undoubtedly be sound. But we are up against this fact: there exists in the world a certain human failing or weakness which is called business rivalry, and it is only necessary in order to prove my point to call the hon. gentleman's attention to one fact, and that is the death of agriculture in England. If Great Britain had properly protected her agriculture, and had not pursued the policy which the hon. gentleman has enunciated she would not be in the desperate position she is in to-day as regards food.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: While Germany is well off.

Mr. BURNHAM: She would be in the position of having developed and maintained a certain national industry, so that it would make no difference to her whether there was a German submarine policy or not, or whether Canada was in existence or not. But heretofore she has proceeded on the assumption of my hon. friend, and endeavoured to feed the world on her manufactures. You cannot live on Sheffield cutlery or on Manchester cotton goods, and the consequence was that when war came, the hon. gentleman's policy found that good old country in the desperate condition in regard to food that she is in to-day. Had it not been for that policy England would now be in a better position. It is one of the greatest possible catastrophies that such a policy as my hon. friend has just enunciated has heretofore obtained in England. My hon. friend must be a mathematician. He labours under the impression that free trade or trade policies are like the principle of the conservation of energy, that where something manifests itself there must be a compensation also, that there is a transformation but never a dissipation of energy. Now, that is not the case with regard to trade. Trade and the principles of trade can easily be suppressed, and the patent law alone ought to show him that the protection exercised by means of that law would itself dislocate all trade. You cannot lay down any such principles as he has laid down so long as you have national boundaries, so long as there is one country up against another, so long as you have a number of countries in close rivalry one with another. Sweep away these boundaries, make humanity one, and what he says is true, provided that you can correct that other weakness of humanity, native greed. If only people will be considerate of each other, if only the Turks will spare the Armenians; if only the Armenians when they send up their prayers to Heaven are considered by the Almighty worthy of being spared and are spared—but the trouble is, when they send up their prayers to Heaven, month after month and year after year, the Almighty turns a deaf ear to them, and Canada and the United States and every other country are asked to subscribe for their protection. Why, you ask at once, should we subscribe for their protection when the Almighty himself refuses to protect them? We must proceed to the bottom of this thing, we must investigate the fundamental principles, and the one fundamental principle is this, that so long as there is this national rivalry throughout the world an easy natural adjustment such as my hon. friend has referred to is altogether and absolutely out of the question.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I had not intended to intervene in this debate, but I cannot allow to pass unchallenged the economic fallacies which I have heard enunciated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burnham). He first of all says that Great Britain in this war has been suffering from her free trade policy. Let me ask him this: Are the people of Germany or of Austria better fed to-day than are the people of England? I do not think so, unless our newspapers are leading us astray by wrong information. Let us review for a few brief moments the history of free trade in Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks upon the free trade policy of Great Britain, to what application it may have to the motion before the House.

Mr. McMASTER: The question of coal is before the House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, as a preliminary observation, I can set the hon. gentleman right as to the economic principles, or rather the fallacies and the heresies which he has enunciated.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just as an observation.

Mr. McMASTER: By way of observation. We have in Quebec notarial deeds, and those deeds sometimes start out with what are called preliminary observations, and mine will be a preliminary observation. Before they had free trade in England the people were starving, and the question before the British people for the first half of the nineteenth century was whether the population of Great Britain and Ireland would emigrate, or whether they would allow free food to come in from abroad to feed the people at home, in exchange for the coal and manufactures of Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen will see that I have not departed far from the subject. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) says, that you cannot live off Sheffield cutlery. No, but you can exchange it for flour from the United States or Canada, and live on the flour. The British people were starving before they had free trade in England. The people of Great Britain had to have free interchange of foodstuffs for their coal and other articles before they could live. I desire to point out that Great Britain, through her policy of free trade in coal and other things, has been able, not only to finance herself, but, at the beginning of the war to finance the overseas dominions, including Canada, and also very largely her Allies. I think if there were anything required to show the sound principle of the fiscal policy of the Old Country, it was the way she was able to stand the terrible financial strain caused by the war. I would not like to think that all economic truths had to be administered to this Government by the back door. I should like to show them that there are economic principles to be enunciated which they must meet face to face.

Mr. A. McGREGOR (Pictou): As coal production is the burning question to-night, and as I come from a coal producing county, I desire to make a few observations with regard to coal production in the county of Pictou, which I represent. With regard to the price of coal as arranged by the fuel controller or his agents, I understand the prices for the Acadia Coal Company are $6.60 for screened coal, $6.35 for run of mine and $5.25 for culm. If a measureable proportion of this unreasonable increase went into the pockets of the mine workers, I would not complain and I believe the people would not complain. In discussing this matter with the accountant, who I understand went to Nova Scotia to investigate the cost of production at the different collieries, he gave the information that, in arriving at a price for the Acadia Coal Company, he estimated $100,000 for repairs or development work for the Allan Shaft mine, and $30,000 for another mine. The company to be reimbursed for said amount in three years. Also that he took into account the capitalization of the company which, I understand, to be five millions; that is three millions of preferred stock and two millions of common. In addition to this he has, no doubt, taken into account the large and highly paid official management of the company, which means very large overhead expense. I wish to object to the method of book-keeping as adopted by this expert. In the first place, the public, in my opinion, should not be called upon to reimburse the company to the extent of $130,000, or to pay dividends on the company's mistakes, or to pay dividends on millions of watered stock. Neither should they be called upon to pay excessive salaries to the management. It must be understood that the Acadia Coal Company are now producing only about 600 tons of coal per day, whereas, the official management is big enough for a company that could take care of the production of 6,000 tons per day. Taking the argument of this accountant, and figuring the cost of production on a basis of 600 tons per day, he has decided that the company should be paid $6.60 per ton for screened coal, $6.35 for run of mine, and $5.25 for culm coal. Following his methods and his contention, if the company further reduced their output to 300 tons per day, and closed down another mine, I presume he would fix the price at $13.20 per ton for screened coal, $12.70 for run of mine, and $10.50 for culm. One trouble with the Acadia Coal Company is that they have closed down two collieries; another is that their overhead expense is entirely too great, and entirely out of proportion to their production. Within the past three months from 300 to 400 mine workers have left the town of Stellar-

ton because they could not obtain employment. It is true they have had trouble in the mines they are now operating. In the recent explosion which took place at the Allan shafts 88 precious lives were lost. I believe the county of Pictou sustained a greater actual loss of life in this explosion than the county has suffered in this great war up to the present time. A large number of widows and children are left homeless and penniless, and no investigation has taken place up to the present time, except a coroner's inquest, conducted by an aged medical doctor, assisted by two lawyers who are favourable to the company. In my opinion there should at once be a thorough investigation of all their mining properties by mining engineers of the first class. I have no desire to cause any injustice to be done to any of the coal mining companies in the county of Pictou; it is my duty to see that fair consideration is given to the coal companies, but consumers must be protected.

I know it is necessary for the companies to receive a fair increase in the price of coal, but I wish to protest in the strongest possible manner against the price of coal as arranged by the fuel controller for the Acadia Coal Company. The solution of the situation in so far as the Acadia Coal Company are concerned is for them to produce more coal and increase their output. They hold a blanket lease of large and valuable mine areas which they will neither operate nor permit others to operate. I suggest that this Government should co-operate with the local government, and take over the extensive leases held by the Acadia Coal Company and appoint a commission to operate the mines for the benefit of the public, or hand the said leases over to firms who are competent and willing to operate such leases and produce coal at a fair and reasonable price. If the company is permitted to impose the present prices that are in my opinion entirely unjustiable, it will mean serious hardship to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and especially to the people of the county I have the honour to represent. Such increase, if authorized, will embarrass the manufacturers and discourage further industrial development. I understand the Minister of Railways and Canals has fixed the price to be paid by his department for the coal required for railway purposes. The people will expect this Government to protect their interests and arrange that the prices to be paid by the manufacturers, the dealers, and the public shall be in keeping with the price paid by the Government for their requirements.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I listened with the usual pleasure and interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and while I cannot agree with his point of view on trade matters, I am free to confess that the hon. gentleman is not only persistent in advocating his free trade principles, but he is also consistent in advocating them, and no person doubts his thorough sincerity in holding the views which he does hold. I am precluded from going into the question of free trade, I understand, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to trespass upon your good nature in that regard. I may say, however, that it does strike me that in a country such as we have in Canada we must, in framing our tariff policy, whether in regard to coal or anything else, take into consideration our climatic conditions as compared with those of other countries with which Canada has to compete. I will not attempt to follow that up any farther, but what I rose to say in regard to the coal question was this: The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said that last winter there were actually people in the capital city of Ottawa who were suffering from cold on account of a shortage of coal, and that he regarded it as the height of absurdity to have a duty on coal when people were suffering from a shortage of coal. He said that when at one part of the continent north of the boundary line there was coal and none south of it, and when at another part there was coal south of the line and none north of it, it was, under such conditions, absurd to have a duty on coal. As I understand it, there is no duty on the coal that the people use in their furnaces and in their stoves. Anthracite coal passes freely from the other side of the line into Canada without any duty. The duty is only on bituminous coal. The tariff is as follows:

> Coal, bituminous, slack, such as 95 per cent will pass through a three-quarter inch screen, per ton, 10c; 12c; 14c.

These rates being the British preferential tariff, the intermediate tariff and the general tariff. Item 588:

> Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal, n.o.p. per ton, 35c; 45c; 53c.

These are not classes of coal that are used by people in warming their houses.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I do not want to make an unnecessary interruption, but I may say to my hon. friend that I am using a grate fire myself—the mornings are cold enough—and I am using both kinds of coal.

Mr. EDWARDS: That may be true, but the hon. gentleman does not dispute my statement that in so far as his argument applies to people who are using coal for heating purposes in their houses, it falls down in that there is no duty on that class of coal. We did have trouble in this country last winter, but according to my idea it was due to the fact that there was a shortage of cars, that the United States had some 25,000 cars which should have been in Canada—they had that many more of our cars than we had of theirs. The great difficulty in obtaining coal for heating houses lay in the fact of the shortage of cars, the extreme winter and the days of blockade upon the railways on account of snow. I have no objection whatever to the hon. member for Red Deer holding views on trade matters. I give him credit for being perfectly sincere in his views. He is, at all events, always consistent. He is an out-and-out free trader, and he wants to see free trade in everything. That is a consistent view for him to take. He may hold that view if he chooses, but I do not think his argument was quite correct in so far as coal was concerned, because it left the impression that it was the duty on coal generally used by the people that was responsible, whereas there is no duty on that class of coal.

Mr. S. J. CROWE (Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take very many minutes of the time of this House, but having listened to the hon. members from Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and Alberta telling us what vast bodies of coal they have in those different provinces, I feel that I should tell the House that in British Columbia we have vast coal beds. Our climate is such that we do not require to burn so much coal as they do in Ontario, Quebec and some of the western provinces. If the people of these provinces have not sufficient coal next winter I would invite them to come to the Pacific coast, because we will have sufficient heat to keep them quite warm. We have vast coal areas on Vancouver island, and besides supplying the lower mainland of British Columbia with coal, we ship as far south as San Francisco from 1,500,000 tons to 2,000,000 tons per year. You see, therefore, that we are not short of coal. The only thing we complain about is that the fuel controller does not keep down the price of coal to what it should be. In the city of Vancouver we pay $9 a ton for coal, and they only have to ship it forty miles across from Nanaimo. I think that is a question that the fuel controller should look into and compel the mine owners to sell their coal at a less rate than they are charging. We have coal beds in the Nicola valley but we cannot ship our coal out from there because it costs too much to transport it to the larger centres of the province. We have coal in the Crow's Nest Pass from which they ship east. We have anthracite in northern British Columbia, in the Skeena river region. An American engineer has reported that there is almost ten times as much anthracite coal in the Skeena district as there is all kinds of coal in the whole province of Nova Scotia. I only wanted to inform the House that British Columbia is on the map when it comes to the question of coal.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Before mentioning the question of coal, I want to refer to one or two observations that were made by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). I would not have said anything in regard to his argument were it not for the slap that he gave to Great Britain. I think it is very unbecoming, to say the least, for any hon. gentleman in this House to abuse Great Britain at this particular time for the purpose of bolstering up the protectionist argument. It only goes to show that the protectionist is now, as he always has been, prepared to slap his very best friend at any time to bolster up his own argument in any way in which it can be done. If he had only taken the trouble to analyse the quantity of food that Great Britain had control of and disposed of since this war began, he would not have used the argument which he did use to-night. We all know what Great Britain has done in the matter of feeding her Allies, we all know what she did for years until the United States took over the feeding of Belgium, and we all know what she has done more recently in regard to Italy, and I think it ill becomes the hon. gentleman to use that kind of argument. He himself states that we should go to the bottom of this argument. The present is not the time for that, Mr. Speaker, but I only hope that opportunity will be afforded to us before the session closes of going to the bottom of the trade argument with the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). We will be very glad to do it if the opportunity is presented, and we will try very hard to kick the bottom clean out.

Coming to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), we all know his tendencies. I might not go as far as he would go in

the matter of free trade, but I will say this: I will trade with anybody that will trade with me anything from a jack knife, to as far as you like to go, across the international boundary or anywhere else. It makes no difference to me what it is; if it is business I am prepared to do it. But I think the hon. gentleman has misinterpreted the meaning of the words that the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) may have used, although personally I did not hear what that hon. gentleman said this afternoon. I may say this, however: People in Saskatchewan, eastern Saskatchewan particularly, are probably somewhat differently situated from the residents of Alberta. We have the long freight haul; the freight on the coal in eastern Saskatchewan amounts to practically as much per ton as the coal costs at the mine. We have, as has been stated, an abundance of lignite coal which when briquetted, we are given to understand, is quite equal in heating qualities to Pennsylvania coal. I understand the argument has been advanced that we should produce all our own coal within our own boundaries. I quite agree with that argument, providing it can be produced in an economical way. But in the province of Saskatchewan that cannot be done at the present time. It is true that we have anthracite coal in western Canada, and our friends in Alberta claim it is equally as good as Pennsylvania anthracite. That is a matter of opinion. Personally I like Pennsylvania anthracite when I can get it; but that is neither here nor there. The available quantities of coal of that particular quality in Alberta cannot be produced in large enough quantities to meet the demands in the province for that class of coal. We have got to have anthracite coal there in the winter time. If we did not have Pennsylvania anthracite coal at this particular time we would have to consign to the scrap heap our base-burner coal stoves that can only be used satisfactorily with anthracite, or similar type of coal. Briquettes, if we had them, would work very satisfactorily, and that is the argument advanced by the hon. member for Regina this afternoon. I understand, not that there should be a bounty, not that there should be protection, but that there should be an experiment as it were, or a demonstration that the use of this lignite is commercially and economically feasible. We have been working along that line for some considerable time, but is is largely private capital that has been used and it has been an uphill job. What is now asked is that the Government should undertake to give a demonstration on a commercial scale to show that that coal can be produced economically. We are given to understand that with proper equipment this coal can be produced at almost one-half of what we have to pay for the Pennsylvania anthracite, and that the two coals are about equal in burning qualities.

In regard to the fuel controller's restrictions I would like to say that, while I have not had it direct from the controller's office, press reports give us to understand that restrictions are to be placed on the amount of coal that the consumer may store at one time. I do not know whether such restriction is intended to apply to western Canada, but if it is, the fuel controller will have made one of the most serious mistakes that any man placed in charge of fuel, or anything else in Canada, has so far committed. I hope that the fuel controller does not intend to go that far. We in western Canada have got—and we have been educating our people to carry out this policy—to put in our winter supply of soft coal during the summer months. The statement is made that coal deteriorates in storage. There are some kinds that will not deteriorate to any appreciable extent in storage. There are large quantities of coal from southern and Central Alberta that will keep for months and months, for an entire year if you like, in ordinary storage; in a basement this coal will keep almost for an indefinite period. Some of the northern coals do not possess the same keeping qualities. However, the reason I have given is not the only one why such a restriction should not apply, at least to western Canada. I have another reason to cite in opposition to it. We consume immense quantities of coal in western Canada, and at the time the people have usually been filling up their bins with coal they have also been moving their wheat out. That works all right in so far as bringing in the anthracite coal is concerned; they can take that back in the cars from Fort William and Port Arthur, and it does not make so much difference. But when it comes to taking cars for the Alberta coal it is an entirely different matter, and the amount of power and the number of cars used during the months of October and November corresponds to about the power and cars required to move anywhere from eight to twelve million bushels of wheat to the head of the lakes. You will, therefore, see how important the restriction in question is from that viewpoint, apart altogether from securing a

supply of fuel for the winter months. We had a serious situation in Western Canada some time ago, just as serious, if not more so, than you had here in Ontario last winter, and we have only prevented a recurrence of it by endeavouring to get our people to secure their supply of coal during the months of June, July and August. That surely should apply this year more than at any time in the past. Without doubt, immediately wheat starts to move in western Canada this year, not one particle of power, nor any cars, should be used in handling coal that could be avoided.

As I stated a minute ago, I have absolutely no objection whatever to bringing in mining machinery free.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe): Mining machinery has been on the free list for ten or fifteen years.

Mr. MAHARG: I am glad to know it; it helps to make the argument all the stronger. There are a lot of other things that also ought to be free of duty. If it is a good thing to bring in the implements of one industry free in order to stimulate it, the principle should apply all the way round. I am very glad, indeed, to know that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get back into the matter of protection at all. But our protectionist people are always ready to remove the protection on everything that comes their particular way. I will just give you one illustration. I was talking to a British Columbia fruit grower, and incidentally the matter of protection on fruit came up, and he wanted to know what the western members were going to do about it. Perhaps he had been a little terrorized, I am not sure, but he had an idea that we were going to do something in the matter of duties. I told him that I did not know what they were going to do. He said: "You can remove the duty on any old thing you like, but for heaven's sake don't touch fruit." He was an absolute free trader so long as free trade did not apply to fruit. If it did, he immediately switched around. That is about the position we are in in western Canada, in so far as the fuel situation is concerned. All that we are asking is that the Government will at least demonstrate that the large and almost inexhaustible lignite coal fields in southern Saskatchewan can be put on the map as a commercial industry in order that we may not be entirely dependent on American anthracite coal to heat our homes during the winter. We must have either anthracite, or a substitute for it, a fuel that will keep up a continuous fire anywhere from sixteen to twenty-four hours.

[Mr. Maharg.]

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have heard several hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan, Ontario and British Columbia speak on this coal question, some of them offering their coal to the province of Quebec and to the other provinces of the Dominion which have no coal mines. After listening to these hon. gentlemen, I ask myself if they have made any practical suggestion in the course of their long or short speeches. Has it occurred to this Government, which seems to want to take charge of everything, to pass even an Order in Council to relieve the city of Montreal from a fuel shortage? I am speaking particularly of soft coal. The industries of Montreal depend on the mines of the Maritime Provinces for their supply of coal. They are compelled to bring in this coal during the season of navigation, although we know that just across the line, as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) has said, only an imaginary line, there is coal. I am going to make a constructive suggestion: why not blot out this imaginary line during the war? Are we not at war equally with the United States? If so, let us help one another. In this way we may save the situation and relieve Montreal of the problem of a coal shortage such as it had last winter. I propose, as a practical proposition, the removal of the duty during the war, so that we can get from the other side of the imaginary line the coal to satisfy the industries of Canada. I say that Montreal is suffering to-day from shortage of coal. We are paying more for gas and for light on account of this shortage. And we look to this Government, this Government of great men, to do something practical by blotting out this duty during the war. That is all I am going to say, because I do not want to be accused of making a long speech. But we are expecting something practical from the Government in the sense of what I have been talking about.

10 p.m.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I think that British Columbia fruit grower, to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Maharg) referred a little while ago, who was satisfied to have free trade in everything but fruit, is typical of free traders, and, in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. L. A. Lapointe), who has just referred to Montreal and the coal situation there, let me ask him to recall the situation with respect to coal in the

city of Montreal some few years ago. In the year when Mr. Fielding and the late Mr. Paterson went down to Washington to negotiate the reciprocity treaty, in the month of April, the city of Montreal called for tenders for the supply of coal for the city for one year. The Dominion Coal Company was the only Canadian tenderer. There were one or more American tenderers, and the city of Montreal bought its coal from the American tenderer that year at 31 cents a ton less than the Dominion Coal Company's tender, so I do not think Montreal is suffering so very much from this "imaginary line."

Now, I have been struck by a number of statements that were made by these free traders, and it was only when they announced themselves as such that I thought they were free traders, for they did not argue along those lines. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) says that trade is the basis of wealth. That may be. But how are you going to trade if you do not produce? I think production is at the bottom of the whole matter. I think my hon. friend has forgotten a few of the principles that he learned from Adam Smith, and it is pretty nearly time for him to reread the Wealth of Nations. I think, Mr. Speaker, when we come to consider the whole matter, as far as eastern Nova Scotia is concerned, there are one or two things that are at the bottom of our declining production. One is the matter of transportation. I know myself that, in the month of June, 1917, the Dominion Coal Company were in straits as to shipping. A certain amount of their shipping had been commandeered for war purposes, and I know that they were making very, very strong appeals to the Government of the day to have returned a number of their ships in order that they might transport their coal up the St. Lawrence. It is true that that may not have hampered production at the time; that might not have been the immediate cause of the slackening production, because at the time a large number of their men had enlisted, so that the Dominion Coal Company lost some thousands of employees, and perhaps had all their men remained there, together with the commandeering, the situation might have been very much more serious. The only reason in the world why they have not suffered during the two last years for the want of shipping, is simply that into Sydney Harbour comes a very, very large amount of shipping. Almost every week or so, thirty, thirty-one, and, as high as thirty-nine, ships, varying in tonnage from 7,000 to 17,000 tons, assemble there to be convoyed across the ocean. These ships all fill their bunkers there. Therefore, the question of transportation was not such a very serious one during the last year or two.

But with respect to the production of coal at least in Cape Breton county, there is a more serious question than that. The Nova Scotia Steel Company and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company are the two principal producers of coal in the province of Nova Scotia. They have coal areas so interlaced on either side of the harbour that the production of coal by either is hampered. So far as that is concerned, the suggestion of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McGregor) is a very timely one, namely, that the Government might possibly co-operate with the local Government to see if there is not some remedy for an evil which has really been tying up and hampering the production of coal in the county of Cape Breton.

One hon. member referred to the overhead charges of some of those companies. Not more than a couple of months ago a financial paper—I forget the name—came out with a photograph of Mr. Crockard, the new general manager of the Nova Scotia Steel Company. Under the photograph was given the amount of his salary, $100,000 a year. One hundred thousand dollars a year to manage that little twopenny-halfpenny company—a larger salary than the President of the United States receives! As my hon. friend has pointed out, that represents twenty cents a ton on every ton of coal mined by that company, or a dollar a ton on every ton of coal that they sell, and they sell all they can over and above what they consume themselves in the steel works. The country has to pay for that. It is twenty cents additional on each ton of coal. That is only one case, for all through the company you will find officials with salaries growing gradually smaller, but still large. If you stood at the street car when the people began pouring out of the general offices, you would think there was staff enough to manage the Standard Oil Company. There are young men there by the dozen, and no one knows what they are doing. Probably they should be at the front.

The question of transportation is very important, for, after all, we ship coal from Sydney harbour, approximately only eight months in a year. Sometimes we can ship for nine months. On the northern side of the harbour the coal can sometimes be shipped for ten months. The fuel con-

troller goes down to Nova Scotia, and he sets prices on coal regardless of the enormous, the stupendous blunders that are from day to day being committed by the management. Take, for instance, to-day the Nova Scotia Steel Company with four mines and nineteen mine managers. If you go down to their steel works at Sydney mines, you can find one piece of machinery which, when completed, cost $750,000, which has never earned a five dollar bill and which is now on the scrap heap. If they continue for a few more years their blunders for which the people of eastern Canada are paying every day, they will have more dollars in their scrap heap than in their coal seams.

An hon. MEMBER: They will require more protection.

Mr. BUTTS: They will require more protection from their own follies. Labour is another great problem there, and it is certainly hard to understand how, under present circumstances, we can supply an adequate quantity of labour. We do not wish to see an inferior class of people brought into the country. We want the country to remain the white man's country. We do not want to see coolie or Chinese labour brought in. We wish to see the standard of our population maintained as high as it is at present and, if possible, improved. The only solution I can see for the difficulty is to encourage production by having cheap mining machinery, as suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McGregor). Cheap mining machinery is something over which, as has been stated, the Government has no control, as at the present time there is no duty upon it. I wish to refer to some of the very peculiar statements that have been made. Great Britain, before free trade, was starving. The miners of Nova Scotia, before protection, were not very far from the mark. I wonder if my hon. friend can explain the paradox. It is a strange thing that but a short time ago an auditor was sent down to some of our mines in Cape Breton —I speak now for the consuming public generally. This auditor, on his return, stated that the Acadia Coal Company, for instance, was selling coal at the rate of $6.35 a ton net, run of mine. He made the further statement that the company was losing $1.50 a ton at that price. It may be very generous on the part of the Acadia Coal Company to supply the community at large with coal at a loss of $1.50 a ton, but such generosity, if it exists, is something that I should like to see explained. I should like, at the same time, any person to explain to me how it is that the cost of production of coal in any mine in Nova Scotia ever came to even $4 a ton. I have been buying coal now for a very considerable length of time, and I have yet to put in my cellar the first ton of coal that ever cost me $4.50. At present I can put coal in my cellar at $3.60 a ton, and the coal company is not selling at a loss. Yet this auditor tells us that he has set a price for them of $6.35 per ton of 2,000 pounds. It is not very long ago since the Dominion Coal Company was able to put over their wharves at Sydney, after transporting it by rail for 17 miles from their mine, coal at $1.12 a ton. The only way the problem can be explained is that the companies down there took this auditor out for a walk.

I think perhaps the only real suggestion I have heard in the course of this debate, with reference to the coal product of eastern Canada, came from my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McGregor) who suggested that this Government get in touch with the Nova Scotia government and see if some changes could not be made in the mining laws of that province to change the leases and facilitate the mining of coal, and perhaps remove a great many of the obstructions the coal companies have had to contend with up to the present time. There is considerable talk in the newspapers from time to time about a merger between the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Coal and Steel Company. I do not know whether it is likely to come to anything or not, nor do I care just now to say whether on general grounds it would be a good thing or not, but I do say that it would at least be a cure for the interlacing of leases, and in that way might materially increase the production of coal. Possibly the conscripting of labour might be looked into when we are considering what can be done to increase the production of coal in this country. There is room for a great many more mine hands and coal workers. The occupation, of course, requires a very considerable amount of skill, particularly the underground work, and it occurred to me, when our western friends were talking about their miners working only one-half or one-third or one-quarter time, that perhaps the best remedy might be for them to send down to eastern Canada a lot of their very best miners, and we will give them employment the year round.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am not going to make any extended remarks, but it seems

necessary to say a word or two in this debate. The speakers have travelled over wide ground, and I am not going to follow them, especially along the lines of a free trade or protectionist discussion. We never would know the particular virtue in my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) unless in the course of his speech he drew a little from the fountain head and source of the economic instruction which he got in Old England before he came to this country. We would lose a great deal of his fire and vigour and peculiar force if he did not drink of that fountain and give us the results of the stimulation gained therefrom. After all, my hon. friend from Red Deer must once in a while settle back and think something like this: Is it possible that all the rest of the world opposed to me is wrong and that I, with those who agree with me, am the only one who is right? He has had a long period in which to indoctrinate the gentlemen on the other side of the House, and with all his vigour he has attempted also to indoctrinate the gentlemen on this side; but I think it will be a long, long while before he gets every one to agree with him that his particular brand of economics is the only true and genuine one. However, I am not going to carry on the discussion along the lines of free trade or protection, because that is not particularly the thing for us to consider at this time. We have come up against a set of circumstances in our country into which very many different factors enter, and we cannot see the whole question properly unless we take a pretty broad view of all the facts. To simply take one and follow it up and found an argument on that will lead us, I think, to a mistaken conclusion. It is very difficult indeed for us to get an all-round view and come to the proper conclusion to be drawn from such a view, but I am just going to mention two or three things that occurred to me during the debate.

Some one raised the question as to what the fuel controller was appointed for, and came to the conclusion that his chief duty was to stimulate and increase the production of coal. Now I do not think that was the object in view in appointing the fuel controller. We are peculiarly situated here. Bring out all the coal we possibly can from west, middle and east, but such are the circumstances of this country as regards distance and transport that unless we have a large importation of coal from the United States we shall have difficulties before the season is over.

In that country, to which we look for a surplus of coal to make up our deficit of fifteen or sixteen million tons, there are also peculiar conditions. My hon. friend from Montreal thinks the whole thing would be solved by taking the duty off coal and letting it come into Montreal and other parts of Canada free. So far as preventing a shortage of coal in this country is concerned, that would not affect the present situation one single bit because the trouble in the United States is to get the supply of coal that we require to keep up the motive power of our industries and the warmth of our dwellings. So whether there was a duty or not, it would not help to provide that amount in the United States which we require. The fuel controller was primarily appointed to see by all possible fair means that we so put our case before the United States authorities that we would receive an allotment of some 16,000,000 tons of coal a year for every year this war is on. That was his primary duty; that duty he set himself to perform, and that duty both last year and this he has absolutely well and perfectly performed. I would like the House to remember that. Unless we had succeeded in putting our case in such a way, and arranging matters in such a way, that the United States might use that allocation, we would have been in very great trouble and at very great disadvantage. We have certainly been saved from that position, first, by the eminently fair and sympathetic way in which the United States authorities have met us, and, secondly, by the way in which—and I think the perfectly good and reasonable way in which—Mr. Magrath, the fuel controller, approached the United States authorities, and put Canada's case before them. As to that part of his duty, I do not think any hon. member in this House who has any spirit of fairness at all—and we all have that—will find any fault with the fuel controller. Outside of that, the duty of the fuel controller was, as far as possible, to see that the distribution of this imported coal went to the districts that needed it, in such equitable and fair proportions as would give to each district its due, without congesting any, or starving others. In that respect, I think the fuel controller's exertions have been rewarded with success. Remember it was not the duty of the fuel controller to pick up a ton of coal somewhere in the United States and land it in the cellar of the man in Canada who wanted to burn it. He was to provide the coal, so that it could be available for the transport man, and the merchant to bring away, so

that the importer and the dealer would have his supply of coal. It was not Mr. Magrath's duty at all to provide for the transport of that coal, and I think he has been somewhat unfairly criticised, because different transport conditions prevailed last year from those which had heretofore prevailed, and caused a great proportion of the disadvantage and confusion, and of the shortage, and in some cases the privation, which occurred in the supply of coal in this country; but in so far as the supply of coal itself was concerned, Mr. Magrath obtained last year for Canada within a few tons as much as she had the preceding year. Some people have expressed their anxiety lest this year we should be in privation and have trouble again. If things go on ordinarily well—the word "ordinarily" being taken in conjunction with these present disturbed conditions in both countries—and if there is not greater trouble in transport and other things than last year, Canada will get her allotment from the United States for the year 1918-19, and the fuel controller will see to it, as he did last year, that that coal is equitably, rationably and reasonably distributed where it is wanted. Then, outside of the duty of making provision for the imported coal, and the distribution of it, it is also the duty of the fuel controller to control as far as he reasonably can the prices, and he is given authority by Order in Council to fix the prices, and the principle upon which prices are fixed is exactly the principle upon which prices are fixed in the United States. As far as is possible, the fuel controller there, as here, gets at the cost of production in the several mines, and different mines have different costs of production. In the United States, as in this country, different prices are put upon the coal as it is produced from different mines, because of these generic differences in the mines themselves. The principle is this: You find the cost of production and then allow reasonable amount for the profit of the distributor, seeing that distributors do not multiply the profits, one from the other, and the profit of the producer. The fuel controller of this country is carrying out the same principle, and he is fixing his prices upon the very same principle as that adopted in the United States. If mines differ, and if there be faults in human agencies, as there will be, it may very well happen that a fuel controller, attempting to fix the prices in the different sections and mines of this country, having to depend, in the first place, upon the calculation of cost, and adding the prices or profits that are reasonably allowable, may make mistakes. If he does, he has a chance to revise, but in the majority of instances it will be fair to assume that if his calculations of cost are correct, then, as a matter of course, the prices that are fixed, with the reasonable profits added to the cost, will be what may be called reasonable and equitable prices. With reference to production, not only has the fuel controller these principal objects in mind, but he is doing every thing that one man can possibly do to speed up production. But his powers of speeding up production are not as large as they possibly might be, and it may very well happen that one fuel controller is not able to handle the whole business that I have been talking about, and at the same time effect what my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McGregor) describes as a "speed-up." I cannot speak from an intimate knowledge of the whole mining industry, and my statements are merely impressions, but from what I have learned during the last two years, I think there is need for more co-ordination and for some general principle of directive power to be brought to bear upon the coal-mining industry in this country, to make sure that coal mining is carried on in a scientific way, with a due regard to economy of production, and to scientific methods of production. There are also, I am led to believe—and I think it may be true—certain anomalies in the relation of certain coal-mining companies to other coal-mining companies, and if what has been stated here as to the matter of salaries is correct, it may very well be that there is some anomaly in that respect, and we ought to have some overhand directive power to correct it, if it is necessary to do that. I think that a fair method of co-operation between the provincial authorities in Nova Scotia, which have so much to do with mines and have such an interest in them, and the Dominion authorities might very well be aimed at, in order to get at the best result. We have on the 17th of this month a conference of all the operators of labour connected with the industry, and of transport people connected with the carrying and distribution of coal here in the city of Ottawa. That has been called for the purpose of taking the whole question into consideration and arriving at some method by which better results than we have had hitherto may be obtained for this year and succeeding years. But we must remember that we have difficulties in labour, difficulties in transport and difficulties in distribution in this country. It is impossible for us to forget it when

we are taking this whole question into consideration. In reference to what the Government should do, or may do, we all know that there is a good deal said that is very general in its character.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he can inform the House as to what the estimated increase in production is in the United States for 1918 as compared with 1917?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I could give my hon. friend only a general idea. In the United States, from circumstances that have arisen there, they require at least one hundred million tons more to be produced this year than last year. So far as it goes from month to month, there is sometimes a decrease and sometimes an increase compared with the same months of last year. I noticed just to-day that in the month of March there was a considerable increase in anthracite coal as compared with March of last year. My impression is, however, that, on the whole, they will have an increased production in the United States this year, if things go as smoothly as they hope in labour and in transport matters, of fifty million tons, and they are trying to eliminate waste and restrict use so as to make a saving of another fifty million tons. But the thing changes so very rapidly from week to week and month to month that it is pretty difficult to get at anything more than a merely approximate estimate. I do not know whether I have satisfactorily answered my hon. friend, but I have made a dash at it.

I was speaking about the ideas that are put forward as to what the Government should do. It is such an easy thing to say that what the Government ought to do is to see that there is the greatest possible development of electrical energy, that there is the greatest possible production of gas—I mean gas for motive power purposes—that there is the greatest possible need for production of coal and for saving and the like of that. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is anxious that the people should be taught to gather wood and burn that. Excellent advice, but the Government is not able to do all these things.

Some arguments fell from hon. gentlemen this afternoon from which is deducible the idea that we should go to work and open coal mines and run them, open gas wells and run them and develop electrical power and things of that sort. When the Mines Branch was under discussion there seemed to be a drift on the part of some hon. members towards the view that the Mines Branch was to be a general operating, working and developing piece of machinery which would have money at its disposal to develop whatever mines were necessary after the deposits had been found, and that it would become a great working force. Well, I think there is some point at which we must make a stand in that respect. There are some things that Governments can do and some things that they cannot do. In this time of war what this Government cannot do is to put money into the development of iron properties, or platinum properties or any other great properties and, with their own work and their own capital, develop them and sell the proceeds. It seems to me that what the Mines Department is for is to search out diligently and find the deposits of value, explain and elucidate these, their qualities and extent, make them known generally, and then allow capital to go to work and develop them. That is the aim of the departments as they are run in Ottawa and I think in every country.

Now, the Government proposes to go a little farther than that in the matter of coal. We have heard discussed to-day the quality of the low grade lignite in Saskatchewan which, if it is amenable to the process of successful briquetting will solve the question in so far as briquetting goes for the whole of the lignite coal of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Government proposes, in co-operation with Manitoba and Saskatchewan, to put in an experimental unit or two for producing briquettes at or near Estevan. From the investigation which was made by the Department of Mines, by the Advisory Council of Scientific Research, and after careful study by other forces and elements in the country, the conclusion has been arrived at that it is as nearly certain as it can be that there is a process by which that coal can be put into a condition where it will rival anthracite and do the work that anthracite now does. The Government in a case like that thinks that it is justified in taking that up and, as an experiment, trying to put it upon a commercial foundation and proving its practicability. I think it will then be a matter for consideration whether it will carry it on as a government industry, whether the local governments will carry it on as a local government industry, or whether, having demonstrated the feasibility of the process and opened up the field to capital, municipal, corporation or otherwise, it will be

left for the usual channels of business to develop it and carry it on.

Mr. MAHARG: Do you propose doing that in the near future so that we will be able to reap some benefit by next winter?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I suppose that it will take a year to instal the whole of the equipment and get it into working order but it is the intention of the Government to organize it at once and go on with the experiment. What has been proven by laboratory work, and what is a little more extensive than ordinary laboratory work, is that you can take this lignite at Estevan, carbonize it, put it into the shape of briquettes with a suitable binder and you can do it at a cost of somewhere between $6 and $7 per ton of briquettes. The value, as compared with anthracite, I think, is about equal. If you can do that at a cost of $7 at Estevan, you can put it into Regina at a cost which will certainly be less than that at which you can put anthracite there. Free trader or protectionist, I do not care a hang which, every man will hold up his hand for that as being good business. If you can do that out of comparatively worthless coal near your own doors and save to these three provinces $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 instead of having that money go out of your country, if you do that by developing the lignites in your own country, give the people a better coal, do away with those long hauls which are so uneconomical, and if you can get the stuff you want with a shorter haul, surely it is good business to do it. That is what the Government proposes to do in that respect. If the Government does that, and does nothing more, and if it proves to be a commercial success, it will have given a great boon to that country for all time to come. It will put the people out there in the position where they can have that kind of coal which is not only tidy and neat, but which is pleasing to the eye and grateful to the body for the warmth which it gives. It will give them these advantages from the coal right in their own district, which is inexhaustible in quantity.

I do not want to prolong my remarks. I felt that it was necessary to say something with reference to the matter, particularly with reference to this last question, which is a practical thing. My own idea is that there was a great deal of wisdom in the remarks that were made by my hon. friend from Cape Breton, and that there is a possible way in which, gradually but surely, we may bring the coal mining industry in this country where it will serve our own wants and make us independent of any contretemps, any situations which might possibly arise in future as between us and other countries of supply. In a way it is a fair thing for Canada to think that the coal measures in the United States are not inexhaustible. Canada has coal measures, which, of their kind, are practically inexhaustible, and in the years of the future she will have to depend more upon herself; and it is well that this country should begin as quickly as possible to put her producing machinery in order to co-ordinate the use of coal and get along towards the point where she will supply herself.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): I merely wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce a question. I followed him very closely in his explanation of the duties of the food controller up to the point where he had arranged with the United States authorities to set aside fifteen or sixteen million tons per year for the use of Canada. The controller's next step was to distribute that quantity of coal, and I would ask the minister how far the distribution goes, whether it is to the provinces, towns, or localities, and how closely the controller follows that distribution.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He follows distribution in this way: He does not either create or call into being coal carriers or coal distributors—they are in our towns and cities and outlying places. The system of gathering information tells him about the needs of each one of these communities —what they had last year, and what they have for this year—and he sees as far as he possibly can that each one of these sections gets its reasonable quota as compared with the preceding year. That is the way the system operates: It follows along in a natural channel, but it also is guided by the controller in the distribution to these centres of supply.

Mr. COPP: And the dealers will look after getting their orders filled, and getting the coal to their locality?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. And the controller holds a supervising power over the dealer from the time the coal gets into this country until it reaches the consumer. He holds the power of preventing unreasonable charges, and there is also this power that he has: If it so happens that in a district one part of that community may be in the way of filling its cellars while another part of the same community has but little or none, the controller has the power to say how much shall go, or the maxi-

mum quantity beyond which it shall not go; and if there is hoarding, and it comes to his knowledge that one person is suffering and has nothing and the other person has his bin full, he has power to take out from that bin and distribute a portion of the coal to the suffering one. Those are his general supervising powers.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie, Sask.): I intended to submit a question but I am very glad indeed that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, by his statement, has relieved me from the necessity of doing so. It was with reference to an item that appeared in the Saskatoon Star of April the 10th, stating that the Dominion Governmen, in unison with the Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, were establishing a plan which the minister has just told us they have already entered into. I wish to congratulate the Government on that policy which will be received by the people of the West with a great deal of cordiality, because we have in Saskatchewan, as the minister said, an unlimited amount of lignite coal which should be capable of being utilized to the very greatest advantage.

I understand the fuel controller has sent orders to the coal dealers in the West not to sell to any one person more than one-thirtieth of the annual supply of coal which he requires. If such is the case it will work very great hardship in the West.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With my hon. friend's permission I will say that I do not think there is any such regulation as that, or that any regulation is set down in that way at all, but, I think, there is general supervising power. There is another thing, if my hon. friend will excuse me for a moment: A fuel controller cannot sit at Ottawa, or any other one place, and stretch his hand over the whole of this country and look after every supply centre. He is working in conjunction and with the cooperation of the provinces, and so each province is asked to, and has consented, to appoint a fuel supervisor, and each municipality has been asked to appoint a fuel commissioner. These all work together from the place of demand in each municipality, city, town or province, as to the amount which is to be allowed, as to what may be given for one section and may not be given for another; and it will depend very largely upon the recommendation and thought of the one who is nearest to the centre of demand. That probably explains part of the question my hon. friend has asked.

Mr. J. F. REID: I am very glad to have this information. It was very plainly stated by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) that in the West during the summer months it is absolutely necessary for us to stock up with our supply of coal for the year, because at that season the freight and box cars are standing idle, and we may as well have the use of them as far as possible in bringing in coal. If transportation is interfered with and the settlers are crying out for coal in the fall when the cars should be carrying our wheat to the East, it will be a very serious thing.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend need not have any fear about that, because the fuel controller is just as anxious that coal shall be got in early during the summer months as any person out there could very well be.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel it my duty to remind hon. members that the House has not got into committee.

Mr. J. F. REID: I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I am a new member of the House, and I shall be glad to be corrected at any time if I fall into error.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was I whom Mr. Speaker was correcting, and I deserved it too.

Mr. J. F. REID: I want to make a reference to the statement of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Butts), who said we did not want Chinese or coolie labour. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is an opportune time to make that statement, because I understand that at the present time we have over in France some 80,000 or more Chinese labourers, and it seems to me that it does not matter very much whether they are building railroads to aid us in bringing this great war to a successful conclusion, or mining coal for us in this country. And I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if this war continues, Canada will be very glad to have coolie labour to do our work while our boys go to France to fight our battles. I do not think that I have anything more to say, and I am very glad indeed to hear the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to the briquetting plant.

Motion agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not sure whether there was any hard and fast arrangement that we should take up any

thing more to-night. We have spent a goodly portion of the day on this burning question, and perhaps my hon. friends opposite are satisfied to adjourn now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The only arrangement was that which I made with the right hon. gentleman the leader of the House at the beginning of this evening's sitting, which was that, for the time being, I should drop motion No. 5, but that I should proceed with No. 7. If we do not go any further this evening, I am afraid that the Government will be taking Mondays. If my hon. friend will say that we will have Monday next week as Private Members' day, I shall not proceed to-night.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend should be satisfied when I say that we will try to squeeze him in.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, April 16, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House has added the name of Mr. John Harold (Brant) to the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. A. Crerar (Minister of Agriculture), the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution; Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act, chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1907, and to provide that an establishment as defined in the said Act shall include any abattoir, packing house or other premises in which any food or food product which may be named by the Governor in Council is prepared for food for export or is stored for export; and that all fish, fruit or vegetables, or products thereof, or any food or food products which may be named by the Governor in Council, used in any establishment where these articles are prepared for export, shall be sound, wholesome and fit for food; and any such articles or products found in the said establishment unsound or unwholesome shall be confiscated and destroyed in such manner as may be provided by the regulations; and also that no person shall offer or accept for export or import, or shall export or import any articles subject to inspection unless the requirements regarding inspection and marking have been complied with in respect to such articles, and every person offering any carcass, or portion or product thereof, or fruit or vegetable, or products thereof, or food or food products named by the Governor in Council, for export or import, or exporting or importing such carcass, portion or product, or any fruit or vegetable, or products thereof, or food or food products named by the Governor in Council, shall furnish such proof as is required by the regulations as to whether the articles so offered for export or import, or exported or imported, are subject to inspection or not; and, further, that no carcass or portion of product thereof intended for food shall be imported into Canada unless proof satisfactory to the Minister accompany it that the same has passed Government inspection in the country of origin, and any such carcass or portion or product thereof imported into Canada shall be subject to such further inspection, and shall confirm to such requirements as the Governor in Council may by regulation prescribe; and that no fruit or vegetables or products thereof, or food or food products which may be named by the Governor in Council, shall be imported into Canada or exported from Canada, unless the same conform to such requirements as the Governor in Council may by regulation prescribe; and that any carcass or portion or product thereof, or fruit or vegetable or products thereof, or food or food product, that does not conform to the requirements of such regulations shall, upon condemnation by any inspector, be forfeit to His Majesty, and may be disposed of as the Minister may direct; and, further, that no article subject to inspection shall be offered or sold for export or import, or exported or imported, under any name intended or calculated to deceive as to its true nature; and that no package containing any article subject to inspection shall be marked with any label, brand or mark which falsely represents the quantity or weight or contents of such package; and that no package containing any article subject to inspection shall be marked with any label, brand or mark which falsely represents the date when the articles or goods contained therein were packed.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: The main object of this resolution is to apply the same regulations to imported foodstuffs, in the way of meats and canned goods, as now obtain in regard to the manufacture of similar articles in Canada. It is also intended to broaden the application of the regulations to include, for instance, such articles as condensed milk, which I am told was not manufactured in Canada at the time the Act was originally passed. It also provides the conditions under which these foods can be admitted into Canada, in the sense that the regulations governing their manufacture in the country of origin may be accepted under proper certification. We are in rather an anomalous position. At the time the Meat and Canned Foods Act was passed, I understand the purpose was to establish a standard or reputation for our manufactured goods of this kind exported to markets outside Canada. We have not, however, ap-

plied the regulations to similar importations, with the result that American manufacturers, for instance, are permitted to export and sell in Canada goods which they are not permitted under their own laws to sell in the United States. An instance of that kind occurred in British Columbia a year ago when a considerable consignment of beef affected with tuberculosis and slaughtered in the States was shipped to British Columbia and sold there, when it would have been quite impossible for it to have been sold in the United States. That is mainly the idea of the legislation that is intended to be founded on this resolution.

Mr. BUREAU: I think this is the longest resolution I have ever read, and if the object the minister wishes to attain is simply what he says, he could have attained it by a much shorter resolution. I understand the Minister of Agriculture does not want slaughterhouses doing business in the United States to import into this country meat which is not subject to the same regulation as the meat which is slaughtered in Canada. Is that one of the objects of the resolution?

Mr. CRERAR: Not quite. We want to put ourselves in the position that we can refuse admission to Canada of products not properly certified to by the inspection system of the country in which they originate.

Mr. BUREAU: From which they issue?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, where they are manufactured.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought the object was to make all such importations into Canada, subject to the same inspection as that to which the product of the Canadian manufacturer is subject to, and I think such a resolution would be more equitable. If the meat is to conform to the degree of inspection which is required by the country from which it comes, how are we going to control it? I understand the minister to say that if meat is imported from the United States, he desires the United States standard to be applied to the meat so imported.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Why so? Does the minister not think it would be fair to apply to any commodity imported into Canada the same standard as is applied to the Canadian producer? If you are going to have a system of inspection for Canadian produce, why not subject the importation of similar produce to the same standard? If we are going to consume imported products in Canada let us have one standard that will protect the consumer, and let it be the Canadian standard, instead of the standard of the exporting country.

Mr. CRERAR: We can absolutely control our manufacture in Canada by our own system of inspection. We obviously cannot send our inspectors to the places where these goods are manufactured in the United States. We can examine their regulations as to the purity of the article manufactured in the United States, and if we are satisfied that those regulations sufficiently guard the purity of the goods, then we can admit the article under the certification that it is manufactured under such regulations.

Mr. BUREAU: The resolution seems to go a little further than that. It says:

> And also that no person shall offer or accept for export or import.

If a Canadian dealer is going to accept for import those goods coming from the United States, why not subject him to the same inspection as the man who is producing in Canada? My hon. friend says we are going to examine their regulations, and if we find their regulations protect us sufficiently, why should we require an inspection on this side? My answer is that the regulations may be all right. You are making regulations in this country. Why do you appoint an inspector? Your regulations may be the best in the world, but what would those regulations be worth unless they were complied with? And how will you know they are complied with, unless you have your inspector who will inspect the produce and see that the produce which is offered on the market complies with the requirements enacted by my hon. friend's department for the protection of the consumer? That is what I think was intended by the resolution. Otherwise why should the words, " or offer for import " be necessary? It would only be necessary to say, " shall not be imported," if the theory of the hon. gentleman is to hold good. My objection is to the acceptance of any regulation made by the United States, and the fact that, if you find the regulations satisfactory you are going to conclude they have been complied with. It is not the regulation, so much as the compliance with it, that protects the consumer.

Mr. CRERAR: Perhaps I am not making myself perfectly clear. As I understand it, it will work out in this way: the inspectors in the United States factories would inspect and supervise the manufacture of these articles.

Mr. BUREAU: American inspectors?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, they would attach the certificate of the American regulations to the manufactured article, and the article could be imported upon such certification. At the present time the American manufacturers can ship into Canada goods that have no certification or inspection whatever.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that perfectly.

Mr. CRERAR: Does my hon. friend suggest we should send our inspector to the United States to supervise the manufacture of these goods there?

Mr. BUREAU: No. I say that before such goods are placed on the market, they should be subject to inspection of the Canadian inspector. If I go to the United States and buy twelve cars of beef—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Or oleomargarine.

Mr. BUREAU: —or oleomargarine—why should I take the certificate of the American inspector? I presume it is all right, but my hon. friend has just stated they were shipping diseased cattle into British Columbia, and one of the reasons why this Act is proposed is to protect the Canadian consumer from the tuberculosis-affected cattle of the adjoining United States territory. If the ordinary Canadian trader thinks Canadians can be fed on tubercular cattle, there might be some United States inspector who would hold the same opinion. I think it would give more confidence if we had the same inspection, and standard and certificate for meat which is imported from the United States as we have for meat produced in Canada.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL: I might be permitted to say one word on this subject. I think I am within the mark in saying that the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) would not be practicable, for the reason that there is an immense trade going on between the United States and Canada, and between various packing establishments in both countries. They would be very seriously interfered with if there were a multiplication of inspection duties, and for a great many years practically the same system has been adopted in the officially-inspected establishments in the United States and the officially-inspected establishments in Canada. Those regulations being framed according to the very best practice, so long as the article coming from the inspection establishments of either Canada or the United States bear the stamp of the inspector, showing that they have been inspected, there is free ingress and egress to and from both countries. But what the Minister of Agriculture is aiming at is to control those imports from the United States and have them subject to the same drastic regulations employed by their official inspection in their establishments, and such examples as he gave, for instance, as meat coming into British Columbia affected with tuberculosis, is quite a vivid illustration that that particular class of product was not subject to the official inspection of the bureau of the United States. We therefore should have some control of all those unregulated products and exports to our country. But I think it would be a mistake to demand such a sweeping measure as not to permit or recognize the official inspection of the United States, because, if you did that, they would immediately refuse to accept the official stamp of the inspectors of Canada, and you would find a very serious interference with the immense trade of the countries in these products.

Mr. ROBB: In this matter, I support the views of the Minister of Agriculture and of the Secretary of State. I infer from the statement of the Minister of Agriculture and the Secretary of State that this will be a reciprocal arrangement with the United States and that they will accept Canadian inspection?

Mr. CRERAR: They do now.

Mr. ROBB: I understand that under the old law we controlled domestic and export trade, but not import trade. The only difference I can see now is that by this legislation we are controlling the import trade.

Mr. CURRIE: Before this resolution carries I think we ought to ask the Minister of Agriculture to let us know one or two things. As I understand the Inspection Act in Canada, the public is the goat. We have been inspecting all the stuff we send out of Canada, while a lot of stuff that is consumed in Canada is not inspected at all. For instance, the people of Canada can be supplied with beef from animals suffering from lumpy jaw and all that sort of thing. Is there any meat sold by retail in Canada that is subject to inspection?

Mr. BURRELL: For interprovincial trade.

Mr. CURRIE: If it is sold for interprovincial trade, it is inspected, but if it is sold locally, it is not inspected. The same applies to a great many other things

that the minister is now taking into consideration. The people of Canada have to take their chance as to the food which is supplied them, but if it goes out of the province, or to a foreign country, it is inspected, and protection is thus afforded to the people of another province or to the foreigner. I think the time has come when the people will demand that there shall be an inspection of all meat that is consumed in Canada, except in the case where a man kills an animal himself and sells the meat by retail. Even in that case some action should be taken. We do not go far enough. We protect the English and the American consumer by a rigid system of inspection, while we allow our own people to be fed with cancerous beef and mutton from abroad and from home.

In reference to the cold storage warehouses. Some years ago we had that matter under discussion, and it is a very warm topic at the present time among the people of this country. This idea of permitting cold storage warehouses to keep eggs and chickens and meat in cold storage for eight or ten years and then unload them on the public when the price is high, is something that should receive our immediate attention. The minister should take unto himself the power, as they have in Australia and other countries, to fix a date beyond which it shall not be permitted to keep meats in cold storage. If I get a deer in Muskoka and I put it in cold -storage, I have to take it out of cold storage at the first of the year or I am liable to a fine. Why shouldn't other meats be treated likewise? The way in which the public has been imposed upon by the cold storage warehouses is an outrage. I do not wish to mention any particular name, and it is unnecessary for me to do so in so far as this is concerned, but I do say that the time is ripe for the minister to take action so that regulations may be provided by this Government and this House, which is the moving spirit of the Government, providing that anybody who puts food into cold storage shall be required to take it out before it becomes embalmed.

There are other matters connected with this same problem which, had I known this subject was coming up this afternoon, I would have discussed. For instance, there is the resignation of Mr. O'Connor. Everybody in Canada knows that Mr. O'Connor was right on the job in reference to these cold storage warehouses that are referred to in this resolution. Mr. O'Connor tried to do his duty with the result that the public supported him in his administration of the law. He endeavoured to curb these cold storage warehouses, control the profiteers and compel the marketing of products held for storage in them. But, what do we find? We find that Mr. O'Connor, who has been giving such good public service, has been dismissed, or at least takes his own dismissal—I do not know why or very much about the subject. The public have made up their mind that the interests that control these large warehouses have got this Government and this Parliament by the throat. I think it is time for the members of this House to speak out in no uncertain tone.

Mr. TOLMIE: In regard to the import and export of meat, there has long been an understanding between the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States and our Health of Animals Branch to exchange certificates. The only proper place to make an inspection of meat is on the killing floor, where the offal can be thoroughly inspected at the time the animal is slaughtered. It would be quite impossible for a man to make a thorough inspection of a dressed carcass. I think it would be asking too much of a Canadian inspector to ask him to inspect the contents of an American sausage. Some of these articles are rather mysteriously made at times. In regard to the inspection of meat, all the meat intended for export or for interprovincial trade, is killed in slaughter houses under inspection, a brand is placed on the meat passing inspection and you can always be assured of securing good meat if you get meat bearing the Government brand. All the other meat killed in local slaughter houses, if inspected at all, should be inspected by provincial governments or municipalities.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if this resolution covers a case which was presented to me the other night from Toronto. A gentleman there, a dealer who bought eggs largely and retailed them in the city, said that he had reason to believe that eggs were imported from the United States into Canada subject to export. He understood that some privilege had been conceded by the Department of Agriculture permitting of the candling of these eggs in Canada. The result is that Yankee eggs are unloaded on the Canadian market and good Canadian eggs are exported. I would like to know if the Canadian public are now getting candled Yankee eggs and if they are taking

the place of good Canadian eggs which are sent out for export. Is that possible under the regulations?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think the legislation intended to be passed under this resolution covers the point that the hon. member (Sir Sam Hughes) brings up. It is intended to cover the inspection of meats and canned goods under the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

Sir SAM. HUGHES: It says "foods."

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) who has had a great deal of experience in the administration of this Act, has very exactly, I think, stated the situation. It would be obviously impossible to send our inspectors over to closely examine all the material that entered into canned goods manufactured in the United States. But we can, under the arrangement we have with their Bureau in the United States, admit these goods to Canada under their certificate and be, I think, assured that we are getting only wholesome and proper food. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the other suggestions that are brought up by some hon. members might be discussed in committee on the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We are in committee now.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like to make my point clear. The eggs that are imported from the United States are brought into our cold storage warehouses. A gentleman from Toronto told me the other night that the citizens of Canada were being fed on eggs imported from the southern States subject, under the law, to export. They are brought in under some suspended clause of the Inspection Act permitting these eggs to be examined and candled and if any are found bad they can be replaced by Canadian eggs.

He had reason to believe, he said, that these eggs were being unloaded on the Canadian market and the Canadian eggs sent on for export; in other words, giving the importer the opportunity of bringing in Yankee eggs and sending our Canadian eggs to take their place on the English market. I have heard that the same thing under similar rules has been done with oleomargarine: it has been brought in and mixed with the Canadian product and disposed of in this manner. I take this apportunity of bringing the facts to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture under consideration the requiring of Mr. O'Connor's services in regard to the condemnation of any food supplies in packing houses?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is quite in order in asking who will administer the Act.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: This is a matter in regard to which I think the Minister of Agriculture should go a little further. He undertakes to protect the consumers of Canada in regard to goods that are imported into this country. That is very well so far as it goes, but I think he should also protect Canadian consumers against the existing method of supplying food products to the people in the large cities of Canada. For example, we have some very large abattoirs in the city of Toronto, as well as branches of Chicago houses, and we have established there a municipal abattoir. Previous to its inception there were many small abattoirs scattered through the city causing a serious nuisance in the residential districts. However, by the establishment of a municipal abattoir, the killing of various kinds of live stock was centralized and made subject to inspection. That policy has helped a great deal, but it is only applicable to Toronto. You may go outside that city and in a good sized town find a small establishment carried on as an abattoir, but not subject to inspection. The same statement applies to the canning of goods. Let me give an illustration of what occurred a few years ago in Toronto, and I think is still occurring today in Chicago. You go to a merchant to purchase canned goods. You may be desirous of having for dinner canned chicken or possibly canned turkey, and you buy what purports to be chicken or turkey, and pay the price demanded for such articles. But what do you get? You get a substitute for turkey or chicken in the shape of immature veal, or calf perhaps only a couple of days old. This kind of canned goods is not subject to inspection, and yet I understand the object of the minister in bringing the present measure forward is to protect Canadian consumers against this shipment into Canada. Why should the Americans, who themselves inspect and reject and prohibit the consumption in that country of immature veal and inferior pork and beans be allowed to send such goods into this country? Inferior canned veal and pork and beans, and goods of that nature will not pass inspection in the United States but they are held to be quite good enough for Canada.

The Government cannot be too severe in checking such methods of sending inferior goods into Canada.

At the same time our people should be protected against some of the methods adopted in this country. In my opinion the Minister of Agriculture should go a step further, and provide that all meats consumed in Canada shall be subject to inspection. The appointment in each village or small community of an inspector may be objected to as expensive; but under a proper regulation that could be done and the expense would not be material. It is simple enough to provide that in a certain township the killing of hogs, sheep, cattle, calves, and other live-stock shall be subject to inspection. The people of the township, knowing that inspection was obligatory, some central point could be fixed where the killing might be done and one inspector could devote three days to inspection work in that township. By a proper apportionment of the time it would be possible for the same inspector to cover several townships, and in that way the expense would not be very great. By such a method you could prevent improper and unhealthy meat from reaching the consumer.

In the case of live stock coming to the Toronto stockyards, an unscrupulous drover who was aware of the strict inspection in force would realize at once that he could not market his animals on the stockyards, and therefore he would immediately ship them to some outside section, where they could be slaughtered and the flesh prepared and afterwards consigned to the Toronto market, and thus escape inspection. Again, in the case of the individual farmer, he might kill seven or eight hogs, a couple of head of cattle, and half a dozen sheep and dispose of the meat on the Toronto market without undergoing inspection, a thing which could not be done in the case of animals slaughtered at the stockyards. The fact that there has been no inspection reduces the market value of the meat, but a speculator might obtain full value for goods that merited condemnation. Therefore, I say the Minister of Agriculture should go far enough to protect the Toronto consumers that are consuming Canadian goods which have not passed inspection, and that can be done at very little expense.

So far as goods that are being imported into Canada are concerned, the minister cannot be too strict in enforcing inspection. If that were done the consuming public would be satisfied. Not only should there be such a system of inspection, but I think that all canned goods, whether meats, fruits, or products of other kinds, should have the date stamped upon the can. The longer such goods are kept the less value they possess, and the consumer purchasing canned goods bearing the stamp of the manufacturers would be able to see from the date whether the goods were one year old or entering upon the second year. Such goods depreciate every three or four months, until after a short time they become of no value, but if the date of manufacture is legibly placed on the can the consumer can see just what he is getting.

I repeat, that in my opinion the minister is going in the right direction, only he is not going quite far enough. When the Bill goes to committee I have no doubt we shall have some further suggestions from him, and, perhaps, amendments will be forthcoming which will meet the approval of the House and the community at large.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomas Foster) is entirely wrong in his statements with respect to the inspection of canned goods. I want to tell him that we have inspectors for canned vegetables, fruit, and also poultry, and have had them for years. I am connected with a company that has been in business, more or less, for thirty years. We did not have our products inspected during the greater portion of that period, but for the last six or seven years there have been inspectors. These inspectors remain all the time in the factory until the Government stamp is put on the cans, and under this system the public is adequately protected.

The hon. gentleman has spoken of the necessity of stamping canned goods. I want to tell him that if canned goods are properly packed and kept in a proper place the quality will be as good years afterwards as it is at the time the goods are put up. With respect to fruits and vegetables we do not want to put the dates on the cans. because any one going into a store, if they see goods two years old, would not want to buy them, even though they are just as good as the day they were packed. We have in our factories, for instance, corn which we have kept for twenty years on purpose to see how long it can be preserved. The only difference you can see in corn kept that long is in the colour. But, as I said, Mr. Chairman, if you want to destroy the canned goods business, simply put the dates on the labels, because the consumer in buying canned goods will naturally look for the goods packed that year. Canned goods are as good five or six years

after packing as the day they were packed. I know this, because I have been canning for a long time, and we have made the test for our own satisfaction. I would be very sorry to have the minister put the date on the labels of canned goods for the reasons I have mentioned.

Mr. PELLETIER: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that the Minister of Agriculture is taking steps to have a more thorough inspection of meats, food and food products. An hon. gentleman stated a few moments ago that some of these goods were mysteriously prepared, and I sincerely believe that he is right. I shall endeavour, if I may be permitted, to give a brief explanation of this matter. But before doing so, I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention to have qualified veterinary surgeons act as inspectors of live stock, or if anyone else may be appointed to such positions? I may say that while I was in the legislature of the state of Montana, in 1901, I was the father of a similar Bill providing for the appointment of inspectors of meats and food, and the Bill provided that up to the time that the cattle went on the killing floor the inspection was to be made by a veterinary surgeon, and no one else. For the inspection of meats in the refrigerators, or in the markets, it provided that a man well versed in meats was to be appointed, one knowing all the stages from the time the animal is killed until the meat is sold to the consumer.

Now, coming to the preparation of ham, one of the reasons why that should be well inspected is simply because the packers are taking advantage of all the opportunities which are given them, and even if the opportunity is not given to them they take it. Take, for instance, to begin with, the brine, which is composed, of course, of water, salt, brown sugar and preservaline; and we all know that preservaline contains acid. Preservaline is put in in order to preserve the meat a longer time. When it comes to the smoking process, instead of smoking it twenty, thirty or forty days, the length of time required to smoke a good ham, it is simply put in a receptacle of some kind with colorine in it. This colorine contains acid also. These things are not very good for the stomach, still the consumer has to take the product. Now, the reason why these things are done is because the ham requires but very little smoking if it is coloured, and it has a very transparent colour, a very nice colour indeed. If it was smoked thoroughly, the ham would drip, that is, the brine in it would drip off, and it would lose weight. Hence the necessity for the packer not to smoke it in order to retain the weight. The same process is used in regard to breakfast bacon. I may say a word or two about sausages.

[Mr. Marshall.]

Mr. SIFTON: Oh, don't.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is the article which is the most mysteriously prepared, I believe.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PELLETIER: As a rule, to begin with, they take from fifteen to twenty per cent of pork fat, and then from twenty-five to thirty per cent of beef scraps, or bits of whatever they can find, trimmings as we probably term it; and then about twenty per cent of Victoria or potato flour; and the balance is water. You have about thirty per cent of water in your sausages, and twenty per cent of potato or Victoria flour. When a consumer gets sausage, he pays for the potato flour, the water, the scraps of beef, etc. But when he comes to put the sausage in the frying pan it almost walks out; it won't stay there until the water is all out of it. For these reasons, and there are a great many others that have been given by other hon. gentlemen, I believe that we ought to have a very thorough inspection of meats at all times, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will do his best and finish the good work that he has started along this line.

Mr. McCOIG: I do not see very much objection to the adoption of the resolution. I am heartily in accord with the minister in his endeavour to do everything possible to ensure that the people have better service from our cold storage systems and also from the abattoirs of the country. I merely wish to add that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier), in naming over the different methods of curing bacon, hams and sausages, forgot to mention the one well known during the past election, as post-curing. That is one method which it might be well to have drawn to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, so that when this resolution is passed, and when legislation is introduced along this line, any person, whether in high standing in this country, or an officer of the Government, whether connected with abattoirs, cold storage, or other great institutions, will be prohibited from using a method of that kind. When legislation is passed providing for the appointment of inspectors, only men who are capable and fearless probably will be considered by the minister. He should not

overlook the fact that Mr. O'Connor who occupied the position of cost of living commissioner in this country has the respect of the people of Canada, and not only their respect, but their confidence. Mr. O'Connor fearlessly carried on the duties of his office. Yet we now find that he is allowed to be relieved of office, while the man who is chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, and an officer of the Canadian Government, still holds office. I do not believe that there is a man on either side of this House, Independent, Liberal or Unionist, who could have stood upon the public platforms throughout Canada in the last election and said that he would support the dismissal of Mr. O'Connor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I ruled a few moments ago that the dismissal of Mr. O'Connor should not be introduced into this debate. My hon. friend is going altogether too far.

Mr. McCOIG: I am quite willing to abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I did not tion. The remarks of the member for North Simcoe was referring to the matter. If the officers selected under the Bill to be based upon this resolution properly carry out its provisions great benefit will result and the measure will operate more efficiently in the best interests of the country.

Mr. MURPHY: Lest the discussion should veer round to a discussion of hereditary titles, I had better intervene with a question. The remarks of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) must have convinced the Minister of Agriculture that, so far as food is concerned, what is uppermost in the minds of the people is home protection against home production. For that reason —and I have regard to the language of the beginning of the resolution—I desire to ask the minister whether it is intended by the Bill to be founded on this resolution to widen existing authority or to confer new authority to deal with such cases as the one which arose in Winnipeg—I need not discuss the details at the moment. I refer to the destruction of a large quantity of food in one of the packing houses there, which had become unfit for human consumption.

Mr. CRERAR: The resolution was not intended, I think, to cover such a case as the hon. gentleman refers to. I quite agree that it is an appropriate matter for discussion, but I think it is outside the scope and intention of this resolution. Any regulations to prevent such an occurrence would come under another authority rather than under the measure now proposed.

Mr. PORTER: I have not sufficient information to enable me to discuss the practice or procedure in regard to meat and meat products, but I have information regarding the treatment of vegetables and fruits which, I think, may be of some advantage to the minister in dealing with this question of provision for inspection. It had previously been the practice to inspect prepared vegetables, pre-

4 p.m.

pared soups, and the like, at the time of shipment at the seaboard—Halifax, Montreal, St. John, as the case might be. As a result, manufacturers incurred very heavy expense and were liable to loss, because if the product was condemned it had to be shipped back and disposed of to the best advantage. That was brought to the attention of the minister, and I was responsible in some measure for the change that was made. Afterwards the department appointed inspectors resident at the different manufacturing points, who were supposed to see that the products turned out by these manufactories were at least fit for human consumption. My attention has been particularly called to some cases that occurred since the war broke out. The Government entered into large contracts for the supplying of vegetables to the armies overseas—and I speak particularly of vegetable soups, which have been shipped overseas in very large quantities. Under the system of inspection that now prevails, these products are inspected at the factory and go to the front without any further examination, and with no possible chance of loss to the producer. But I heard a returned soldier upon the public platform say quite recently, in the presence of the manufacturer, that although the soldiers went over to Europe to kill the Huns, when they ate that soup they felt more like killing the manufacturer than like killing the Huns. Evidence was forthcoming to show that in the manufacture of these goods, which had passed the inspection of the officer appointed by the department, celery had been used which had been lying in the warehouse from the days of the South African war. It was ground and prepared, but not shipped, and it had become the habitation of rats, mice, cobwebs, flies, and all sorts of other unnecessary ingredients. This was used in the manufacture of soup supplied to our soldier boys at the front. Testimony to this effect was made by men who were actually employed by the manufacturer; yet the inspector appointed by the department had failed to discover that, or had overlooked it.

Mr. ROBB: What department of Government appointed this inspector?

Mr. PORTER: The Department of Agriculture, I think. I am not quite certain about that.

Mr. CRERAR: Were these Canadian products?

Mr. PORTER: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: Where were they manufactured?

Mr. PORTER: In Belleville, Ontario, I am sorry to say. If the inspectors appointed by the department permit such a condition as those described to exist, it is high time that some steps were taken in the matter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is my hon. friend himself not somewhat responsible for that condition? Did he not recommend this gentleman's wares in the early part of the war—of course before he knew he was wrong?

Mr. PORTER: Yes, before I found him out. I am complaining not of the man himself, but of what he is doing or permitting to be done in the manufacture of food for the soldiers at the front. I understand that the same inspector is not there now. No doubt this firm will be endeavouring to obtain contracts from the Government, or renewal of contracts, and the Government should take special pains to see that such an occurrence as this is not permitted again, and, if necessary, that the inspector who has so far neglected his duty be removed from any further opportunity of permitting what I would describe as a fraud upon the public. Perhaps the minister had better amend this resolution so as to enable him to appoint an inspector of the inspector—because I think that he needs inspection as much as any one.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Agriculture did not answer the question that was put by my hon. friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier) just now, as to the standing of the men appointed as inspectors. I also wish to put a question. This resolution is introduced because it involves the expenditure of public moneys. Now we have not heard a word as to the purpose for which this money is to be expended. Is it because a greater number of inspectors are to be appointed, or because the inspectors will be of a higher standard and will require bigger salaries?

[Mr. Porter.]

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think this legislation will involve any additional outlay of public money. I take it that the customs officials who pass these goods in the ordinary way will simply have the added responsibility of seeing that the goods are properly certified to in the country of origin. My attention is drawn to the fact that an additional inspection may be demanded, but it is not contemplated that such will be necessary. The United States to-day have precisely a similar law. They permit importations from Great Britain, for instance on the certification of the proper British authorities. We are simply endeavouring here to apply the same conditions to importations into Canada.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is it intended to have the smaller factories inspected? I understand that a great number of the smaller factories putting up canned meats and that sort of thing have been put out of business because they were too small to get an inspection made. Several instances of this have occurred in my own constituency; perhaps the bigger concerns have something to do with it, but at all events these smaller factories have been put out of business.

Mr. CURRIE: Before the minister brings in his Bill I would suggest that he provide against meats being kept in cold storage warehouses beyond a certain period. I trust the minister will provide in the Bill for giving the people of this country control over these cold storage warehouses, which I understand are the main factor in the tremendous increase in food prices. If the cold storage warehouses were compelled to market the goods they have in storage at stated periods, after being put in, instead of being allowed to carry them for two or three years, the people would get food a great deal cheaper. It is an injustice to the public to permit such a monopoly as this to spring up. If the minister would look at the Acts that have been pased in the province of Victoria, Australia, I think he would find something to help him in framing an Act that would be of some benefit to the public. Canned goods, if properly canned, will last for ten years, but if not properly canned, they will not last ten days; that is the whole sum and substance of the trouble. But this is to be borne in mind. A great quantity of the canned goods coming into this country are imported from other countries than the United States. A vast quantity of beef, for instance, have been imported from the Argentine Republic, and no doubt it is

still finding its way into this country. Eggs from China are also coming in, some of them twenty years old, no doubt. The minister should take these things into consideration and should be empowered to provide regulations from time to time to cover cases as they arise, such as the bad chicken that had to be cremated in Winnipeg. The minister in Australia has power to frame regulations and stop these abuses. I know the Minister of Agriculture is desirous of doing everything he can to protect the public and we must all give him credit for his sincerity in that regard. I am sure he will be fearless in doing his duty.

Mr. CLEMENTS: Is it intended that every manufacturer of canned goods shall have his monogram or the firm's name on every can of his product? I have heard a good deal said about cold storage warehouses this afternoon, and, am bound to say that if some of the gentlemen who have referred to cold-storage abuses had gone into the subject a little more fully, they would have realized the benefits of cold storage better than they do. The reason I ask the question is this—on the Pacific coast, and on the Atlantic coast too, there is a very great difference in the grades of fish caught at different places along the coast. A certain fish, whether it be a chum salmon, a dog salmon or a cohoe salmon, is of very much better quality in one section of the province of British Columbia than in another, and it would be very unfair for a manufacturer putting up chum or dog salmon along one section of the Pacific coast of British Columbia to have his pack compared with, say, a northern or a southern pack. I have always contended that the manufacturer should place his name or his firm's name on every can, whether it be in the province of British Columbia or in any other province, and I sincerely hope that the minister will see that every manufacturer of canned goods in Canada stands behind his own brand and has his name printed on every can in his product.

Mr. EULER: I should like to refer for a moment to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Thomas Foster), that this Bill does not go far enough. As I understand it, this Bill deals only with the inspection of foods intended for import or export, and it has perhaps escaped the attention of the Government that a great proportion of the meats consumed by the people of this country are not imported. In not only the smaller cities but the larger cities as well a good proportion of the meat is slaughtered by the farmers in the country and is brought into the city markets and there disposed of to the consumer

Of that food, I think, there is absolutely no inspection and no guarantee that it is fit for human consumption. I am quite ready to admit that in most cases there can be no fault found with the kind of beef and pork that is brought into the markets of the cities. In the city of Kitchener, from which I come, the suggestion has been made at times that all foods brought into the city for sale should have some kind of inspection. We considered that matter for years, and were not able to find a solution, largely because the matter of inspection led to too great an expense, and placed a heavy burden either upon the farmer who produced the food, or else upon the consumer, and under present conditions, where foods are very expensive, and especially meats, perhaps it is not the time to deal with the matter. I would like to make the suggestion that if the Government could direct its attention to that phase of the matter, so that all meat which ordinarily would require inspecion should be inspected with possibly the assistance of the Department of Agriculture, I think a great service would be rendered to the consumers of the cities and towns. Perhaps this is not the place to make that suggestion, but I do so because the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Thomas Foster) mentioned it, and because I believe it is very well worth considering.

Mr. CRERAR: I might say, with respect to the observation of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and of some other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject that the scope of the Meat and Canned Foods Act is to cover the inspection of articles for interprovincial trade or for export. No matter how desirable it may be to extend the scope and operation of the Act to cover all goods offered for sale, there are obvious difficulties in the way. For instance, a man manufactures sausage, bacon or ham, and brings it into his local market to sell. Very practical difficulties are presented in the creation of a Dominion system of inspection that will adequately inspect, and I believe such inspection for consumption within the province where it originates is under provincial regulation, and quite within provincial and municipal power, and the purpose has been to secure a safeguard in that respect through municipal and provincial regulation, leaving to the Dominion the

matter of controlling inspection where the article is for provincial trade or for export.

Mr. BUREAU: I should like to get an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier). I listened with astonishment to the statement made by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter). Goods were manufactured in Canada for export and were shipped across the ocean, to be consumed by Canadian soldiers. It is very painful to have to hear such statements as that made by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter). Can we not get from the Minister of Agriculture a statement of what he intends to put in his Bill? I think it would be proper he should define the qualifications of the inspectors, if he is going to have any. The Bill is generally prepared at the same time as the resolution. The discussion on this resolution is to enlighten the House, or to suggest to my hon. friend certain things which occur to the minds of hon. members of this House, according to the knowledge they are able to impart. Why not tell us what will be the qualifications or requirements necessary under this Act for the man to be appointed inspector in order that the people of Canada may expect good service, and have good men in this most important position? Because, after all, the health and welfare of the community depends a good deal upon these people, their honesty and technical knowledge. The hon. gentleman from Matane (Mr. Pelletier) asked, in the case of slaughter houses, if licensed veterinary surgeons would not be appointed. Why not put it in the Bill that, for certain classes of inspection, only men of certain qualifications shall be appointed? This would, at the same time relieve the minister from the burden of patronage. In spite of all the confidence I have in the Civil Service Act, which will be discussed in a few days, I am afraid there will be some loopholes yet, where some fellows will have enough brass, in spite of the law, to walk up to the Minister of Agriculture and say, "I want to be appointed inspector of this or that," and if the applicant does not come within the four corners of the statute, my hon friend will only say, "I cannot appoint you, there is the law." It will help him, and will give a great deal of satisfaction to the consumers of this country.

Mr. CRERAR: The regulations at present in effect governing the control and inspection of Canadian products provide for the very point my hon. friend raises. Every abattoir or packing-house established in Canada is required to have qualified veterinarians to supervise the work. They are assisted by lay inspectors who need not be qualified veterinarians, but whose qualifications must be such as to satisfy the Dominion Director General of Veterinary Service that they are fit for the position. It is not expected or contemplated under this that additional inspectors will be created. There will not be any need for it so far as I can see. The admission of products from other countries can be supervised by the customs officers who will see that the proper certificates are attached to the article before it is admitted. I appreciate just as fully as my hon. friend the importance of having these goods thoroughly and properly inspected. I assure him that, as far as the possibility of patronage entering into the administration of this Act is concerned, I have no hesitation in making the declaration that it is absolutely not going to enter into it, as far as my administration is concerned. We have suffered considerably in Canada from the injection of the patronage evil into Government service, and it is time in my judgment that it was eliminated from it.

Mr. ROBB: So far the Minister of Agriculture and all the other members of the Cabinet have dodged the issue raised by the hon. member for West Hastings. I think the condition of things exposed to the Canadian people to-day deserves a statement from the Government. If such conditions of inspection exist in one factory, as stated by the hon. member for Hastings, I would be ready to believe the same condition existed in other factories throughout the country. Had the question been raised on this side of the House, the Government might have thought it was a political attack, but it has been raised on the other side of the House, and I think we are entitled to a statement on this question.

Mr. CRERAR: I would say, in reply to the hon. member for Hastings, that, of course, I have no knowledge of the case cited by him. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that such condition of affairs should not be permitted to exist. I take it that this happened some time ago, and I shall certainly take the opportunity to investigate the matter and obtain all the information I can upon it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This subject is undoubtedly a very technical one, and I believe, after a discussion of an hour and a half, we do not yet understand fully the

extent or purport of the resolution. The hon. gentleman from West Hastings has brought before the House a case in which the law was violated. Of course, it may have been the result of an accident, but as to what the facts are we are not very clear. But the fact to which I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture is that this cannot have the effect of improving the law as it is now but rather of emasculating it. If I understand this resolution aright, it will not make the law more rigid but it will reduce the rigidity of the law and make possible its evasion. The law we have to-day, the Act passed in 1907 provides that all food, whether animal or vegetable, shall pass inspection. There is no exception to it. Here is the letter of the law, section 3:

All animals intended for slaughter in any establishment shall be inspected as provided by the regulations.

No animal shall be allowed to enter the parts of an establishment where slaughtering is carried on, unless it has undergone such inspection and been found to be healthy and fit for food.

Section 13 of the Act reads:

All fish, fruit or vegetables used in any establishment where these articles are prepared for export, shall be sound, wholesome, and fit for food; and any such articles or products thereof found in the said establishment unsound or unwholesome shall be confiscated and destroyed as provided by the regulations.

Under these two sections all animals, fish, fruit and vegetable foods must go into an establishment. By the Act the word "establishment" is defined and what is the definition?

"Establishment" means any abattoir, packing house, or other premises in which such animals are slaughtered, or in which any parts thereof or products thereof, or fish, or fruit, or vegetables, are prepared for food or export or are stored for export.

Again we find the definition of the word "food":

"Food" includes every article used for food or drink by man, and every ingredient intended for mixing with the food or drink of man for any purpose.

This means that all kinds of food, without any exception, which are to be exported, shall have to pass through this examination. No exception is made. What, however, is the principle of my resolution of my hon. friend? Instead of having this rigid provision that all food must be inspected, that there may be no exception, the law is to be emasculated by substituting the will of the Governor in Council for the rigidity of the law and the will of Parliament. Here is the resolution and I call the attention of my hon. friend to it.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act, chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1907, and to provide that an establishment as defined in the said Act—

which I have just read—

—shall include any abattoir, packing house or other premises in which any food or food product which may be named by the Governor in Council is prepared for food for export or is stored for export.

This means that instead of, as we have to-day, the rigid letter of the law that all food for man must be inspected and must pass through this establishment, the Governor in Council has it in his power to say, in his wisdom, that any kind of food shall, or shall not, be inspected. It may be poultry, it may be bacon, it may be anything else; the Governor in Council has the power to except from the provisions of the law any food that he thinks it proper to except. That is not making the law more rigid than it was before. It is giving to the Government a dangerous power because it seems to me that there should be no exception at all and that all food should be inspected. The Governor in Council should not have the power to except any food from that inspection. In that respect the resolution is certainly emasculating the Act as it is at present and I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it. For my part, I have no doubt of his good intentions; I give him every credit for them, I do not think he has been the draughtsman of this resolution, I think he should take into his very serious consideration the question as to whether he should ask Parliament to adopt such a provision as that.

Mr. CRERAR: I can assure the committee that it was not the intention to have the construction put upon this resolution which the right hon. the leader of the Opposition attaches to it. It is possible that the resolution may be faultily draughted, but I shall read the amendment which it is proposed to make to Section B of the Act, defining the meaning of "establishment." Paragraph B, as it stands at present: is:

(B) "establishment" means any abattoir, packing house, or other premises in which such animals are slaughtered, or in which any parts thereof or products thereof, or fish, or fruit, or vegetables, are prepared for food for export or are stored for export.

With the addition that is proposed to be made, it will read as follows:

(B) "establishment" means any abattoir, packing house, or other premises in which such animals are slaughtered, or in which any parts thereof or products thereof, or fish, or fruit or vegetables or any food or food products

which may be named by the Governor in Council, are prepared for food for export or are stored for export.

If I understand the argument of my right hon. friend, it is that the addition of the words "or any food or food products which may be named by the Governor in Council" limits the preceding words?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: That is not the intention. The idea we had in mind was to cover all additions to these present categories of food; that is to say, some food that might be manufactured or invented and which would not be covered by the preceding words. Take, for instance, condensed milk. Condensed milk would not be included under the definition as it previously stood. At any rate, that was the purpose of the addition to the definition of the term "establishment." I shall be very glad to take the suggestion of my right hon. friend, which, I admit, is a very important one, into consideration and discuss it with the officials of the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would be very glad if my hon. friend would do that. But, let me call his attention to the fact that condensed milk is an article of food. Let me again refer my hon. friend to the definition of "food":

"Food" includes every article used for food or drink by man, and every ingredient intended for mixing with the food or drink of man for any purpose.

This includes condensed milk. The objection I have to this provision is that the Governor in Council takes it into his power to remove from the disposition of this Act any kind of food whatever. The law should be left as it is that all food should be subject to inspection.

Mr. MORPHY: What is the necessity for changing the law as it stands?

Mr. CRERAR: I take it that the hon. gentleman was not in when I gave my explanation at the commencement of the discussion this afternoon?

Mr. MORPHY: No.

Mr. CRERAR: It is necessary to widen the scope of the Act so that the regulations may apply to food imported into Canada as well as food manufactured in Canada. That is the object, broadly speaking. In reference to the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, I take it that it would be met if the words "which may be named by the Governor in Council" were eliminated?

[Mr. Crerar.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall take it into consideration.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. Crerar thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 55, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, chapter 27 of the statutes of 1907.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RESIGNATION OF MR. W. F. O'CONNOR.

CORRESPONDENCE LAID ON TABLE BY MINISTER OF LABOUR.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): With the consent of the House I desire to place upon the Table a return to an Order of the House re the O'Connor correspondence.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there be unanimous consent by the House there is no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does the return comprise the whole of the correspondence, including the reply of Mr. O'Connor?

Mr. CROTHERS: The correspondence is up to date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I cannot ask more than correspondence that is up to date.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know whether my right hon. friend has any information in advance of what I have, but the correspondence is all there up to date so far as I know.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As to that I am in the hands of the minister.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

COMPENSATION FOR SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Crerar (Minister of Agriculture) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, chapter seventy-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by chapter six of the statutes of 1913, and to provide that the Governor in Council may order a compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provisions of the Act, the value of the animal to be determined by the Minister or by some person appointed by him, but the value, except as otherwise provided by the Act, not

to exceed in the case of grade animals two hundred dollars for each horse, eighty dollars for each head of cattle and twenty dollars for each pig or sheep, and in the case of pure bred animals five hundred dollars for each horse, two hundred and fifty dollars for each head of cattle and seventy-five dollars for each pig or sheep. These amendments to remain in operation for three years.

Mr. CRERAR: I think a word of explanation will suffice for this resolution. At the time this Act was originally passed the values upon which compensation was based for the slaughter of condemned animals were fixed by statute, in the case of cattle $60 per head and for pigs and sheep $15 per head, and the compensation allowed when animals were condemned and slaughtered was two-thirds of the value set by statute. Owing to the increased value of these animals at the present time, the compensation allowed when they are ordered to be destroyed does not adequately compensate their owners. The intention of the Act when originally drafted, as I understand it, was to encourage the reporting to the proper authorities of animals which might be affected by some contagious disease, so that they could be properly examined, and, if found a menace, destroyed. I think it is only proper that now, when the value of these animals has increased, and in some cases doubled, beyond what it was at the time the Act was originally passed, that the limit upon which compensation can be fixed should be raised, and that is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. MURPHY: Under the old Act, was there any distinction made between grade and pure bred cattle?

Mr. CRERAR: There was.

Mr. MURPHY: But not as great a distinction as exists here?

Mr. CRERAR: The value of the animal was based upon the market values prevailing at the time the Act was passed. I am not at the moment able to say whether that applies to pure bred cattle or not. I am of opinion that it does not, but that is a point that can be taken up by the committee.

Mr. MORPHY: Can the minister state the amount of money that has been paid, say, for the last fiscal year, for purposes of this kind?

Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry that I cannot give that information at the moment, but the officials of the department estimate that the change in the regulations suggested here will probably involve an additional outlay of $10,000 a year.

Mr. MOLLOY: Will the valuation under the proposed legislation be $200 and the compensation two-thirds of that amount, as against the valuation $150 and a compensation of two-thirds under the old Act?

Mr. CRERAR: That applies to horses.

Mr. MOLLOY: Yes.

Mr. CRERAR: The proposed change does not affect horses; it only applies to cattle, swine and sheep. I omitted to point out a moment ago that the value upon which compensation would be based in the case of horses was changed a year or two ago; I am not certain of the date.

Mr. WM. SMITH: I would like to congratulate the minister upon having taken a step in the right direction. The owner of live animals found to be suffering from contagious disease may not be at fault and therefore he should be recouped in some way or other. I do not find fault with the minister's figures so far as thoroughbred animals are concerned, but I do not think he has gone far enough in connection with the grades. The compensation fixed for grade horses is all right. But it does not take much of an animal, in the case of cattle, to be worth $80. The minister should have gone at least $120. In the case of swine, we all know that, at 20 cents a pound it does not take much of a hog to represent $20. I would suggest that that amount be raised to $30, leaving the compensation for sheep as it is. I would suggest to the minister that, when he introduces his Bill, it should be on the lines indicated here to-day.

Mr. McCOIG: I agree with the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) that there might be a slight advance made in regard to grade cattle. I feel satisfied that the minister is taking a step in the right direction, but I question if he is going quite far enough. The great difficulty we have had in Ontario in regard to swine and cattle which is condemned at different abattoirs, is that a percentage is deducted from the buyers, and the buyers deduct it from the producers. That has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction. The Government have inspectors in the abattoirs where the stock is slaughtered, and when a diseased animal is condemned, the cost comes back either on the buyer or on the seller to the extent of one-half of one per cent, which is deducted by the buyer from all the purchases that he makes throughout the country. Some buyers deduct from the seller; some stand the loss themselves. But the

abattoirs exact that percentage from all the buyers irrespective of whether it comes out of the farmer or not. I believe the time is opportune for the minister to extend his legislation a little farther, and since the condemning is done by his own officers, instead of a deduction being made from an innocent party it would be well if the Government were to make an allowance to overcome that, and so do away with the inconvenience, annoyance and dissatisfaction which occurs from time to time. I believe that last year, or the year before last, the packing houses, when extracting one-half of one per cent for this purpose alone, made a net profit of $165,000 above the value of what was really condemned, judging from figures which I have secured from the Department of Agriculture. This is a matter which I would be very glad to have the minister give his serious thought and attention to, and if he can effect a reform, it would be heartily appreciated and accepted with good-will by all the producers throughout Canada.

Mr. ROBB: In introducing this resolution, the minister stated that he did so on account of the increase in value of animals in recent years. That statement is right enough, but it seems to me that the result of his arithmetic has been defective, because, as stated by the hon. member for South Ontario, the compensation allowed for a horse is altogether out of proportion to that given for a good dairy animal, that is, in proportion to their earning value today. The value of a horse has not increased since the previous regulations were put in force; it has rather decreased. But the value of dairy cattle has increased enormously, and it seems to me that the minister might readjust that and give a fair compensation for dairy animals.

There is another feature of this matter which is deserving of consideration by the minister while he is dealing with this subject, and that is the prevention of tuberculosis. I am told by stockmen that there are many ways in which tuberculosis is spread throughout this country. One way in particular, which is a grievance of the stockmen, is in the importation of cattle from the Old Country. Take, for instance, cattle shipped from the Old Country to the United States via Canada. These cattle arrive at the quarantine station at Lévis, and they are there tested, and if there are reactors in a herd they are not allowed to enter the United States, and they are not shipped back to the Old Country, but they are earmarked and allowed to go about through the herds in Canada spreading disease among Canadian animals. I think the minister should give that matter his serious consideration, and stop that practice.

There is another matter which has been pointed out by stock men which might prevent somewhat the spread of tuberculosis in dairy animals, and that is that any man calling an auction sale—when a man buys at a private sale he is running certain chances, but that is his own business—should be compelled to give a certificate that the herd is free of disease. I submit these suggestions for the consideration of the minister.

Mr. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, being fairly well versed in the value of dairy cattle, I am of opinion that the compensation of $80 placed on these animals is altogether too little. It is a well known fact that the price of dairy cattle this last year has risen from twenty-five to forty per cent. We cannot get any kind of dairy cattle at the present time for less than $140 or $150, and even up to $180. I think that the man who has the misfortune to have disease enter his herd should not be paid off with $80, when it has cost him double or treble that amount for his animal. I think the minister might go a little further, and put the amount at $100 or $120; which would, to a certain extent, meet the loss sustained. So far as the compensation for horses is concerned, I have no fault to find with that, but in the case of other animals, especially swine, the compensation is hardly enough. The compensation to be paid for dairy cattle is a very important consideration, especially in eastern Ontario, at the present time. I have no doubt but that, when the minister thinks the matter over, and takes into consideration the prices we have to pay, he will raise the amount of compensation for dairy cattle.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: I would like to bring a matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, when drafting the Bill which is to be presented to the House, in order to obviate an injustice which I think was done to a resident in my constituency. I was not a member of this House when this was brought to my notice, and I have not all the details in my memory now, but I remember that this farmer told me the circumstances, which entailed a heavy loss, in the neighbourhood of $2,000, compensation for which was refused by the Department of Agriculture. This man had a large herd of hogs, and a representative of the Government claimed that his hogs were

infected with cholera. Against the protestations of the owner, the hogs were slaughtered. The inspector first slaughtered a couple, but did not find any indications of cholera, as the farmer informed me. I understand that when a hog has cholera the disease is shown in the lung. Although he did not find any traces of cholera, he insisted on slaughtering the entire hundred hogs. Afterwards, he stated that he would make a report to the Government, and that the man would be paid for his hogs. At the time this man was speaking to me, he had not heard what had become of that inspector, nor had he been paid for his hogs—and this was eight months ago. Apparently the inspector, seeing he had made a mistake, made himself scarce, and I do not know whether even the department knows where the man is. Would it not be well, in drafting this legislation, to provide that when a veterinary or inspector condemns a man's stock he should, before destroying it, give the owner a certificate so that the owner will have something to show that his stock has been condemned and slaughtered? There should be some way of providing against such an injustice as that to which I have referred.

Mr. BOYER (Vaudreuil) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I approve entirely the principle of this resolution, but that I cannot accept the opinion of the hon. Minister of Agriculture as regards one of its provisions. I find that the fee, under the terms of that legislation, in the case of dairy cattle slaughtered, is not sufficient, the resolution provides that in the case of grade animals, two hundred dollars will be allowed for every horse and eighty dollars for every head of cattle. I am satisfied that this amount is inadequate especially at the present time. The price for dairy cattle has considerably increased of recent date and such increase will be more in evidence in the near future; the reason is that the supply is much more restricted for that kind of stock than it is for horses, for instance. As a matter of fact, it is much more difficult to get good dairy cattle than any other kind of farm animals. Considering the enhanced prices for dairy, I am of opinion that a higher rate of compensation for dairy cattle should be fixed and I trust the Minister of Agriculture will duly consider this suggestion.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 56, to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved second reading of Bill No. 32, respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

He said: At the time of the adoption of the resolution upon which this Bill is founded, I said I would make some explanation of the Bill on its second reading. I shall do so as briefly as I possibly can. The Bill does not institute a new department; the amendments are designed to improve and broaden the Act and ensure its better working. Perhaps I might outline briefly the development of our statistical work in Canada from the time of Confederation —without, of course, going into history. Our statistics at first centred upon the taking of the decennial census. The first census was taken in 1870. Legislation was enacted for the taking of that census, but no permanent census or statistics office was established. Again in 1879 there was legislation for the taking of the decennial census, and three censuses were taken on that legislation. In 1905 there was a complete revision of the Census and Statistics Act. The office was made permanent; the staff was made permanent and the scope was broadened so as to include general statistics. The work went on with a gradual accretion and extension in the different departments, and in 1912 the branch was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce. No uniform and co-ordinated system of statistics had been established, and the method was not at all in keeping with the necessities of the case. A departmental commission was appointed in 1912, composed of Richard Grigg, Commissioner of Commerce at that time, Chairman; Professor Adam Shortt, Civil Service Commissioner; Ernest Henry Godfrey, Census and Statistics Branch; W. A. Warne, Statistical Branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce; Robert Hamilton Coats, Department of Labour, and John R. K. Bristol, Department of Customs. This commission instituted a thorough examination of the system, as it affected both Dominion and provincial work and summarized their conclusions. I do not think I could do better than read an extract from the report of that commis-

5 p.m.

sion, which briefly states the general situation.

Though many of the statistical reports issued by various departments are of undoubted excellence, there is apparent in the body of Canadian statistics, considered as a whole, a lack of coherence and common purpose. This is traceable to imperfect appreciation in the past of the fact that the statistics of the country should constitute a single harmonious system, with all divisions in due co-relation. Under the British North America Act, 1867, the Dominion is given specific authority to deal with "statistics," and while this must not be regarded as precluding statistical activity on the part of local governments, it does apparently imply that statistics are a matter of national concern and may therefore properly come under the general co-ordinating authority of the Federal Government. No such viewpoint or function, however, has in the past been assumed. The effect statistically has been to inculcate routine and the neglect of opportunities for furnishing wider information and service. While this detachment has characterized the departments of the Dominion Government, still more has it been evident as between the several provinces and the Dominion, and between province and province, notwithstanding that the national importance of many of the functions of the provincial governments under confederation calls urgently for statistical uniformity and homogeneity. This general condition we would consider to be the fundamental defect which must be met and overcome in the existing situation. Some of the unfortunate results which have followed may be briefly indicated:

1. The scope of Canadian statistics has been restricted. On not a few points of vital interest to the country little or no statistical information exists. There has been no general answer to the question, what statistics should a country such as Canada possess? What are the phenomena requiring the scientific measurements supplied by statistics if Canadian national development is to proceed to the best advantage?

2. Where the statistical activities of several bodies working along similar lines are virtually independent, duplication is inevitable.

3. The statistics are unequal in quality and value. The absence of leadership is nowhere more apparent than in the varying extent to which statistical methods have been developed in the different branches.

4. The restriction of outlook has impaired promptitude in the issue of reports.

5. Lack of unity and co-ordination prevents true comparisons between Canada and other countries. The recent growth of international intercourse has rendered such comparisons more than ever necessary, and they have become indispensable to the national progress of Canada.

That, in short, is a characterization of the impression which was left on the commission after its examination was completed. A remedy was suggested by the commission, and I will take the liberty of reading a short extract to give the essentials of their recommendation. They suggested:

1. That there be created a Central Statistical Office to organize in co-operation with the several departments concerned, the strictly statistical work undertaken by the Dominion Government. The object of this organization should be to co-ordinate the statistics of Canada under a single comprehensive scheme and so to extend them that they may meet the present needs of the country and follow the probable course of its development. To borrow a phrase employed in a similar connection by an eminent statistician, the object of such a reorganization should be primarily to constitute a "central thinking office" on the subject of the statistics of Canada. Describing the possible functions of such an office Mr. Bowley wrote: "Such an office must have cognizance of all the statistics of more than departmental importance which are published officially. Misleading statistics must be suppressed, overlapping must be stopped, careful plans must be devised for filling in the gaps at present left, and preparations made for investigation of matters likely to become of public importance. All bills involving or affecting the collection of statistics should be considered by it. Publications for the use of the public should in some cases be edited by it, with careful definitions and with short analyses and criticisms, stating accurately and intelligently the purport and meaning of their contents. In other cases, where a department already exists for such publications, there should be co-ordination with a view to carrying out the purposes already indicated."

This so well expresses our own views as to the scope and functions which the proposed Canadian office should assume that we cannot do better than allow it to stand as a part of our report, adding that the examples of Germany and Austria show that the idea is both practicable and valuable.

2. In order to give effect to this recommendation it may be necessary to enact further legislation or to amend the present Census and Statistics Act.

The House has now before it the condition of things as it appeared to the commission, and their recommendations as to what should be done to remedy that condition. Since that time different steps have been taken in respect of modelling and preparation for broader work, and for more co-ordination between the branches gathering statistics. What was found and hinted at by the commission was this: A system of gathering general statistics over and above the departmental or administrative statistics had gradually grown up in some departments, and in consequence there was overlapping and lack of uniformity in method, and that took away from the authority of the general conclusions arrived at. What was also taking place was that outside of Dominion statistics the different provinces were gradually branching out into statistical work necessitated, in the first place, by their administrative wants. Different branches under provincial administration, say Mines or Fisheries, were gathering and distributing statistical information in order to meet their departmental or administrative necessities, so that at the

time this report was made nearly all of the provinces had more or less extended statistical branches at work upon different lines of examination, gathering and selecting and distributing information. There were three or four different bodies gathering statistics on crop reports, for instance, and agricultural production, doing the work separately, province by province, and not having the same basis for their questionings, different results were obtained, and it became very difficult indeed to place authoritative reliance upon the statistics as they were gathered, in so far as they affected the Dominion as a whole. The Dominion was also preparing crop reports and making returns of agricultural production, and there was a difference in method between the Dominion Government and the provincial governments. In consequence, not only was there overlapping, but a condition of things came about in which the outside world, and in fact the people of Canada, did not know on which set of statistics to rely.

The outside world was in doubt as to what was authoritative, and it also had its contradictions within the Dominion itself. As soon as the commission's report was made, steps were taken in Canada to work it out along the lines of the principles laid down for organization by the commission. In the first place, conferences were held between the Dominion Statistical Branch, and the statistical branches of the various provinces; Mr. Grigg, in his time, travelled from one end of the country to the other, and had conferences with the different statistical branches of the provinces, and they canvassed the whole question, and came to certain conclusions as to agreement and co-operation. That resulted in calling a Dominion conference of the statistical heads representing the provincal and Dominion authorities. At that conference, statistical methods, in so far as they affect the provinces and the Dominion, were canvassed, and certain agreements were come to. These were to be worked out by the central statistics office here, and afterwards to be submitted to the provincial authorities, which has been done. Again, in 1915, on the demise of Mr. Blue, Mr. Coats, from the Department of Labour, was appointed Dominion statistician and he took up the work as he found it at that time, and proceeded with it upon the same lines. Since then the endeavour has been to co-ordinate the work in the departments at Ottawa that were gathering statistics, to prevent overlapping, to get uniformity, to secure the best method, and to ensure as great economy of working as possible. On the other hand, the same system of conference and co-operation was carried out, with reference to the provincial authorities, and at the present time I may say, with reference to all the branches of statistical information, selection and distribution, that there is complete accord and harmony between the Dominion statistical office and the statistical offices of the different provinces. Where the provincial organization is apparently the most reliable for gaining the information, it is availed of. Where the Dominion plan or organization appears more reliable, that plan is adopted. There is agreement on both these points as to the selection and tabulation of the information. In nearly all cases the tabulation is done in the Dominion statistical office, where we have the greatest facilities for doing it, and the information, when tabulated, is returned again for the use of the agricultural and other statistical departments of the provincial governments, whilst of course the same information remains with the statistical office here in Ottawa. These have been the lines along which the Dominion statistician has been working, with the results I have just mentioned. It is proposed to call this a bureau rather than a statistical office, because the word bureau widens the meaning somewhat, and is more in accord with similar institutions in other countries. The main idea is that, so far as the gathering of general or economic statistics is concerned, it shall be the work of the bureau itself, but departmental statistics for administrative purposes remain with the departments. In so far as, by co-operation, mutual advice and direction, the gathering of the statistics in the administrative departments can be made to fit in with the general plan, and can conduce to economy and accuracy of selection, that co-operation and co-ordination takes place between the central office and the statistical branches of the different departments working along their lines of administrative records and statistics.

With regard to what has been accomplished, the Dominion statistician and his higher staff in that office have been making a series of very thorough investigations and examinations and have been laying out the field for a general statistical operation. It might be interesting to the House, if I were to briefly mention the different fields or divisions of work that are now being prepared for, and which have been or will be put into operation.

In the first place, we keep our old decennial census. We have each ten years been taking the census of the Dominion, with the collateral information, outside of statistics of population, which has been gathered hitherto and which may be easily gathered in a census of population. Agriculture and population go together in the schedules which result in the information gathered in the decennial census.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will those last figures be quoted in the agricultural reports, or will they appear in the Year Book?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have spoken of the decennial census of population and agriculture, but it has long been felt in this country, and in this House, that a ten-year census of the condition, or the situation as regards agriculture is not quite sufficient for these times through which we are passing. Therefore, in addition to the decennial census of population and agriculture, it is proposed to add an annual census of livestock and crops, the record of marketing, and the statistics of butter and cheese production, so that each year we shall have an up-to-date statement as regards the condition of agricultural work, so far as that can be interpreted by statistics, which will supplement the information which is got in the decennial census with regard to agriculture itself. We have been having a kind of crop report, but it was not very widely based, and consequently has not included sufficient information to enable reliable estimates to be made. The idea underlying this yearly census is to develop the sources of information, to distribute more widely the area of information upon which we draw, and to make the estimates approximate, as nearly as possible, to the actualities of the case. In June, our crop reporters, who were selected and distributed throughout the country, gave us a statement as to the areas under cultivation, the crops sown and the number of live stock. These were followed up in the succeeding months by reports upon the condition of the crops, the live stock, and the like of that. The wider you can get the basis of the information upon which you can apply your final estimate, the more reliable the result will be. That is where co-operation is taking place between the Dominion and the provinces. I do not know that I can do better than just read an extract from the plan to show the improvement that has been made and the benefit that will arise therefrom:

As to the crops and livestock the statistics are issued monthly, the basic data relating to crops and numbers of live stock are obtained in June on a card designed to reach every farmer in Canada.

A specimen card is appended here and can be seen by any hon. member who desires.

The specimen card is issued in co-operation with the provincial departments of agriculture. The arrangements for co-operation differs slightly in the case of each province. For example, in the case of the provinces of Quebec, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the cards are distributed and collected by the provincial authorities through the rural school teachers and then returned to this office for compilation.

By the co-operation of the educational authorities in these provinces, the teachers, in the first place, are prepared by an instructional circular which is issued to them for the kind of work which they are expected to facilitate. Then this card, prepared by the central office here, is sent out and approved of. The card is made out after consultation between the provincial authorities and our statistical office. These cards are then sent out to the departments in the three provinces. These departments, through the educational branches of the governments, forward these cards to the school teachers in every district. The cards are then distributed by the scholars and brought back to the teacher, a lesson having been given to the scholars in the meantime as to the significance of this operation and as to the public service involved, and as a result they are interested in it. These cards are then brought back by the children, are sent in to the provincial authorities, and by these are forwarded for compilation purposes to the central office.

In British Columbia the cards are mailed by this office to individual farmers and returned to the provincial department for compilation. British Columbia has had a system of sending direct to farmers a form that is the basis of estimates as to crops. They consider that the best way of doing it and they are doing it in that way rather than through the teachers. Ontario and Manitoba this year are coming in practically on the same basis as British Columbia. The details are already settled. The Maritime Provinces have agreed to the principle of co-operation and the details are to be arranged during the present month. It is interesting to note the results for 1917 in the case of Quebec, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. In Quebec returns have been received from 29,000 farmers; in Saskatchewan from 35,000; in Alberta from 14,500, and in British Columbia from 6,900.

Under the old system of crop reporters we had only an infinitesimal fraction of that number; consequently, our basis was that much curtailed. Here the basis upon which the estimates are to be formed from the whole country is widened very largely.

Passing from the census of population and of agricultural production, with the addition of the annual statistics gathered, to keep up to date between the decennial periods, we take up the next division; that is, the census of production. We propose to do for industrial production, taken in its widest sense, what has hitherto been done with regard to agricultural production and population. Hitherto all we have got in respect to industrial production has been what we have been able to gather at the decennial census. In addition to the difficulty of getting an adequate industrial census by means of the schedules which are distributed for the decennial census, and which must include so much other matter, we had no further information for each of the nine years intervening between decennial periods. That is not what is necessary in these days and particularly in the face of Canada's largely increased and increasing industrial activity. What it is proposed to do is to take in each ten years a general census of industrial production, taking it in a different period from that at which the decennial census of agriculture and population is taken and then basing upon that, just the same as is done in the case of the agricultural census, a postal census of the industrial production each year, to keep up to date, in so far as it can be done, with the progress that is being made in our industrial activities. We shall be doing for industrial production in this respect what is done for agriculture in the other division.

In that there will be combined fishing, mining, lumbering, forestry, manufacturing—all the great basic industries of Canada. One will see how necessary that is when it is stated that some twenty-nine departments, under Dominion work and under provincial work, have been publishing statistics of production during the last number of years with all their different methods, in a fragmentary manner more or less, and without uniformity or co-ordination. Between all these departments and the central statistical office there is now a plan of co-operation; each taking its own part in a co-ordinated plan, and all working together for the general result, which I anticipate will be excellent.

The third division takes in statistics of trade and of commerce. At present these statistics are under the management of the Customs Department, the Trade and Commerce Department, and the Statistical Department—three departments. What is proposed in respect of these is, by co-operation and co-ordination to prevent overlapping between these three departments; to hit upon and carry out a system which shall be carried on with the greatest economy and with the greatest efficiency, and without one department overlapping in any respect the work which is being done by the other.

Then there is the division of transportation, which, of course, is intimately connected with production—with natural production and industrial production—and the statistics with reference to which are absolutely necessary if we shall come to any correct interpretation of the forces at work in Canada contributing to the business and trade and national prosperity of the country.

Vital statistics are also to be taken up in a new and adequate way. Up to the present time vital statistics have been chiefly gathered by the provinces. Some provinces have none; some provinces have more or less well developed plans. Complete accord has been reached between the statistical office here and the vital statistics branches of the different provinces, and a plan of gathering and distributing these vital statistics has been arranged for and will now be carried out. Members will see how vital this is to our country, as it is considered vital to all progressive countries. There has been a great lack of complete vital statistics in this country up to the present time, and we now propose to have that lack remedied.

Criminal statistics are being gathered in a way, and have been for a number of years, but I do not think any one will contend that they have been satisfactory; they have not been broad or thorough enough. The gathering of criminal statistics will be enlarged and carried out, I hope, with greater advantage to the country at large.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Enlarged in what way?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, for instance, that there will be a wider range selected. Criminal statistics are published in part; we have a publication of our own on criminal statistics. Several of the provincial governments have also statistics, more or less, that they are gathering. These will

be enlarged to take in all that is necessary for a well founded system of criminal statistics, and then all will be brought together and published, or distributed, in a form in which you will get everything that is vital to the understanding of the subject, instead of having to rummage round through the different provinces, and here in the Dominion, to gather the information and pick it out from these different sources.

Then there is the division of wealth, and debt, and taxation, which will take in governmental, municipal, corporation, and private finance. Not very much attention has been given to the collation and co-ordination of such material as already exists, but which exists without being put in a form where it can be readily of use. The Union of Municipalities has been very insistent upon the improvement, or the creation, of a system of statistics for the Dominion which shall aid them in their municipal work; and with the co-ordination of the municipal authorities, the provincial authorities and ourselves, it is proposed to enlarge that system of gathering statistics, and to collate it in a form where it can be easily got at and be readily usable.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the minister give an example as to what he intends doing, for instance, by the collation of municipal statistics?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend knows that pretty nearly as well as I do myself. All our municipalities govern themselves. They have their system of expenditures and of revenues; they have their debts and their tax systems, everything of that kind, and each municipality knows what it itself is doing, and it knows to a certain extent the plans along which it is working, but there is no collation of this for the municipalities as a whole, and therefore for the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand. It will simply be the embodying of the yearly financial statements of the municipalities.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be that, but it will also be something more, because the moment you begin to do that and to show the different systems which are at work in one municipality and another, it gives a chance for a comparison which is not feasible when the operations of each municipality in its own department appears alone.

All I have to state in addition to what I have already said deals with the editorial and publishing phases of these general statistics. We have, as hon. gentlemen know, a Year Book, which was instituted in 1886, and which has been improved from year to year, until to-day I think I can say that Canada has a Year Book which it is not ashamed to let go out into any country in the world. We have had from other countries, I may say, very strong commendations and expressions of approval as to the Year Book as it is now published. The publications, of course, will take in matter which is gathered in any of these different divisions with such annotations and analyses of them as it is really the highest work of the statistical office to accord in connection with facts once they are gathered.

I have troubled the House a little longer than I had anticipated, but I have been under the impression that probably not enough attention was given to the importance of statistical work in our country, and that not as much attention has been given to it as ought to be given to it in this House. Everybody will admit that a system of broad, well-based, accurate information running out into all the possible sources of activity of our country is not only a good, but an absolutely necessary thing to have in these days. Everything we do—I mean morally, spiritually to a certain extent, and to an absolute extent in the way of business, trade and finance is based upon facts. Facts constitute the foundation upon which they are to be based if results are to be satisfactory.

All our activities more or less demand a foundation of accurate and particular information. Not only do we need that for our country and its own business, but we are side by side with the progressive countries of the world, whose statistical systems during the last ten or fifteen years have been wonderfully improved, and if Canada is to do her work and perform her part in the world of nations, she must have a statistical system, which, so far as possible, will not only be adequate to her needs, but which will bear comparison with that of other nations and be for the benefit of the country in its relations with other countries. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more as an introduction to the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. CRONYN: Might I ask the minister if, in the use of the word "economic' in

this section, it is the intention to cover the case of financial companies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The division which takes in "wealth, debt," etc., and municipal statistics, covers that.

Mr. CRONYN: I notice that in section 34 there is a subclass of statistics called "Public and Private Finance." There seems to be no special provision covering financial concerns in the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think when we come to that section the explanation will satisfy my hon. friend that that is what is to be taken in.

Section agreed to.

On Section 4—Dominion statistician appointment and duties—Officials.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would like to ask my hon. friend if it is the intention to increase the personnel of the Bureau? I suppose he has a plan prepared for that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a reproduction of the clauses of the old Act in the main. It provides for the appointment of an officer to be called the Dominion Statistician. The Dominion Statistician has already been appointed, and is in office. So with reference to all the officers who are at present employed. As the work enlarges it may be possible, of course, that more help will be needed, but nothing is contemplated at the present time in this Act other than the staff that we at present have.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Commissioners, enumerators and agents.

The CHAIRMAN: I might point out to the committee that the rule is that the clause is called and the marginal heading read. If the committee desires that the whole clause be read, the Chairman, of course, is willing to do so.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I might make a brief explanation when the clause is called, and then perhaps it will not be necessary to read it in all cases. With reference to this clause, it is an exact reproduction of the old Act, except that it provides for all appointments to be made by the Civil Service Commission. And my right hon. friend will recollect that the previous practice has been that the major part of the help employed in the Census and Statistics Department was by appointment by the census officer himself and was not under the Civil Service Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If this clause is drafted with the good intention of dispensing with patronage, it will be all right.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is absolutely all right.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Oath of office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You had better read this section, Mr. Chairman.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This section provides—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, there is a request that I read this section.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did not hear the request.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The explanation may suffice without the reading of the clause. My hon. friend might go on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall proceed with the explanation, and then if my right hon. friend wishes the section read it can be read. This is the oath which was formerly not included in the Act, but was provided by Order in Council; and it is placed here as a section in the Act because then it becomes enacted, and it is seen when the Act is read. I think it is much better there than in an Order in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is a wise improvement.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Rules, regulations and forms.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Section 7 reproduces Section 9 of the old Act, except that the old Act requires the assent of the Governor in Council to the schedules and their publication in the Canada Gazette. This has proved wasteful of time, and the assent of the Governor in Council was very often perfunctory. The preparation of these schedules is a technical thing, and the officers of the Census really are the persons who know, and they, with the minister, prepare these schedules. It was thought unnecessary to have them go before the Governor in Council.

Section agreed to.

On Section 8—No discrimination.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the same as subsection 3, Section 19, of the old Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is to be no discrimination by the minister or by the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The section reads:

8. The Governor in Council shall not, nor shall the Minister, in the execution of the powers conferred by this Act, discriminate between individuals or companies to the prejudice of any such individual or company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has this been submitted to Mr. Fripp?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, now, Mr. Fripp is not in the Dominion Statistician's office.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—arrangements with provincial governments:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a re-arrangement and enlargement of section 20 of the old Act, providing for a scheme of co-operative Dominion and provincial statistics. It is largely copied from the Australian Act, in which it is provided that a Central Statistical Bureau work to a considerable extent through the provincial departments.

Mr. CRONYN: Is the power in this or any other section of the Bill to compel provincially incorporated companies to make returns of statistics that may be desired? Some years ago we endeavoured to secure Dominion-wide statistics relating to trust and mortgage companies, but we found, if my recollection serves me aright, that some of the provincial governments had no machinery for the collection of these statistics and it was impossible to get anything like a satisfactory census, as one might call it, of the activities, investments, etc., of these companies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Who was the collecting authority in that case?

Mr. CRONYN: A private authority.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of course, they could refuse a private inquisition, but the statistical office has inquisitorial powers, and it can get information from any company or concern.

Mr. CRONYN: Even provincially incorporated companies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. But if information is secret, it is used in the mass, not individually.

Section agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

[Sir George Foster.]

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 22—statistics of Commerce and Navigation:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These provisions are adaptations from clauses in the legislation of Great Britain, Australia and the United States.

Section agreed to.

On section 25—domestic trade:

Mr. MURPHY: Is it the intention to circulate these monthly reports as previously?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 34—general statistics:

Mr. MURPHY: In the phrase "Public and Private Finance," to what does "private" finance extend?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Private banks, for instance.

Mr. MURPHY: But not to individuals?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think so.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

On motion of Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) Bill 51, to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1, subsection 1—compensation to be same as under law of province where accident occurs.

Mr. CURRIE: In Ontario there may be a liability on the part of some of the railways coming under the operation of the Government, and a board has been created which takes the place of workmen's compensation legislation in that province. Is it the intention of the Government to contribute to the funds of that board? The Ontario Government have done away with the old Employers' Liability Act, and a department of the government deals with this question. Every employer pays so much money into this fund annually. No doubt the railways will be taken over shortly, and there is a large mileage of railway in Ontario. Has the minister considered the operation of the compensation

board in Ontario, or will this clause cover the whole thing?

Mr. J. D. REID: The intention of this Bill is to bring not only the railways but all Government employees on public works under a compensation Act. I may say, the railway employees prefer the Dominion Act, but it takes some time to work it out, and therefore I am introducing this Bill and placing all the employees in exactly the same position as the employees of a private railway. The Bill has been framed on that basis. The hon. gentleman asks whether it is the intention of the Government to deposit an amount with the Ontario Government, under the laws of that province. I may say it is not necessary for the Government of Canada to deposit any amount to ensure that any judgment under that Compensation Act will be paid. I do not know whether the law compels the Canadian Pacific or Canadian Northern to deposit any money, but it is not the intention of the Government to do so. In case of accident, injury or death, any liabilities will be paid in accordance with the amount the employees would be entitled to in any province.

Mr. CURRIE: The Ontario Government's officers will assess the damages to the person injured, and this Government will pay it?

Mr. J. D. REID: The court, or whatever the tribunal is.

Mr. CURRIE: There is a board?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The Dominion Government Railways will go through the same procedure as the Canadian Pacific, in case one of their employees is injured.

Mr. COPP: Has the substance of this Bill been submitted to representatives of the labour organizations on the Canadian Government railways for their approval?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, we have discussed it with some gentlemen representing some of the organizations. There is a clause referring to the provident fund, and it was with some of those connected with that fund we discussed it. The employees on the Intercolonial railway are satisfied, because they have this additional security.

Mr. COPP: The last line or two of this subsection says:

—shall be determined in the same manner and by the same board, officers or authority or by such other board, officers or authority, or by such court as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

Why is it necessary to establish another court? Why take it out of the hands of the regular courts?

Mr. J. D. REID: As I understand the provision of the clause, its purpose is to enable us to follow the law that exists in each province. I suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to know why it is necessary to appoint any board by Order in Council?

Mr. COPP: Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID: I understand that in Prince Edward Island, for instance, they have no board of arbitration, and no law such as we have in Ontario, and it might be necessary to appoint some board in that province similar to the boards in other provinces. That is the reason that clause was inserted.

Mr. CURRIE: The province of Ontario has a compensation board, with a staff of officials; and manufacturers, or others employing over a certain number of persons come under the regulations of that board. There is a certain expense every year which those who come under that board have to pay into the treasury for the maintenance of that board and to pay its inspectors and officers. I should think it would be advisable, if the Government railways come under the operation of that board, that they should pay a certain amount into that fund annually, the same as any one else. It would not be fair to have an organization work for the Dominion Government for nothing, because this service examines into these cases, and sends its inspectors to various points. When the award is made the Government will pay the award but it will not pay any of the expenses of the men who have gone out to investigate. I do not know whether the Bill makes any provision that out of the consolidated revenue fund there should be any payment besides the award that is paid to the person injured.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is this Bill to be made retroactive?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not retroactive.

Mr. MICHAUD: Take the case of employees on a gravel train, or in a sand pit, and working for His Majesty the King, who are insured against accident for an amount of $250. If some of them sustain injuries are they entitled to compensation under this Act? It seems that parties who are injured cannot put in any claim for damages beyond the amount for which they are insured. I remember a case in my own

constituency where a man had his two legs broken. I made an appeal to the solicitor of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton and he told me that the Government was not responsible beyond the amount of $250. I ask the minister whether or not this man by signing an agreement can prefer any other claim beyond $25?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I might venture to answer the question of the hon. member (Mr. Michaud). If the party injured is an employee of the Government railway, he is entitled to just the same remedy, and subject to just the same restrictions, should this Act pass as if he was employed on an ordinary railway. The law of the province applies in just the same way as it would if he were employed on another railway. In the other case the hon. gentleman brings forward, if under the law of the province in which the man resides, an insurance fund would be deducted from any amount he might otherwise receive, or would not be deducted, it would be deducted or not deducted according to his agreement. That would be the result in an action where the party was employed in the Government railway. I think that is clear.

Mr. MICHAUD: Under the present law, is that young man entitled to any compensation from the Government outside of his $250 insurance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. gentleman mean by "present law"—Dominion law or provincial law?

Mr. MICHAUD: The present Dominion law. He cannot come under the provincial law if he is working for a Government railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the present law, if I understand it—I may be wrong—compensation is paid by the Crown as an act of grace. There is no law governing the exact amount that shall be paid. This Bill establishes the principle of liability under the provincial law of the province where the man resides.

Mr. MICHAUD: I understood from the solicitor of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton that His Majesty is not responsible for any accident to any of his employees. Is that right?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. MICHAUD: Therefore, a widow and children cannot bring action against the Government for the death of the husband and father?

[Mr. Michaud.]

Mr. J. D. REID: No. This Bill, however, makes it possible for them to get compensation. In the hon. gentleman's province, in case of an accident on the Canadian Pacific railway, they can bring action against the company under the Compensation Act and get damages. But they could not do that if the accident happened on the Government railway. This now puts the Government railway in the same position in that province as the Canadian Pacific would be. In case of injury, an employee of the Government railway will be in exactly the same position in regard to compensation as would the employee of a railway company.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I am afraid that this Bill constitutes an encroachment on provincial rights. I see the minister smiling, but that is the construction I put on section 1. It says that the amount of compensation shall be determined by—

> —the same Board, officers or authority, or by such other board, officers or authority or by such court as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

I understand that if there is no board, officers or authority, or any court, the Governor in Council may appoint a board, officers, or authority to deal with these cases. Why not make this clause clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding? Make it read:

> Such compensation shall be determined in the same manner and by the same board, officers or authority, if any, or, if none, by such other board, officers or authority as the Governor in Council shall appoint.

My opinion is that in a province where there is already authority constituted the Governor in Council, under this clause, can appoint another authority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It did appear to be somewhat facetious to suggest that this Bill encroaches on provincial rights. If this Bill does not pass the law in the matter is that no court in any province has any jurisdiction whatsoever. No court established by a province has the slightest jurisdiction in regard to any cause of action that is under the purview of this Bill. Then, obviously, there is no provincial right encroached upon. There is no provincial right now. In so far as this Bill affects provincial rights, it enlarges them. It, in effect, gives to the province the power to determine the liability of this Dominion in respect to causes of action against a Dominion railway. It gives to a provincial board, unless replaced by a board established by the Governor in Council, the determination of the amount based on the principle that the

provincial legislature established. Consequently, whatever might be said for my hon. friend's contention, it could not be suggested that it encroaches on provincial rights.

Mr. GAUTHIER: This Bill will give jurisdiction to the authorities constituted actually by such other authority as the Governor in Council may appoint. Now to make my point very clear—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very clear now.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I beg the hon. minister to listen. To make my point very clear: I am always afraid of the explanations given by the hon. minister. When we were discussing the Military Service Bill he told the House that the province of Quebec should not be agitated by it because it would be the least affected; now the province of Quebec is supposed to be the most affected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid my words in that regard were only too true, but at present we are not discussing the Military Service Bill. I hope I may be as well within the mark now as I was on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman has referred What the hon. gentleman argues for is this: That the Governor in Council should not take the power to establish a board which would have the determination of, and the application of, a provincial law in fixing this amount. But even though we do take this power, I was pointing out we do not encroach upon any provincial right, because there is no provincial right to encroach upon. I submit that we ought to take the power for the following reasons: The principle objection that could be raised against the Dominion putting itself in this position is that it places itself within the power of a province to establish a board over which the Dominion has no control whatsoever, and no right to interfere with it in any way whatever, and enables that board to assess against the Crown in the right of the Dominion such compensation as may seem fit. Now it was thought right that the Government place itself under the same principles as apply to the province, that we should have the power to determine the nature of the tribunal which would apply those principles and assess the damages against the Crown. As the Minister of Railways has pointed out, there seems to be a special need of the exercise of that power now in the province of Prince Edward Island, and there may be need of it elsewhere. It may be thought fit to order that in all cases of claims against the Crown in the right of the Dominion a superior court should exercise jurisdiction, or it may be thought fit to establish in each province a board which, applying the law of the province, would determine what the amount should be. It seems to me only just that that right should be reserved inasmuch as we go to the extent of putting it within the power of a province to fix the principles and the law upon which we must pay damages.

Mr. KEEFER: Might I ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) for a little more light on this subject? My reason for doing so is that I pledged myself to the railway men of my riding that I would see to it, as far as I could, that such legislation as was in their interest should be passed. In the constituency of Port Arthur we have the three transcontinental railways and nine divisional points where the engines and the crews are changed. Those railway men are the civil soldiers of the country, and they should receive, not any greater consideration, but as great consideration as any other class in the community now receives. To-day they are labouring under two or three disabilities, and I have promised to use my influence to remove those disabilities. This is one of them; the employees on Government railways are asking to receive the same rights and the same amount of compensation for injury given to the employees of any other railway. If we do not establish that principle the result is going to be that we shall lose the good men in the railway service to the other railway systems that are not owned and operated by the Government. I have heard them say that if they cannot get the same rights and protection as other railway employees they would go to work, for the Canadian Pacific railway, for instance, where they would enjoy those rights. They want the Government railways not operated politically but operated by a commission absolutely divorced from politics, so that a man may rise by merit and merit only. I have pledged myself to do what I can to bring about that result.

A third matter I wish to bring up is that the railway men want the right to vote on election day so that if they are going out on duty they can come in and vote just as soldiers were able to vote at the last election. These men have to get up at four or five o'clock in the morning, or earlier, to attend to their duties, and cannot record their votes because they are off guarding His Majesty's mail, or carrying food and war supplies, and so forth, in doing which

they are discharging their duty to the country. These three grievances the railway men want remedied, and I seek to enlist the sympathy and support of this House on their behalf for that purpose.

Now, as regards this section, the Minister of the Interior has explained, if I understand it aright, that it is desired in some way to keep control over the provincial legislature in the way of how it may legislate. If I understand the position correctly it is this: First of all there is the principle of law that the Crown is not liable in any action by any suppliant without its permission, which is the well-known and right principle. Now we are making an inroad into that principle by this legislation, and rightly making it. Then the principle as to liability, as I understand it, is, that if the province has not Workmen's Compensation Boards, and so forth, there is a common law liability, under a well known and celebrated case that every lawyer knows, by which if a man is engaged in a hazardous undertaking he is entitled to recover damages, which damages must be reasonable in amount. Under the provincial law, as I take it—the Minister of the Interior will correct me if I am wrong,—any court in a province where they have not these workmen's compensation boards, would decide the matter upon the principle of common law. Now, is the railway man in any way to be deprived first of all of his right under the common law where there is no board or tribunal, or otherwise? Or is he entitled to go to the tribunals of the land—or in case of his demise, have his widow and children that right—and sue for damages, thus being put in the same position as any other railway employee? That is the point I want to make clear beyond possibility of doubt. If that were not so, and there was not the common law liability, then the Crown might want to step in and create some tribunal, but it would be only in case, I should think, where the common law liability is not retained; otherwise I should think it would be a dangerous proceeding to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Crown to step in and constitute a special tribunal. I would like that point made clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the hon. gentleman to ask whether or not the former common law liability will be retained.

Mr. KEEFER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no former common law liability as against the Crown.

[Mr. Keefer.]

Mr. KEEFER: I mean the same common law that applies to other subjects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no common law liability now against the Crown. But I would say that the common law liability as it exists in any province as applied to a railway corporation may now, if this Bill passes, be utilized against the Crown, and will be in effect unless it has been displaced by provincial legislation.

Mr. KEEFER: That is perfectly clear.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I endorse what has just been said by the hon. member from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) as to the importance of and necessity for this legislation.

There is certainly no reason why the State should not be treated or considered as an ordinary employer of labour. I know of many injustices which have been done to workmen on the Intercolonial railway because of the lack of such legislation. The other day, when the resolution which preceded this Bill was discussed in committee, I enquired whether there were Workmen's Compensation Acts in all the provinces, and I was told that there was such legislation in all the provinces. A gentleman well posted on labour questions has told me that there are several provinces where no such legislation exists. If the hon. minister has the information as to that he should supply it to his colleague, the Minister of Labour, because I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Labour Department last year entitled "Labour Legislation in Canada," and I read this:

> In 1916 laws in the field of labour legislation were passed by the Federal Government and by the legislatures of all the provinces except Prince Edward Island. The outstanding feature was the enactment of workmen's compensation laws in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, following the passage of compensation statutes in Ontario in 1914 and in Nova Scotia in 1915. In the autumn of 1915 the British Columbia Government appointed a commission to investigate the subject of workmen's compensation, which reported favourably in time for the passage of the Act at the next session of the legislature. The enactment of modern compensation laws by four provinces brings Canada fairly well in line with the rapid development of legislation of this kind throughout the world.

This would indicate that as far as the Labour Department is concerned they are not informed as to whether such legislation exists in all the provinces of the Dominion. On the other hand, the information given there is certainly incomplete, because I know, as a matter of fact, that in the prov-

ince of Quebec a compensation law was enacted in 1909, the first labour compensation legislation in the Dominion of Canada. If the province of Quebec comes last on woman's suffrage, it was the pioneer as far as labour legislation is concerned. So, if the information of the Department of Labour was wrong as to Quebec, it may have been wrong for the other provinces as well. I would like to know, and the Committee is entitled to the information, whether such legislation exists in all the provinces?

Mr. CURRIE: I do not think the hon. gentleman realizes what the compensation laws of these provinces mean. In the provinces generally, under the common law, I think a man could bind himself outside of compensation. That is, I could hire a man and make an agreement with him under the common law that if he sustained any injury he or his heirs could not ask for any compensation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is not good law.

Mr. CURRIE: Then there was another law passed in England—I think it was called Lord Campbell's Act—the lawyers in the House will correct me if I am in error, because I do not speak as a lawyer but as an employer of labour——

An hon. MEMBER: You are not talking good law.

Mr. CURRIE: However, there was a law passed there which made it so that a man could not contract outside of the operation of securing compensation. Supposing a man was killed, his family could sue regardless of any agreement made with the employer. That is the British law. Now, all the provinces passed statute laws of that character, and the law the hon. gentleman refers to in Quebec is along that line. In the province of Ontario the insuring of the employee is taken entirely out of the hands of the employers, and a board is set up which insures every workman who seeks employment with a corporation or individual, and if he is killed or injured, the Government has a number of inspectors who visit the man or the place of his employment and take all the evidence in the case, and the workmen's compensation board at Toronto fixes the degree of liability and the compensation, whether it is to be an annual payment extending over the lifetime of the widow, and so on. They fix it, and the Government pays it, and they charge that up generally to every business or employment in the category. All kinds of businesses are categorized. For instance, munitions is in category C; farming will be category A, and so on, all the way down the line, and the compensation is in accordance with the category; but practically the amount paid into this fund annually is in accordance with the risk. I might say in that connection that in the province of Ontario in the year 1916 in a munitions plant that I know of the premium was something like $350. Previous to that the amount paid to the insurance companies would run about six or seven hundred dollars. So we find the Compensation Act works a great reduction in the cost of carrying the risk of the workmen. Previously, the workmen could get practically nothing at all. The employer paid into a liability company, which employed every lawyer it could get to keep the workman from securing damages, and their whole business was to prevent him from obtaining damages. They stood behind the manufacturer and said: If you incur any damages, we will pay them, but we will put the workman and his wife and children through all the courts in the land before they will be able to collect anything from you. That was a vicious principle in itself. Now, these boards fix the compensation. But, like the high cost of living and everything else, the amount paid into the province of Ontario last year as premiums increased three hundred per cent over the previous year, and there is a great deal of grumbling about that. It is claimed that the board has assessed the figure for the year far too high in order to accumulate a large fund for itself. In the province of Quebec, I think there is not a board of that description; I understand there is not. But the province of British Columbia has adopted the principle, having largely copied from the law of the State of Washington. The other provinces down by the sea have also adopted a similar system; it is a splendid system for both employer and workman. But unless boards are established, I think the law will stand, not the old common law, but the general law of all the provinces, that a man cannot contract himself out of his right of claim upon his employer in case he is injured. Under the old common law he could not do that, it being held that he was a free agent.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If it is intended that the law of the province with respect to the amount of compensation and the manner of obtaining it is to govern, the section as it now stands is a little obscure. The wording of the clause is as follows:

—and the liability for and the amount of such compensation shall be determined in the same manner and by the same Board, officers or authority, or by such other Board, officers or authority or by such court as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

If we cut out the alternative clause, it will read as follows:

—and the liability for and the amount of such compensation shall be determined in the same manner and by the same Board, officers or authority, as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

There are no similar actions at all, because it is within the authority of the Governor in Council absolutely to determine the board. I would suggest that the clause be amended in this manner:

—and the liability for and the amount of such compensation shall be determined in the same manner and by the same Board, officers or authority, as similar actions for compensation are determined under the laws of such province, or by such other Board, officers of authority or by such court as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

Mr. BUREAU: Striking the alternative out?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: No, there is no alternative. As it reads now, the section says: "shall be determined by the same board as the Governor in Council shall direct." I suggest that after the word "authority," in the third line from the last, there be added the words: "as similar claims for compensation are determined under the laws of such province." Then, if in any particular province there is no board for the purpose of determining compensation the alternative clause will apply and the Governor in Council may appoint such authority as is deemed expedient.

Mr. J. D. REID: The parliamentary counsel, our railway solicitor, and, I think, the Chairman of the Railway Commission, all assisted in drafting this clause with a view to having it right.

Mr. JACOBS: In the multitude of counsel there is wisdom.

Mr. J. D. REID: My whole object is to get this Bill in such shape that in cases of accident employees on Government railways shall have the same rights as employees of other railways. Under the present law, if a man is injured or killed, I have no way of providing compensation for his family. Cases have been dealt with in the estimates, but it is not fair to me or to the family that I should have to decide the matter in that way.

Mr. FIELDING: Does this not mean that the minister, the Government, or the department desires to put itself, in every province, in the position of a private corporation, and then to come under the operations of the compensation law of that province?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is what I have in view.

Mr. FIELDING: That is an object with which we can all sympathize. My hon. friend has had half a dozen lawyers preparing this clause, and it must be right, I suppose. The object is certainly a worthy one, but I should not gather it from the reading of the clause as it stands.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Suppose that during the course of his employment a 9 p.m. man receives an injury which does not come within the terms of the Compensation Act, and the compensation board in the particular province refuses to take jurisdiction over him, what remedy is open to the dependents of that man? If a man is killed, perhaps through the gross negligence of the railway itself, does this Act purport to give a fiat for the bringing of action against the Crown for damages?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I take it that my hon. friend means a case in which action would lie against a private company in the ordinary courts of the land, but which would not come within the special compensation law of the province. The effect of this legislation would be to give the family of such a man action against the Crown in the ordinary courts of the land.

Mr. TWEEDIE: According to that, then, the Act does not limit the right to recovery under the Compensation Act of the provinces. A private individual would have a perfect right to bring an action against the Crown, just the same as against a private company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is my understanding.

Mr. TWEEDIE: If that is a correct interpretation of the Act, the provision is an excellent one.

Mr. CURRIE: In view of the suggestions which have been made, the law clerk should be asked to go over this section very carefully. While the marginal notation may read all right, I confess that a few more words seem to be necessary in order to make the clause absolutely clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was impressed by the point raised by the member for North Grey

(Mr. Middlebro). It is more a mistake in English, I think, than anything else. Perhaps I may be pardoned for saying here that I did not draft this legislation. I move that the following words be added after the word "authority" where it first occurs in the 13th line:

—as that established by the law of the province for determining compensation in similar cases.

Mr. BUREAU: If a man is injured in Ottawa, does that imply that he may go before the Exchequer Court instead of before the ordinary Superior Court, or whatever you call it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He could not go before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the meaning of these words?—

—or by such other Board, officers or authority or by such court as the Governor in Council shall from time to time direct.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is only for the purpose of providing for the appointment of a board in any province where no Compensation Act has been adopted. I believe that would apply to only one province—Prince Edward Island. If a man were injured while employed on a Government railway in Ontario, the Ontario board under the Compensation Act would determine the compensation to be paid.

Mr. BUREAU: In that case, what harm would there be in adding after the amendment just moved by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), that in case no such board of officers exists in the province, or in the absence of any compensation law in force in the province, the Governor in Council may determine before what board or court the injured person may come?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I endeavoured to state the point of view of the Government before. We do not wish to take the authority and apply it only in cases where there is no provincial law so as to fix Dominion liaright to establish a tribunal in any case that we see fit, or in all cases that we see fit. The distance Parliament is going to in placing it within the power of the province to establish the laws and the principles upon which we shall pay damages seems to me to be a long way indeed, without asking us to go the further length of placing ourselves wholly within the jurisdiction of such tribunal, of whatever character, as the province may establish for applying that law and determining the amount of compensation. It may be that in no case except where there is no tribunal, shall we exercise that right, but we wish to reserve it, and it might be that the Governor in Council might see fit to enact that only a Superior Court in any province should apply the provincial law so as to fix Dominion liability.

Mr. BUREAU: I entirely agree with what was said a few moments ago by my hon. friend from Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer). He asked the Government to put the railway man working for the Government in exactly the same position as the ordinary man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to law.

Mr. BUREAU: That was his idea, if I understood him correctly. But this goes further. Supposing a man gets injured while working on a Government steamer or on a public work; under this Act he would be entitled to compensation, whether he was working for the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Railways, or the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend said he was afraid it might not be the judge of a Superior Court who would take cognizance of the case. I suppose it is the same in other provinces as in Quebec, where the jurisdiction of the judge is limited by the amount involved. In our province it is specifically provided that it is the judge of the Superior Court who shall take original cognizance of the case. Before an injured man can sue, he has to present a petition, and when that petition is presented, if employer and employee agree the judge renders judgment which has the same effect as if the action had been tried by the court in the regular way. I am not speaking on behalf of my district particularly, because we have no Government railways. I had forgotten; we have the Canadian Northern paid for by the Government, but not yet owned or operated by the Government. Under this legislation, the railwaymen working for the Government would not feel they were on the same footing as the men working for the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk, because there would always be an uncertainty as to the Government creating a board to decide these compensation cases. But knowing the sympathy of the Minister of Railways for the working man, I do not think he would make any change which would be to their disadvantage; but we know he does change his mind sometimes, and we have precedents enough for that if we look backward.

There is another point. Would it not be well to mention in the Bill that the action may be brought against the department in which the injured man was employed? Because if the action is simply brought against His Majesty the King, we should see His Majesty King George the Fifth summoning His Majesty King George the Fifth to appear before the Superior Court of Three Rivers or elsewhere to answer to John Doe, who has broken his leg while in the employ of His Majesty. We might provide that when a man brings an action for personal injury, the fact of designating the department for which he was working will be sufficient to bring the Crown before the court. I remember that when we amended the Railway Act to allow people to bring claims up to $500 for cattle killed by the railway, a special board was appointed and the action was brought against this board and that was sufficient to make the Crown appear. The Crown has gone extensively into the railway business, and Government railways cover the whole country. Heretofore, Moncton has been the seat of railway operations by the Crown. In an action for damages, would the injured man have to serve notice on the minister or the deputy minister at Ottawa, or in the head office of the railway company, or in the resident engineer's office for the Department of Railways, or on the customs officer of the district if the accident happened to a man in the customs service? I think we should set out in the Bill who shall be sued when a man wants to sue the Crown for personal injury, and where the Crown may be served. Otherwise, if the labourer has to serve the documents in Ottawa or at some divisional point he might be put to considerable expense. On the Canadian Pacific, if an accident occurs, the injured man may serve the head office in Montreal or the agent at the place where the accident happened. Perhaps the minister would draft a paragraph embodying my suggestions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think the principle of this Bill is an excellent one, and I am certainly in favour of the Crown granting compensation to employees suffering injuries through the operation of the railways. I think this is the natural corollary of the legislation passed some years ago by which those who suffered from fires caused by sparks from an engine on the Intercolonial could sue to the amount of $200 before the courts of the province through which the train passed. I do not think the paragraph before us is quite clear. The Government first of all admits the jurisdiction of the courts of the provinces to adjudicate these cases, and accepts the various compensation Acts passed by the different provinces. The courts of the provinces, although created by the provinces themselves, are paid out of the federal exchequer. As the Government by this legislation accepts the compensation Acts of the provinces why not trust the administration of this Act to the Superior Court judges of the provinces? Why does the Government take power to create special boards in the various provinces? The Government will accept the compensation Acts which are provided for by the different provinces; it seems invidious that it will not accept the jurisdiction of the courts in the provinces and pass the administration of that Act to those special boards. You are creating an invidious distinction as between our judges in the various provinces, who are paid by the federal exchequer although created by local legislatures, whilst you admit the validity and the scope of our Compensation Act. If the Government were providing for special boards which would administer compensation Acts differently from the provincial Acts, I could understand this legislation. I say to the Government: The legislation is excellent; the principle is most excellent, but I do not understand why you do not trust the provincial courts in the administration of the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the Constitution of this country the greatest care was observed in providing for the establishment and the manning of our courts. The balance was well preserved between Dominion and provincial responsibility, and if all the provinces had referred the administration of their compensation law to the courts, then I do not apprehend that this alternative would have been inserted in the Bill. But a board established purely under provincial law, and manned only by provincial authority, is not naturally a board in which the Dominion would be likely to place irrevocably its destiny in these matters; at all events in the same way as we might be quite prepared to place it if the provincial law prescribed the court to adjudicate, instead of a board.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why do you not limit it to provinces where they have no board?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the reason that the province itself has not limited it. The province comes along, displaces the jurisdiction of the court, and establishes a board, and we would have, by Order in

Council to re-establish the jurisdiction of the court and place our cases under their jurisdiction. Consequently we must take this alternative. Otherwise we are wholly within the power of a board constituted by provincial authority, manned by provincial authority, in respect of which this Dominion has no say whatever. My hon. friend asks: Why not at once remove the jurisdiction of boards, and place this wholly within the power of the Superior Court of each province? That might be done, but it was thought better to try it with the boards that now exist, and see how it operated, and what effect it would have. It is true they are in no way answerable to us, they are appointed by provincial authority, paid by provincial funds, and in no way in the nature of courts established under the provisions of the British North America Act. It might be well to try the operation of this law as administered by the board, but we retain power, not only to establish a board, or a court where there is none now, but to displace the board now established, if we see fit, by a court or a board which may sit through all the provinces, as the Governor in Council may see fit.

Mr. KEEFER: If I understand the position, we have now come down practically to what you might call a constitutional question, whether the Dominion of Canada shall or shall not be willing to submit itself, as far as this principle of liability is concerned, to the provincial courts. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) says: Yes, I want to see all the men employed in the Government railways receive the same treatment as men employed in any other railway. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), being a very able lawyer, and realizing much more fully the meaning of these words, practically says: No, I will only agree to the provincial authority, provided we are satisfied with it. Let us use blunt language in this matter; let us place the cards on the table. I think it would be a horrible mistake, when dealing with railway employees, to leave the matter in such a position that it could be argued in two or three ways. These men do not like to be deceived. I am a new member of the House, and do not know which is the proper course to adopt. They are both very far-reaching. It is a dangerous thing for the Federal Government to submit itself without reservation to the provinces. Canada stands to-day in a peculiar position in regard to railways. I hardly think any of us realize it. We are to-day the owners of about 15,000 miles of railway—the largest railway owner in Canada. We have seen fit, and rightly so, to take over these railways. Having done so, and having come into competition with other existing railways, it seems to me that we ought to take the liabilities incident to taking over the railways. Remember, these liabilities will be very far-reaching. We cannot stop at this matter. You have to take up the principle of municipal assessment later on, the principle of municipal liability for taxes, and so on, just as the railways have done. Heretofore the Government never allowed itself to be taxed, and rightly so. So that the matter cannot be disposed of very triflingly. It seems to me very unwise not to be able to say to the men: You are working on this railway for us; you are going to have exactly the same treatment as you would have working for any other railway. For that reason, I would like to see the Government so amend this clause that the principle would be clearly and well defined. It cuts into the principle that my hon. friend the hon. Minister of the Interior just enunciated. I should like to move an amendment—

The CHAIRMAN: There is already an amendment before the Committee.

Mr. KEEFER: In order that the Committee may be considering it, I may say that the substance of my proposed amendment will be to insert after the word " or " in the 13th line the following:

—if such board, officers or authority be not then existing.

That squarely defines the position, that if there is not an existing board, we will appoint one.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment now before the Committee is that proposed by the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Mr. KEEFER moved to add after the word "or," where it appears for the second time in line 13 of subclause (1), the following words "if no such board, officers or authority be then existing."

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: When I moved my amendment I had no thought of taking away the alternative from the Government. I do not think we are justified in placing absolutely and entirely in the hands of such a local board as a provincial government may determine, what compensation we should pay for any injury which may be sustained by any person within the limits of that province. What the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) says is

quite sound, that we should give this Act a trial. It may be that when these provincial boards get to know that whatever compensation they allow in such a case is going to be paid by the Dominion Government, the amount of the compensation may very materially swell. I think it is well to have the reservation if for no other reason than that these boards will know that if they do not give reasonable compensation for losses, or the compensation that is allowed in similar cases in various provinces, if they do not do what is fair and square as between the claimant and the Government, it is within our power to withdraw the matter from their jurisdiction and place it in the hands of such other boards or tribunals as we shall appoint for that purpose.

Mr. KEEFER: We can always pass a new Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: For that reason, I say, give the present Act a trial and if it is satisfactory we do not need to change it. If it is not satisfactory, we can pass a new Act, as my hon. friend says.

Mr. J. D. REID: When I spoke a few moments ago I assured the committe that my object was to give the railway employees all the benefits which they would receive in any province in so far as compensation is concerned. This Bill allows the Government to do that. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) who has just spoken. If some province should appoint a board, or adopt a law, by which the railway employees would not probably get as much as we believe they would be entitled to, we would be in a position to appoint a board that would see that they received their just dues.

Mr. BUREAU: In that case we had better put it in the Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID: This Bill has been passed upon by the railway employees. I would like to give it a trial, and if, by the time another session of Parliament is held, it does not work out as we expect, we can amend it. I think that to give away our powers in so far as doing what is just and fair by the men is concerned would be to take a step that would hardly be justified.

Mr. COPP: The minister started out with the very good intention of putting Government railway employees in the same position as the employees of any other railway. But, apparently the multitude of his legal advisors have got him into a bad plight because he has, by the first part of this section, given the employees of the Government railways what they are entitled to, but every man in this Parliament must realize that he leaves the back door open, in the provision contained in the last line of the section, so that in case the award does not suit him he can withdraw the case from the board.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is not so.

Mr. COPP: That is as I understand it. I do not say that the minister intends to do that, but that is actually how it works out. The provinces, apparently with one exception, have compensation Acts each administered by what are known as arbitration boards, as explained by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) a few moments ago. A board is appointed by the provincial government to hear these cases, deliberate upon them and give their judgment the satisfaction of which becomes a charge upon the fund that has been raised by an assessment upon these large corporations. The amendment moved by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) is all right as far as it goes, but the Canadian Government railway employees will not be satisfied with a clause which says that the Government, if not satisfied with the way in which the case has been tried before the arbitration board in the province in which the claimant resides, can take it out of their hands and appoint a board of their own. They may get just as good and just a reasonable a board, and a board that would give a fair judgment, but nevertheless the employees of the Government railway will look upon it with a good deal of suspicion. I am absolutely in favour of the principle of this Bill, and I would like to see it adopted in such a shape that the Government would be protected as well as the employees of the road. But, this is how it will work out: Somebody is injured or killed on the Intercolonial railway and his dependents come before a board appointed by the legislature or government of the province of New Brunswick. The case proceeds, and the board, in the opinion of the minister, makes too large an allowance to the dependents.

Mr. J. D. REID: I never made any such statement, and the hon. gentleman knows that I did not.

Mr. COPP: I did not say the hon. gentleman did, but I was suggesting that that is how it will work out.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman is making out a case on supposition.

Mr. COPP: If a judgment has been given by the arbitration boards that is too large in the opinion of the minister, he takes the right, under that section, to withdraw the case from that board and to appoint a board of his own.

Mr. J. D. REID: No. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. COPP: Well, now, let us see.

Mr. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. BUREAU: For future cases.

Mr. COPP: For future cases, exactly. Now then, what would happen?

Mr. MEIGHEN: You cannot do that with respect to future cases.

Mr. BUREAU: You are changing your policy in that regard?

Mr. COPP: I think the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) understands the position. What would happen would be this: You must have a solicitor to look after the legal interests of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the solicitor of the railway, who would be against the employee, would practically appoint the board that would sit upon the case and that would bring in its decision. I say that is absolutely contrary to the object of the Bill as explained by the Minister of Railways, when he told us that it was intended to put the employees of the Government railways on a fair and reasonable footing with the employees of all other railways and corporations. I agree with him that is the proper thing to do; but I protest in the strongest manner possible on behalf of the employees of the Intercolonial railway particularly, who are very numerous in the constituency which I represent, against taking power away from the boards of the province of New Brunswick and placing it in the hands of a board appointed by the Governor in Council, for that will raise suspicion in the minds of the railway employees which will be beneficial neither to the Government nor to the railway. If there is no compensation board in any province and you appoint a court to deal with the matter, well and good, but to give this power to a board to be appointed by the Governor in Council does not seem to be in the interests of the railway employees themselves or in the interests of the country.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member (Mr. Copp) is afraid that the railway employees will not receive fair treatment if their case is tried by some tribunal appointed by the Dominion Government. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that a very large delegation of railway employees from all the different railway organizations came to Ottawa and urged me to bring in a Dominion Compensation Bill, and why? Because they claimed they were not getting fair treatment from some of the provincial boards.

Mr. COPP: A permanent board?

Mr. J. D. REID: The enactment of a Dominion Compensation Bill was what they wanted.

Mr. COPP: Exactly, providing for a permanent board.

Mr. J. D. REID: And my answer to the delegation was that we had not time during the present session to enact the legislation which they wanted, but that I would bring in a Compensation Bill that would fit in with the provincial laws for all the Dominion, and give it a trial, and at another session, if they so desired, I would be glad to introduce a Dominion Bill. Therefore, the railway employees were not only willing, but anxious, to trust their case in the hands of the Dominion Government. That is the stand they took within the last two weeks.

Mr. COPP: Then their faith is badly placed.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not agree with the hon. member. Now, as those men pleaded with me to bring in a Dominion Bill, I would not be justified in abandoning this legislation now, and, therefore, I ask hon. gentlemen to support the Bill before the House. I am giving them my word that this Bill is intended to dovetail in with the provincial laws throughout the Dominion, and I ask hon. gentlemen to support the Bill as it is. Let us pass the Bill and give it a few months' trial. Let it be tried until the next session of Parliament, and then if the railway employees say that the law is working out unsatisfactorily, let us do our best to perfect it. So far as I am concerned, my whole object is to try and secure the passage of a law that will be satisfactory to railway employees throughout the Dominion.

Mr. COPP: I can assure the minister that the provision embodied in this section will not be satisfactory, but will be absolutely unsatisfactory to the railway men. It is unreasonable for one of the litigants interested in the case coming up for adjudication to have the right to appoint the board. It would be just as reasonable,

I submit, to introduce an amendment providing that if the employees of the Government railway were not satisfied with the board appointed by the provincial government, or by my hon. friend opposite, they could apply for the appointment of an arbitration board of their own choosing. What is fair for one ought to be fair for the other. The Minister of Railways may pass the Bill, but I tell him that within twenty-four hours after it is enacted and it goes down to employees of the Intercolonial railway, and they realize what has been done, he will be flooded with protests against putting any such amendment on the statute-book. It is absolutely unjust towards the railway employees.

Mr. KEEFER: I think probably the wisest thing to do in the interest of the railway men is to carry out the suggestion of the Minister of Railways. He has come down to the House in perfect good faith with legislation to better the railway men's condition. I welcome this Bill as an improvement on the existing law. It may not go quite as far as we would like it to go, indeed it is a sort of experiment, and I agree with the hon. member from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) that it would perhaps be better to compromise and accept the Bill just as it is with these amendments. Then if it does not work satisfactorily, and the House is so disposed, the law can be still further improved next session.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman desires to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. KEEFER: Yes.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. BUREAU: The Minister of Railways made the statement that he had received a delegation representing not only the employees of the Government railways, but the employees of all the other railway systems.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. As far as I can remember they represented all the different organizations of railway employees.

Mr. BUREAU: Did I understand the minister to state that the delegation objected to the provincial boards and wanted a Dominion board appointed?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. What I stated was that a delegation of railway employees called on me and asked that a Dominion Compensation Bill be enacted, in other words, that the Compensation Act should apply to the same extent in one part of the Dominion as in another.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. BUREAU: I am not asking questions from captious motives, I simply want information.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, I recognize that. To put it in another way. What the railway employees submitted was something like this. An employee in the province of Ontario is injured and damages to a certain amount are awarded under the Ontario Compensation Act, whereas some of the other provinces have a law under which there is not the same amount of compensation. The delegation stated that the law should be similar in character in every part of the Dominion. I informed them that as the session was likely to be short I could not put such a Bill through, but that I would introduce a Bill under which the employees of the Government railways would have identically the same rights as the employees of other railways enjoyed. Now, so far as I am concerned, if any employee of the Government railways, between now and the next session of Parliament, should be injured or killed, the claim for compensation would be treated in exactly the same manner as it would be if the employee belonged to the Canadian Pacific railway. Let us see how this Bill works out in operation, and next session if amendments are needed we will be very glad to put them into effect.

Mr. BUREAU: I wish to say—

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but I promised the hon. member for South Renfrew that I would see him next.

Mr. PEDLOW: I will not take up the time of the committee to any great extent. I merely rise to offer a suggestion that I think would simplify the matter very materially. I cannot see any reason why matters of this kind should not be dealt with through the civil courts. I understand that such matters are dealt with through the civil courts in the province of Quebec. I am not a lawyer—and I may say in passing that I am glad of that seeing that lawyers are getting things mixed up so much. I am sorry for the Minister of Railways in that respect; I think he would have been well advised to have kept out of that. I am an ordinary business man, and my suggestion is that it would simplify matters if cases of this kind could be dealt with by the civil courts in all the provinces alike.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Chairman, the discussion on this Bill has proceeded largely on the assumption that it is confined largely

to railway employees. It covers every man in the service of the Dominion Government, whether he is working on a railway, or a public building, or a dredge, or in any other capacity.

Mr. J. D. REID: It covers women too.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, women as well. Now, a suggestion has been made that it would be right and proper to leave this matter to the constituted courts in the various provinces. The legislature of Ontario, for instance, in their wisdom, have said that these are not matters that ought to be disposed of by courts. They have said that any claim arising in that province ought to be determined by a board specially constituted for that purpose, and not by a court. Now, one reason for that was this: we found in that province for many years that men having claims and finally succeeding against their employer would discover that the lawyer cabbaged all the damages and these poor fellows got nothing. One object in introducing the Compensation Act in Ontario was that the man or his widow, or his fatherless children, would get whatever they were entitled to without any cost. I am not familiar with the Compensation Act of the province of New Brunswick, but I fancy that it is in some respects at least like the one that exists in Ontario. There is not much left to a board—

Mr. COPP: It is left to the judge of the court there.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is determined by the statute that a man shall be entitled to a certain percentage of the wages that he earned for the twelve months previous to his injury or death.

Mr. BUREAU: That depends on the degree of the injury.

Mr. CROTHERS: —and is fixed by the statute. So that, if the law in New Brunswick or in any other province is like the law in Ontario, there is very little left to the board, and it is not worth while arguing that one board would award larger sums for damages than another. They are restricted by the terms of the statute to pay a certain percentage of the wages earned during the preceding year. That, however, is the case in Ontario. I rose, Mr. Chairman, to set my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) right. If I understood him correctly, he was attacking one of the reports of my department. I think he misread the clause altogether. He read the following:

> In 1916 laws in the field of labour legislation were passed by the Federal Government and by the legislatures of all the provinces except Prince Edward Island.

I gathered from what he said that he understood that laws affecting wages or compensation were passed. Well, he says he did not mean that, so there is no discrepancy. There were laws passed in 1916 affecting labour, but he spoke about the modern legislation. The article contained these words:

> The enactment of modern compensation laws by four provinces brings Canada fairly well in line with the rapid development of legislation of this kind throughout the world.

His statement was that we had said that there were compensation Acts passed in four of the provinces, and that some one else had said that such laws were in effect in either seven or nine provinces. What we refer to here is modern compensation laws. There never was a time, I think, in any part of the British Empire, when a servant had not the right to bring an action against his employer for damages resulting from the negligence of his employer. But several abuses grew up in England, as well as in some parts of Canada, where what is known as contributory negligence was brought in, where fellow-servants were brought in, where it was held that if a man were injured while in the employ of another man through the negligence of a fellow-servant he could not recover anything from his employer, because when he hired to his employer he took his chances of any negligence that a fellow-servant might be guilty of. I do not think that principle was ever adopted in the province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was a very erroneous principle, but it grew up in Ontario to such an extent that they have held there that a sectionman working on a railroad was a fellow-employee with the superintendent of the road living in Chicago, and if he were injured by reason of the negligence of the superintendent in Chicago he could not recover anything because of that fellow-servant principle. This Compensation Act has done away with contributory negligence altogether, and with that principle or doctrine of co-service, a fellow-service, fellow-workmen or fellow-servant. But, as I said a moment ago, there never was a time when under the common law of England a servant could not recover from his employer for negligence by the employer himself. Well, it was thought a hardship that he could not recover where the negli-

gence was on the part of his superior officer, or the manager, or the superintendent of the road, and a Compensation Act was passed many years ago in Ontario—not what is referred to in the article quoted from as a modern Compensation Act, but one passed more than twenty years ago making an employer liable in certain cases to his servant for the negligence of a superior officer. But the modern Act, passed in 1914, does away entirely with the question of contributory negligence and the doctrine of co-service or fellow-service, allowing a man a certain percentage of the wages that he earned during the twelve months next preceding the time when he was injured. If he is killed his widow gets a certain amount of money per month while she remains a widow, and each child receives a certain amount per month until it reaches a certain age. So that these boards in Ontario have very little latitude after all.

Mr. BUREAU: Might I ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) to determine in the Bill what procedure will be followed in an action against the Crown? Will it be the provincial procedure, or the procedure followed in the Exchequer Court?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not be the same as in the Exchequer Court, because he would not be suing in the Exchequer Court. He would be suing in the court that had jurisdiction in the province. The only question that comes up then is the question of service, and the ordinary law would apply as to what would be service for the Crown. In actions against the Crown with respect to railway claims under $500, special provision is made for service on railway agents on the line. This procedure would not apply in this case. I have not looked into the point to see just what would be service on the Crown, but that would be for the judge in the case to determine. I do not think it is necessary here to go to the extent of fixing what is service on the Crown, nor do I think it would be wise to legislate that service on officers of the Crown situated in far-off provinces, would be service, for the reason that this Act is so very wide, enabling suits to be lodged against the Crown by employees of any department whatever. I do not think it would be wise to facilitate service in such a way as to enable a man to serve some one at a great distance—perhaps a comparatively minor employee—and obtain judgment before there could be even notice upon those who were responsible to refute or dispute the claim. I think we had better leave it to the application of the ordinary law for the time being, and not provide means for facilitating service.

Mr. BUREAU: Will service be on the Attorney General?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Leave it to the application of the law. I would not undertake to advise what the law would be.

Mr. JACOBS: The matter of service is a very important one. In this case the proceedings would be against the Minister of Railways—

Mr. J. D. REID: It might be against any department.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, but notice would have to be served on some department. In the province of Quebec, when we wish to proceed against the Crown, a petition of right must be served on the Attorney General. Here a new Act is being brought into life. If you legislate in a substantive way, you must have the adjectival part at the same time the procedure indicating how the Act is to be carried into force. With all the statutes before us, we lawyers sometimes have the greatest difficulty in advising clients what to do. If no procedure is provided for the party who is asking for compensation will find himself in the midst of so many complications before he gets through that he may find this law will be of very little value.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not appoint a committee of business men—not lawyers—to fix it up?

Mr. JACOBS: Suppose we appoint ex-Ministers of Militia and Defence.

Mr. MOWAT: No more dangerous suggestion could be adopted than that of my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs). Nothing is more dangerous than for one legislative body to interfere with the machinery of another. If there is any trouble in the province of Quebec, let the persons interested go to the Quebec legislature and get it remedied.

Mr. JACOBS: May I ask—

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that the rule which says that the rules of the House must be observed in committee with the exception that a member may speak more than once should not be interpreted to mean that more than one member may speak at the same time.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend simply wanted to speak more than once.

Mr. MOWAT: The Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) is quite correct in asking that

this clause be put through as it was drawn. He says that the parliamentary counsel, the solicitor of his department, and the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners assisted in drafting the clause, and it is not likely that by getting up one after the other in a haphazard way we can reasonably declare the law better than that tribunal of three. I think that some members who have spoken have not realized the difference between a court and a board. A court determines whether there is liability on the part of the employer; a board assumes that there is liability. In Ontario there is no question of whether there is liability or not; every employee has a remedy.

10 p.m.

Mr. JACOBS: Certainly, it is the same all over.

Mr. MOWAT: The whole point is as to the amount of the compensation. The Government think that they should have a right to determine the compensation from time to time, and if in their opinion the boards are not proceeding on a proper basis, the Dominion, as the superior legislative body, should have the right to take action in the matter. That would not affect any railway employee, as some hon. gentlemen have contended, because his claim would be decided before any change was made.

Mr. BUREAU: In our province the court decides not that there is liability, but the amount of the damages. Liability is created by law, and the amount of compensation is limited. But what we want to know is how we are going to serve, and where. If I sue the Minister of Public Works, where am I to serve him? If I sue the Department of Customs, where am I to serve the Department of Customs? In such cases I am suing His Majesty the King; where am I to notify him that he is to appear? If we are to have an Act to help employees of the Government, let us give them the means of bringing the King before the proper tribunal in order that he may answer the demands made upon him for compensation.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I am surprised to hear the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat), who represents such a large railway constituency, say that he is satisfied with the general provisions of this Act so far as compensation is concerned. The particulars of the Bill are practically the same as the terms of the resolution. I am not satisfied with the provisions of the Bill respecting compensation. I was glad to hear the Minister of Railways say that this is a measure of temporary relief, and that the Government propose to bring in a measure of compensation which will apply to the whole of Canada. The first objection I have to the general principle of this Bill is that the compensation which will be awarded to the same class of employees throughout the Dominion is not uniform. A man may be injured on a railway in Ontario and when he seeks compensation he is brought under the terms of the Compensation Act in force in that province. He then appears before a board, and that board determine whether or not they have jurisdiction over the action which has brought about the injury. Their decision is final and no further compensation or damage can be recovered against the employer, or, consequently, against the Dominion Government. In Saskatchewan they have not a modern Compensation Act, but an Act which places the administration of such cases in the hands of the district court. The man who receives an injury, even if he was slightly negligent, would be entitled to recover damages. The measure of the damage for accident to which he would be entitled is determined by the various clauses of the statute, and, in the case of death, the amount which his dependents could recover is limited, I think, to $1,800. In Ontario the limit is $2,500. We must note this distinction: Under the Compensation Act of Ontario, once the board assumes jurisdiction to determine the amount of damage, the amount which they assess is limited to $2,500 and there is no possible recovery beyond that. Under the Saskatchewan Act—the same Act is in force in Alberta—where a man is injured or where a man has been killed and leaves dependents the injured man or the dependents have the right to elect whether they shall proceed for the recovery of damages under the Compensation Act or in an action at common law. That is a matter of great importance to the dependent family. A man may be killed by the negligence of a railway corporation, and an action may be brought under the Compensation Act. In Ontario, $2,500 is the limit that can be awarded under the Compensation Act, but if an action were brought at common law in Saskatchewan or in the other provinces which have similar Acts, for that act of negligence, the railway corporation or the employer, whoever he or it might be, would be assessed in damages which would be adequate compensation; it might be $5,000, $8,000, $10,000 or $15,000 the dependents would receive. I believe

that when we adopt the compensation Acts of the provinces we are taking away from the employees the right which they may have at common law, that is, assuming that this Government intends to give to employees the right to bring an action against the Crown. I think that whatever scheme of compensation is adopted by this Parliament for the benefit of Government employees in this country should establish, first, that they may have their remedy under the Compensation Act, if they so desire and wish to recover damages for something in the nature of an accident, or secondly, that they may bring an action at common law. I think the Minister of Railways, when he discusses this matter fully with the representative of the railway organizations, will find that that is the principle which they have in mind, because I have discussed this matter with a great many railway men in the West and know their viewpoint. While they appreciate, no doubt, what the Government is doing for them, I trust that when the minister has had an opportunity of looking into this he will introduce a compensation Act into this Parliament which shall apply to all employees of this Government throughout the whole Dominion.

Mr. CAHILL: Will this Act apply to employees of the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern railway comes under the provincial Acts, just the same as the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 1, subsection 4—employees on Government railways must elect between Railway Provident Societies benefits and this Act:

Mr. WIGMORE: Does this mean that members of the Provident Fund will not share in this compensation?

Mr. J. D. REID: When this Bill was being drafted, I sent for representatives of the Provident Fund and discussed the matter with them; and we have had the Bill drafted so as not to interfere with their rights in any way. The Provident Fund Act was passed in 1907, and to that fund the Dominion Government subscribes $100,000 per annum. Members of the fund have a great many different rights; they are pensioned for life, for instance, and receive so many weeks' pay in case of injury, and so on. The object of this clause is not to take away any rights a member of the Provident Fund would have under the fund in the case of injuries or death by accident. There is a board of managers of the Provident Fund, and they have regulations governing the amount that shall be paid for different injuries, and I think there is also an amount payable in case of death. The Compensation Acts of the different provinces provide compensation only for injuries or death, whereas the Provident Fund has a long list of benefits. One of the representatives of the Intercolonial railway was here with the solicitor of the Railway Department for two or three days, and it was agreed to put this clause in and see how it would work out between now and next session. If it does not work out as we expect, then we can provide any remedy that is thought desirable next session. I do not wish to interfere with the members of the Provident Fund in any way. I want the railway employees to have all the benefits that are coming to them under the Provident Fund, but in case of death their dependents can go under the Provident Fund or under this Act, whichever they desire, but not both; that is the only object of this clause.

Mr. JACOBS: I am surprised at the Minister of Railways. He was posing a moment ago as a philanthropist who wanted to see the railway employees get as much as they could. Now we see him in a different light entirely. The Minister of Railways ought to know, or the law officers of the Crown ought to know, that a member of the Provident Fund pays into the fund a certain sum of money as insurance, and when this insurance becomes a claim, he is entitled to a certain sum of money, irrespective of any other sums he may receive from the Government. He pays for this insurance, and the Government has no right to ask him to elect whether he will accept one or the other. The Provident Funds of Railway Company employees and their rights thereunder have received judicial interpretation by the Privy Council in the case of Miller versus the Grand Trunk railway, and I am sure that if the law officers of the Crown had studied that case they would not have advised the Minister of Railways to bring before Parliament a clause of this kind, which is subversive of all the rules of law laid down by the highest court in the realm.

Mr. WIGMORE: The reason I asked my question was because I had the same point in my mind as my hon. friend. I do not think it is fair or just to discriminate against a member of the Provident Fund. While the Government are paying $100,000

into this fund, the members of the fund are also paying in a certain sum every month, or every year, and I do not think they should be discriminated against. They pay this amount every month just as a man may pay the premium on his insurance policy. I understand—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that the majority of the employees of the Intercolonial railway are members of the Provident Fund, and some of them have been paying into it for years. I think this is a clear case of discrimination. I think they should be allowed to draw whatever benefit they have a right to derive from the provident fund, and should share also in any benefit they are entitled to share in under the Workmen's Compensation Act. I think it is clearly a case of discrimination against the men in the provident fund. The hon. minister says he has considered this very carefully with the employees of the Intercolonial and that they are satisfied with this. I am very much surprised to hear that they were satisfied.

Mr. J. D. REID: Before preparing this Bill, or deciding on it, I had the solicitor send for a representative of the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Not of the employees?

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course it was an employee of the Intercolonial who was a member of the Provident Fund Board. We discussed it at times during two or three days, and I understand they agreed to this clause, and were satisfied with it. The way we discussed it was this: we are paying $100,000 into this fund——

Mr. COPP: You pay that much each year?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes—and the idea was that if an employee were injured and received, as compensation for the injury, a certain amount from the Provident Fund, to which fund we were paying $100,000 per annum, and also received money under the Compensation Act, he would be twice paid for his injury. There was no intention—and I have no desire—to discriminate against the employees in the Provident Fund. We talked this over, and thought this clause was fair. This Bill may have been prepared hurriedly. I will have to take this Bill up again, probably in the recess, and see how it works, and if there is any discrimination or anything unfair in any way, shape or form, so far as the employees are concerned, I will remedy it at the next session of Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some years ago, I think in 1906 or 1907, a tentative Bill was presented in this Parliament by the railway companies. They wanted to avoid their liability when one of their employees had been killed or injured, if the family was receiving money from the insurance fund which was provided by the company. At the request of Parliament, the question was submitted to the Supreme Court, with an appeal to the Privy Council. I remember Mr. Justice Lennox, then member of the House, represented the railway employees. The matter came up before the Privy Council, and they decided to the best of my recollection, that the railway company—I think it was Miller vs. Grand Trunk—were liable, even where the family of an employee had received money from the insurance fund. It seems to me this case is absolutely similar.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no other object in view than the one I stated. I have been trying to make the Bill fit in with the law of the provinces in regard to other railways. If there is nothing in the way, other than the difficulty which has been suggested, I would remedy that at the very first opportunity, at the next session, and, therefore, having gone into the matter with the little time I had at my disposal with the official of the railways—

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the employees?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; I cannot remember the names of the employees representing the Provident Fund, but it was a railway employee—I am not going to take any advantage in any way, but would like to have the Bill passed in its present shape, and see how it works from now until next session.

Mr. WIGMORE: The Canadian Pacific railway have an organization the same as the Intercolonial, a provident fund you might call it, and yet, when it comes to a question of their rights under the Compensation Act of the different provinces, they receive the benefit under those Acts, just the same as if they were not receiving a benefit from the Provident Fund. It is exactly the same as the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial. Therefore, I claim this is a pure discrimination against the men in the Provident Fund.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: If the hon. minister wants to put the Government employees in the same position as other employees, why this clause? My hon. friend spoke of the case of Miller versus Grand Trunk railway. The same principle has been affirmed

several times in cases against the Intercolonial railway or the King. In my own practice I have had a few cases of this kind, and the Intercolonial railway has always tried to plead this clause in the Provident Fund to get rid of the liability, but the Exchequer Court has always decided that the employee was entitled to the damages, as well as to the amount due from the Provident Fund. This Provident Fund is a sort of natural insurance. The employee is paying for that, and it is not optional either. The very day a man enters the service of the Intercolonial railway he becomes a member of that insurance fund. He must be a member of the insurance fund, and every month a certain amount is kept out of his salary by the treasurer of the railway. Why should there be a discrimination of this kind against the employees of the Intercolonial railway, when the employees of other railways are entitled to both the compensation and insurance, which they must receive when their death is caused by an accident? The hon. minister is not improving the position of the employee by this clause. He is taking away something to which they were entitled before this legislation.

Mr. McMASTER: In comparison with the $100,000 paid by the Government into this fund, what do the men's contributions amount to?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not tell you this evening.

Mr. COPP: The hon. minister has stated to the House that the employees or their representative had been conferred with, and had agreed to this section. If that is so, I will not have very much more to say in regard to it, but I really think that they must have misunderstood the situation or they would not have agreed to such an unreasonable proposition being placed upon the statute book, which would take away from them the very equitable right that they should have in a case of this kind. I am glad to hear the hon. minister say that he will remedy the matter, if any difficulty occurs. I have not had any communication from the railway men whatever, and if I were Minister of Railways I would be very sorry to take the responsibility of taking away from the railway employees the rights they have had for so many years under this Act.

Mr. J. D. REID: Instead of taking away any rights, I believe it gives them more rights than they had before. Some gentleman, a stranger, was introduced to me, and said he was a representative of the Railway Provident Fund. We discussed the matter two or three times. He was an employee of the Intercolonial railway, as I understood. I am only stating the matter as I gathered it from this gentleman. We agreed on this proposition in the meantime. We agreed on this in the meantime and if it is not fair or right we can remedy it next session.

Mr. JACOBS: In the face of the decision of the Privy Council, does the hon. gentleman persist in forcing this Bill through the House?

Mr. J. D. REID: I persist in doing what I believe is fair and right and what has been agreed upon by the employees of the railway.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. gentleman think that the Privy Council is doing what is fair and right?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not doing any thinking now in regard to that; I am only thinking of what is fair and right to these employees.

Mr. McMASTER: I think there should be some saving clause in this Bill to protect rights acquired prior to its sanctioning. As I apprehend the meaning of subsection 1 of section 1 of this Bill, a man's rights will be limited to the recovery of what he could recover under the Compensation Act of the province in which he resides. Thus, in the province of Quebec he could receive $2,025. I am aware of one claim in that province where the litigants believe they have a right under the laws that now exist to a substantially higher amount, and I would suggest to the minister that rights which have been acquired prior to the sanctioning of this Bill be protected.

Mr. J. D. REID: They have not any rights prior to this Act at all.

Mr. McMASTER: The case to which I refer is one in our own office. We believe we have. The judge may find that we are wrong. This is not dealing with the railway, but with another department of the Government. A man was killed, and his widow and numerous family believe that they have a right to a substantial indemnity or damages. We purpose to try the matter out. If this Bill should pass it might possibly affect the rights of the parties in this case, and as there is this case that I know of, so there may be others. I would suggest that the following be added as clause 2:

The present Act shall not prejudicially affect or limit any cause of action existing prior to the coming into force of the present Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see any need of this amendment. In the first place, it is not the judgment of the Government, at all events, that there has been a right of action against the Crown at all heretofore existing for injuries such as are covered by this Bill. In the next place, even if there had been, this Bill does not take away any right without substituting another and a fair right. I do not think my hon. friend, as a lawyer acting for his client, would have any great cause for complaint if we took away the very shadowy, nebulous right which his office thinks it has in this case and provided him with the substantial and very certain right which he would have here.

Mr. McMASTER: The nebulous right is a right in satisfaction of which one department has offered $2,000, but we consider it is sufficiently devoid of nebulousness to warrant us in pressing for $5,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Many a thousand dollars has been paid by the departments in respect to losses as an act of grace on the part of the Crown and not as a matter of right. It is the same in this case. If there is a right taken away it is of a character that has not yet been established and there is substituted for it a fixed and definite right.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I believe that this legislation is good, but I would not like the minister to imagine that previous to the adoption of this measure a workman on the Intercolonial had no recourse against the Crown. We have been suing the Crown time and again as a result of accidents. Recourse was more difficult than it will be now. We had to prove statutory negligence. When there was no statutory negligence proved the action was dismissed. We have obtained compensation for employees of the railway in many instances and it was not all a matter of grace on the part of the Crown, as the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) suggested. These cases have been carried to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. Section 20 of the Exchequer Court Act states:

> The Exchequer Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine all claims against the Crown arising out of any death or injury to the person or property and every claim against the Crown arising under any law of Canada.

I think it would be well to insert in subsection (1) of this Bill the words " notwithstanding anything in the Exchequer Court Act."

Amendment (Mr. McMaster) negatived.

Mr. Meighen moved:

> That there be added to the said Act, as clause 2 thereof, the following words: "The Governor in Council may make regulations as to the title of the defendant and the effecting of service of process in proceedings under this Act."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals), Bill No. 52, to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act, was read the second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 20—Stores Accounts, Limitations.

Mr. J. D. REID: The object of the Bill is simply to increase the amount of stores which the Canadian Government railways may keep on hand at one time from $1,500,000 to $6,000,000. The reason for the change is this: When the Railways and Canals Act was passed a number of years ago, the Government only owned the Intercolonial railway. Since then the Transcontinental, the Intercolonial and other railways have been added to the Government system. Requirements have increased to such an extent that we could not possibly operate these railways without increasing the amount of stores that we may have on hand. For some time we really have been operating almost in violation of the law in the extent of the stores that we have been carrying, and the Auditor General insisted that we should have a vote sufficient to cover all requirements. On the eastern lines at the present time Stores Account is as follows: Fuel, $1,110,000; ties, $200,000; General, $1,706,400; making a total of $3,016,400. In the case of the western lines the Stores Account stands as follows: Fuel, $1,176,000; ties, $10,700; General, $1,026,000, a total of $2,212,700 and a grand total of $5,229,100. We are getting in large stores of coal for the coming year, and for that reason we are asking Parliament to increase the amount to be voted for that purpose.

Section agreed to, Bill reported and read the third time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding, and distribution of

the Labour Gazette, and allowance to correspondents and for clerical assistance in preparing tables of statistics $35,000.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Is the Labour Gazette sent to the various labour organizations free of charge?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, it is sent free to the secretary of every labour organization in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Was the number of strikes settled last year in excess of the number for the year before?

The CHAIRMAN: I think my hon. friend's question would be more in order under the next item dealing with the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

Mr. McMASTER: The item before the committe is very broad in its terms and it is very hard to know just what is covered by it. How many boards of conciliation were appointed last year?

Mr. CROTHERS: As the Chairman has just suggested, these boards are all appointed under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and perhaps it would be better to give the information asked for when we reach that item.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act applied only to public utilities.

Mr. CROTHERS: Two years ago, by Order in Council, we extended the scope of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act so as to cover all enterprises manufacturing goods for our own forces, the British forces, or the forces of the Allies, including ships, munitions, and anything of that kind.

Mr. BUREAU: I see that the item has reference to preparing tables of statistics. Now, this afternoon a Bill passed the House creating a Bureau of Statistics, and according to my understanding the Minister of Trade and Commerce explained that all statistics henceforward would be compiled by that department. Will the minister explain what particular statistics are here supposed to be gathered, and whether they are to be handed over to the Department of Trade and Commerce, or will the publication still be continued of statistics compiled by the Labour Department?

Mr. CROTHERS: The Bill introduced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) this afternoon was not intended, as I understand it, to interfere with the statistics that were being gathered in the several departments. Our statistics are confined largely to wages and the prices of commodities, and matters connected with labour organizations. It is not intended by the Act that was passed this afternoon to take any of that sort of work out of our department.

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand the matter aright, all statistics pertaining to labour will be collected in the Labour Department; those pertaining to agriculture will be gathered by the Department of Agriculture. The statistics pertaining to the Department of Trade and Commerce are now prepared in that department, and we get them monthly or bi-monthly, I cannot say which, in special issues. My idea is that all statistics having reference to the Dominion should be within the jurisdiction of the Statistical Bureau which is being organized by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If we are going to be compelled to go to the various departments to get statistics as heretofore, I fail to see the necessity of the bureau which is being established. If that bureau is to obtain the statistics of this country, I do not see the use of statistical branches in the other departments.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon explained the object of his Bill. The hon. member knows that the Customs Department, for instance, issue a blue-book every year of customs statistics, and the Trade and Commerce Department issue another, and other departments issue their own statistics. The object of the bureau is to compile them altogether. Each department, of course, must gather its own statistics and hand them over to the Trade and Commerce Department, and there they will all be compiled in one volume. In that way, you have them all together under one department to be put before the public in book form. That was the object of the Bill. The hon. member will quite understand that, in each of the departments where it is necessary to compile statistics, you must have employees to gather these statistics.

Mr. BUREAU: Then it would come to this, that the Department of Trade and Commerce is establishing a bureau which will publish a résumé of the statistics of all the other departments. Why not leave it as it is now if you are not going to get any more information?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not see how that can be discussed now. The Bill was reported to-day, and will come up for third reading to-morrow. Then will be the time

to renew the discussion and get any further information. But the hon. member, I think, will understand that the object of that Bill is as I have stated, instead of having every department publishing blue books, with statistics, some probably not agreeing with those issued by another department, and thus misleading the public, to have the bureau co-ordinate them all. Some men have said to me, comparing the statistics of trade issued by the Customs Department with those issued by the Trade and Commerce Department: They are not the same; you should get the different departments together, see that they are right, and then publish statistics that are accurate. That is the reason why the bureau will have supervision of all statistics.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not discussing the advisability of the Bureau of Statistics. As the Minister of Railways says, the Bill has been reported. But now comes a discussion as to whether these appropriations for departmental statistics are advisable or not. If we are to have a bureau of statistics—and I think we should have all the information we can get—why should we duplicate its work in the Department of Labour or in the Department of Agriculture? Now is the proper time to discuss the necessity for this particular item, and I do not see that it is necessary. I admit that this bureau is one where you will have all the information you require from all the departments of the Government. If that is so, and I think it is properly so, why should we have a repetition of the same thing in each department? That is the reason I want information. If it is not necessary, I do not desire to see an item for statistics go through for the Department of Labour. If the minister can show the necessity for this work to be done in his department, in addition to the work of the bureau which seems to be an improvement on the present system, we will have to let the item through. Otherwise, I do not see the necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. BUREAU: We would like to have some information on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister not answer and show us the necessity for this vote?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I have already said enough to show the necessity for gathering statistics in the Labour and other departments. The bureau provided for in the Bill introduced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon did not pretend, for instance, to gather the statistics that are known and gathered in the Department of Agriculture, or in the Customs, or the Post Office, or the Labour Departments. We keep track, for instance, of the strikes that occur, and it is not intended at all that the bureau should undertake to report on all the strikes in Canada, or the boards of conciliation, or the wages, or the food and other prices, or the exports and imports of this country. I do not remember whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce mentioned it this afternoon, but I know it is not his intention to undertake the work now done in the several departments.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $25,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the hon. minister is bringing in some amendments to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and when his Bill comes up for second reading, and is in the committee stage, we will talk about the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to repeat the question I asked in regard to the previous item. What number of disputes were investigated and adjusted by the department during the last year?

Mr. CROTHERS: There were about thirty boards of conciliation appointed under this Act.

Mr. McMASTER: How does that compare with the year before?

Mr. CROTHERS: There were not quite so many last year as the year before.

Mr. McMASTER: Would there not be room then for a decrease in the amount of the estimate, economy being the watchword we all have before us?

Mr. CROTHERS: The probabilities are that the expenditure under this item will be larger than it has been owing to the fact that, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, the scope of the Act has been very materially broadened so as to take in the enterprises I referred to.

Fair Wages and Inspection Officers, $15,000.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the special purpose of this appropriation?

Mr. CROTHERS: We have, I think, five fair wage officers. They are called fair wage officers, because when they were originally appointed their work was largely

confined to fixing schedules of wages on public works. We are not doing very much by way of public works now and have not been for some years, neither has their work been confined to that sort of thing. They are largely employed in settling disputes and differences between employers and employees before these reach the stage where a board of conciliation is applied for. For instance, we have a man located at Vancouver. Some six years ago we had only two of these men, both located at Ottawa. These differences between employers and employees often arise in a few hours, and previously, if they occurred at Vancouver or Sydney, a big strike might be on before our men could get to these distant places. One of the first things I did was to send to Vancouver one of the best men we had, so that he would be right on the ground to hear the rumblings of labour disturbances and to check them before they became serious. This man has saved the Government many thousands of dollars; he has kept men at work who would otherwise have been on strike and, on the whole, has rendered very valuable service by being on the ground. We appointed other men at Calgary, Winnipeg and Saskatoon, and they did valuable work in assisting in the maintenance of industrial peace. We have been especially fortunate in keeping our working people at work; no serious disturbances have occurred in Canada since the outbreak of war. That speaks well for the employers and employees, as well as for those officers who have devoted their best efforts to keeping things running smoothly. These are the men mentioned here as fair wage officers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The fair wage clause has certainly been a boon to labour. The unfortunate thing is that it applies only to public works, not to private industry.

Mr. CROTHERS: Except by consent of the parties

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. Was not an arrangement made between the Government and the munition factories for the application of the fair wage clause in munition works?

Mr. CROTHERS: There is an understanding between the Imperial Munitions Board and the Department of Labour that we shall co-operate for the maintenance of industrial peace. We inquire into any complaints made by workers in munition factories, and the Imperial Munitions Board assist in settlements. The Imperial Munitions Board have gone so far as to cancel contracts in cases where we advised that employers were not paying fair wage or treating employees fairly. Contractors have come to understand that the Imperial Munitions Board will go that far if necessary; consequently no very serious disputes have arisen in munition factories since they began operation in Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it only when complaints are made by workers that the inspectors make inquiry and report to the minister, or do they keep in touch with the various industries, ascertain the labour conditions and whether the men have any complaints to make, and so on?

Mr. CROTHERS: The fair wage officers do not wait until complaints are made—that is, if they are not busy at something else. We endeavour to keep them going. For instance, our fair wage officer in Montreal is instructed to visit the various industries in that city from time to time, even if he is not called upon to do so by complaints. We are doing that in the city of Ottawa. If we hear that there is likely to be trouble in Toronto, for instance, we send one of these men there.

Mr. MURPHY: Did I understand the minister to say that he is doing that in Ottawa now?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not say that it is being done to-day, but we ask the inspector to go out occasionally and find out how things are.

Mr. MURPHY: I thought my hon. friend referred to some special case.

Mr. CROTHERS: Oh, no.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.02 p.m.

Wednesday, April 17, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SECRET SESSION OF THE HOUSE.

The House, in conformity with a resolution, agreed to on motion of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister on Monday, the 15th day of April inst., went into secret session, until the House should otherwise order.

At the conclusion of the secret session, the following report of its proceedings was issued under the authority of Mr. Speaker.

"The Prime Minister, on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, made a full statement surveying the present war situation, treating of the military position, the

supply and production of foodstuffs, and the problem of merchant shipping and the submarine, with especial reference to the man-power position of the British Empire and the Allies.

"He stated that the Government, being impressed with the desirability of giving to the House the fullest possible information had communicated to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom its intention to move for a secret session and had requested from Mr. Lloyd George a statement of the present position which might be made known to the House. Mr. Lloyd George's message in response to this request was then read.

"The Prime Minister then presented other information and considerations bearing on the situation. The military position confronting the Empire was explained in detail. The enemy had clearly disclosed his intention to make a supreme effort to destroy the British army on the western front as an effective fighting force. To this end he had adopted measures placing every man in the German Empire between the ages of 17 and 60 at the disposal of the Government, reducing the age limit for military service, and re-organizing his formations in the field. His forces and reserves for striking at the western front had been enormously increased by the withdrawal of Russia from the war. The employment of Landwehr and Landsturm formations for the defence of the eastern front, the use of these formations to supply individual men as drafts to replace casualties in France and Flanders, their places being taken in turn by the youngest recruits for purposes of training, the cessation of war wastage in the East, and the transfer in addition of large numbers of Austro-Hungarian troops—considering all these factors, the Russian withdrawal had increased the potential enemy strength on the western front, including Italy, by possibly as many as 1,600,000 men without taking into account the reserves which would otherwise have been necessary for the Russian front.

"France had made already enormous sacrifices, and she would continue her heroic and glorious effort to the end.

"The Government of the United Kingdom had accordingly initiated the most drastic measures for maintaining their effective forces and providing the necessary reserves for the future.

"The military effort already made by the United Kingdom, France and the Dominions was shown by means of detailed confidential information as to the strength of the forces which have been raised by each.

"As to the position confronting this Dominion, it was apparent that an attack upon the Canadian Army corps in full force must be expected. No one could say when, but in view of the strategic value of their position there could be no doubt they must be prepared to meet any attack launched by the enemy and the country must be prepared to provide the reinforcements to make good all losses. The Government had been in communication with the overseas military authorities, and as the result of the most careful consideration the clear conclusion had been reached that if the Canadian Army corps was to be maintained as an effective fighting force, additional measures must be taken. The Canadian Army corps must be maintained; no one could question that. There was therefore no other alternative before the Government but to propose further measures for recruiting the needed reinforcements. These measures had been formulated and announced.

"With regard to the shipping situation, the Prime Minister pointed out that allied and neutral ocean-going tonnage, estimated at 33,000,000 tons at the beginning of the war, had been reduced at the end of 1917 by a net loss of 2,500,000 tons, that is, about 8 per cent; while British tonnage, considered separately, had suffered a reduction of 20 per cent, the tonnage being 18,000,000 tons at the outbreak of war and the net loss, taking into account new construction as in the other case, being 3,500,000 tons.

"The strain on British shipping was illustrated by a citation of the very large proportion which is devoted to the special war services of the army, navy, the Allies and the British Dominions. The result was a very serious reduction in the amount available for supplying the United Kingdom with its essential foods and materials and the sacrifices imposed upon the people of Great Britain could not be overstated. The shipbuilding programme of the Empire and the Allies was explained. The important question of the world's food supply was reviewed and the House was made acquainted with information pointing to the vital necessity for stimulating increased production.

"In conclusion the Prime Minister urged that it must be recognized that the position was one of extreme gravity. In view of the issues involved Germany must be defeated. There could be no other alternative. And to this end Canada must provide all the

assistance in her power. We must supply the men necessary to keep our divisions up to full strength no matter what casualties were suffered, and we must so organize our remaining human power as to maintain and if possible increase our agricultural production.

"Following the Prime Minister's statement a brief discussion ensued, those who took part in it being Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Sam Hughes and General Mewburn.

"The members of the Senate attended the session, that House having adjourned for the purpose."

And at five minutes past five of the clock in the afternoon, the House having so ordered, the doors were opened.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen, (Minister of the Inertior), Bill 39, to amend the Yukon Act, was read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) Bill 32, respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways) moved: Third reading of Bill No. 51, to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duty.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers). It is provided by the Bill that Government employees of each province shall be treated the same as ordinary employees, coming within the Employers' Liability and the Workmen's Compensation Act. The question arose yesterday as to how we should designate the Crown when we desire to bring an action and desire to summon the King. The summons is in the name of the King, and it will be the King summoning the King. I would suppose that if a man worked for the Public Works Department the fact of his bringing an action against the Public Works Department would be sufficient without any service. Could the Minister of the Interior explain as to that?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: It was suggested that the Governor in Council might by regulation determine the title of the defendant and what should constitute service on the Crown. It would then be within the power of the Governor in Council to say that the department concerned might be the defendant. The reason I did not see fit to recommend that the suggestion be followed was that there might well be injuries sustained by employees who could not be said to be employees of any department, but still were employees of the Government of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: It is all left with the Governor in Council. Suppose a man is injured on a public work, where will he serve the King? Will it be the Department of Public Works?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is covered by the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the Bill is a step in the right direction, but the way in which the King ought to be summoned and the place where he should be served ought to be designated in this Bill. It is a question of procedure, and the provision should be in the statute so that we should not have to go to the official Gazette, or write to the Clerk of the Privy Council, to get a copy of the order, to determine by what procedure this law is to be put in force, or in what way the King can be summoned or where he can be summoned. A few words added to the Bill would make the required provision. However, if it is going to delay the passage of the Bill, I am willing to drop the matter.

Hon. J. D. REID: After the discussion last night, it was thought well that a clause should be inserted giving the Governor in Council power to say on whom the service should be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed some laxity in the proceedings to-day, in order that the hon. member might obtain the information he desires, but the minister, having moved the third reading, he has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to explain——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has also exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): I desire to endorse the views expressed by the hon. member for Three Rivers with reference to this Bill. Hon. gentlemen can imagine for a moment an attorney conducting a case for a certain client, having to write to the Department of Justice, or to the Clerk of the Privy Council, for information as to whom he should address himself in presenting the

petition in the name of his client. It would only require the insertion of a few words in the Bill. I understand this Bill is in aid of all parties who receive injuries on Government works, and I understand the provisions are in line with the compensation Acts of the different provinces. Under those Acts, attorneys or solicitors are limited in their costs; they simply draw up one petition, and address it to the court, and then the Judge sets the case down for hearing. But under this Bill we have to hunt around and find to whom we should address ourselves, and how we should obtain information as to the proceedings. Of course we should endeavour to save costs, in the interests of those seeking compensation. This matter should be definitely provided for in the Bill, and make it a precedent for all time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

RAILWAY BELT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill 54, to amend the Railway Belt Act was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Issue of patent for land held by deceased settler.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the object of this Bill to make the regulation, whether in the Railway Belt or elsewhere, conform to the amendment that we passed in the Dominion Lands Act the other night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. We amended the Dominion Lands Act this year, so as to provide that where the patentee died before the issue of the patent the minister would have power to have the patent issued in the name of the deceased person, the intention being to avoid the necessity of seeking out the heirs entitled to the real estate of the deceased. It is particularly applicable to provinces where the heirs are entitled to the legal estate of the deceased, and where the administrator is not entitled to it, and where the department would not be justified in having patent issued to the administrator. The railway belt of British Columbia and the Peace River district is particularly the place where the need of this amendment is most felt, because by the law of British Columbia we cannot relieve ourselves of responsibility by issuing a patent to the administrator of a deceased patentee.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. W. Crothers (Minister of Labour) Bill No. 48, to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps the minister might give a brief sketch of the proposed amendments.

Mr. CROTHERS: The amendments do not propose any change in the principle of the Bill, but are suggested with a view to increased efficiency in the working out of the intentions of the Act. The amendments will explain themselves as we come to them. There is no opposition to the Bill so far as I know; the working people are in favour of it.

On section 1—employee or employer not to cease to be such for lockout, strike, etc.:

Mr. BUREAU: What change is there from the old Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: In several cases it has been held by courts that as the Act provides for an investigation of disputes between employers and employees, immediately there is a strike that relationship no longer exists. If a number of men went on strike yesterday, for instance, and applied for a board to-day, under this decision of the courts they would not be entitled to a board because the relationship of master and servant had ceased. This amendment aims at placing them in a position to apply for a board even after they have gone on a strike or lockout.

Mr. BUREAU: Under the old law they had to apply for the board before they could call a strike. The object of this amendment is to allow the men to apply for a board even after they have gone out on strike, and to extend the same privilege to the employer?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is the idea.

Mr. BUREAU: The amendment is for that object only?

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Minister to appoint boards on application:

Mr. BUREAU: Have any special cases not covered by the old Act been drawn to

the attention of the minister, and if so, what is the nature of those cases?

Mr. CROTHERS: The first subsection of the old Act has been somewhat altered to give us authority to appoint a Board of Conciliation even in cases affecting Government railways, for instance. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, in a case of that kind proceedings would have to be taken under the Conciliation and Labour Act. These proceedings were very circuitous and unsatisfactory, and as the Industrial Disputes Act is very much more direct. I thought it would be an advantage to have the Board of Conciliation appointed under the latter Act rather than take proceedings under the former. Referring to subsection 2, cases often arise where applications are made for a board by people who are not lawyers. The officers of a labour organization for example, would send an application from Vancouver, we will say, and it would take it a week to reach Ottawa. Perhaps you will find, if you examine the application very carefully, that some of the provisions of the Act have not been strictly complied with. I take up these applications, and, if satisfied that in substance the requirements of the Act have been met, I establish a board, although there may be some technical objections to them because it would require another week to send the forms back to Vancouver, and a third week to get them back here again. As my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) knows, working people during his administration, as well as during mine, have often objected to what they call delay in having these investigations made. They insist, and very properly so I think, that the inquiry should go forward just as soon as possible after the application is made. I have found that employers in many cases where an application is made —written out by workingmen who are not lawyers and perhaps do not strictly comply with the provisions of the statutes—go to a court and ask for an interim injunction. An interim injunction is granted ex parte for a week or ten days, and then the matter comes up and is further adjourned perhaps for three months. In that way the object of the Act is entirely defeated. Now I think it would be a great advantage if employers, or employees either, were not permitted to go to court at all to determine whether or not the application justified the establishing of a board, and that they should have no power to question the boards procedure. Lawyers do not appear before these boards; they are supposed to hear the evidence and act upon common sense principles, and settle the matter, if possible, in a manner satisfactory to both parties without so much regard to legal forms.

Hon. gentlemen will notice that in the section as it formerly stood it was declared that the finding of the minister should be final, but notwithstanding that courts have held that they have a right to inquire whether or not the facts warranted the establishment of a board. I am now proposing to make the Act so strong as to prevent any interference. It is a matter, I think, which may be safely left to the Minister of Labour as to whether the circumstances warrant the inquiry provided for by this Act, and personally I feel very strongly that it is a very proper provision. We have several examples of similar legislation. In substance the findings of the Board of Railway Commissioners are not to be reviewed by judges.

Mr. BUREAU: Are they not reviewed by the Governor in Council?

Mr. CROTHERS: Well, practically they are not.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there not an appeal on questions of law to the Supreme Court?

Mr. CROTHERS: Only in certain cases. Speaking generally, the findings of the Board of Railway Commissioners are final, and are not reviewed by any court. Furthermore, in my recollection, there has not been a change made by Order in Council during the last six or seven years. In certain cases, as I already said, an appeal may be made to the Supreme Court on points of law, but, speaking generally, there is practically no appeal from the board's findings. The Workmen's Compensation Act in the province of Ontario contains a somewhat similar provision to what is proposed here. There is no appeal from the decisions of the board, those decisions are final, the courts have nothing to do with them. That was thoroughly threshed out when the recent Workmen's Compensation Act was before the legislature of Ontario, and I think the legislature was unanimous in reaching the conclusion that it was not a case for any appeal, but that it was very important that decisions should be made promptly, and that the decision of the board should be final.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Although the amendment seems to be very drastic, yet I realize that in the application of this law, and in

its administration, the hands of the minister should be strengthened in order that the purpose of the law may not be defeated by technicalities or trivial objections. I remember a case in Montreal some years ago where objection to the constitution of the board in the matter of a strike or lock-out, I forget which, resulted in court proceedings which extended over months and months, even years, and thereby the object of the law was frustrated. I believe that the spirit of this legislation is well understood by the people at large. They understand how desirable it is that capital and labour should come to an understanding by the best available means, and the best available means is that they be brought together before a board of investigation and air their grievances, and the publicity of the report of the board cures the evil in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Therefore, in my judgment, although the minister is taking very drastic powers, yet having regard to the spirit of the law, its popularity with the people at large, and its success in practical operation, we are warranted in giving such powers to the minister. After all, you want to bring the interested parties together. That was the great difficulty in the past. Under this Act you bring them together, you investigate the grievance which exists, and if the parties concerned are not bound by the report, public opinion will compel them to accept the decision of the majority of the board.

Mr. McCREA: Whilst the Bill may appear to be drastic I do not think it is quite drastic enough. At this particular time when the Government is passing Orders in Council very easily, and perhaps with good reason, I think it would be well advised if it passed an Order in Council, as a war measure and operative during the period of the war, making it an impossibility either for men to go on strike, or for employers to force a lock-out. Now just to emphasize what I mean: At the present time when there is a scarcity of labour and an urgent demand that every man should make himself useful, the idea of tying up a business because somebody is dissatisfied with his pay or with the conditions of his employment, is altogether wrong. I do not mean to say that the labourer should be compelled to continue working at his present wages if he is dissatisfied, but it is open to him to make application for redress to the board appointed to deal with these matters if he thinks fit, and in the meantime he should be compelled to continue at work. As a further illustration of what I mean let me say that I was in Fort William on the first of last October when six or eight hundred elevator men went on strike. I asked some of those interested what was the cause of the strike. They told me: There are thousands of cars of grain standing to-day on the siding here, waiting to be loaded or unloaded, which cannot be released owing to this strike. There are also some twenty vessels tied up at the docks waiting to be loaded and yet nobody can be got to do anything. Now at a time when carriers are hampered in the effort to give satisfactory transportation to the public, whether by water or by rail, it is a very serious matter to tie up thousands of cars which should be in operation and performing that service which is urgently needed. It is a very serious matter to tie up the services of fifteen, twenty or more vessels simply because a few hundred men are not satisfied with their working conditions. I think the Government will be well advised if they would pass one of these Orders in Council, which seem to be very handy, making it a criminal offence for men to go out on strike or for the operators to lock out. These differences can be settled: If the employers or the labourers are not satisfied, let them apply to the board; let them get a ruling from the board, and meanwhile keep on doing business. It is in the interest of the business of this country that strikes be one of the things we must not have during the war.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I do not approve of the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. McCrea) on this subject. I think that labouring men should be free to make their request; and that perhaps it would be better that the employer should measure up to the present situation and be forced to pay to labour what is due for its work. I think that would be the proper remedy in this time of stress. Labour should be protected, and the point of my hon. friend, in my opinion, is not well taken. I believe that the Minister of Labour should provide all the law necessary to protect the labouring man. They deserve it. I think, therefore, the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) should not be accepted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let me say to both hon. gentlemen who have just spoken that, if they will look at the Act itself, they will find exactly what my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) wants. There is a pro-

vision in clause 56 of the Act prohibiting all strikes and lockouts prior to or pending reference to the board. There is a penalty provided for violation of this prohibition by either side to the dispute. I understand my hon. friend from Sherbrooke referred to a matter of grain transport. Well, that is a matter of public utility which comes under the operation of the Act, and there is a penalty provided in the Act against any one striking without first submitting the difficulty to a board.

Mr. BUREAU: According to the present Act, I see that the minister is the final judge as to whether or not an application is in due form, and also as to whether such application does not relate to a dispute which is the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Conciliation and Labour Act. Those words do not appear in the section as amended by the present Bill. May I ask the minister if there is any particular reason why these words were left out?

Mr. CROTHERS: I tried to explain that a few moments ago by pointing out that the provisions of this Bill are more direct and more convenient for the investigation of such disputes than those of the Conciliation and Labour Act. If my hon. friend had the Act before him he would see that the procedure is very circuitous and unsatisfactory.

Mr. BUREAU: The amendment then would cover all cases of railway and other disputes?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think so.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Additional matters may be referred to board.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister give a case in point?

Mr. BUREAU: What necessitates the addition of that subsection?

Mr. CROTHERS: The men, when making an application for a board, set forth the grounds upon which it is based, the grievances and so on. During the inquiry carried on by the Board of Conciliation, it may appear that there is some other question which ought to be determined at the same time, and the suggestion here is that the minister should have the power, if such circumstances should arise, to direct the board to go on and hear other matters more or less directly connected with the grievances set forth by the men themselves.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

On section 5—Publication of reports—additional matters upon which minister may require opinion of board:

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the minister why it is being provided that the reports of these boards shall not be published in the annual report of the Department of Labour? This section provides that these reports are to be published in the Labour Gazette. For the same purpose as we have recently established a Bureau of Statistics, I think it would be well if these decisions by the boards were published in the annual report of the Labour Department which would contain the decisions of the fiscal year in one volume. If the reports are published only in the Labour Gazette, which comes out once a month, it is necessary to go through the file for a whole year, and it is therefore not as easy of access for purposes of research as if the procedure under the old law were to be followed.

Mr. CROTHERS: The Act as it now stands requires that the whole report of a board shall be published both in the Labour Gazette and in the annual report. If it were published only in the annual report, they would have to wait a year for it.

Mr. BUREAU: I did not say that it should be published only in the annual report; I was inquiring why the annual report should be cut off.

Mr. CROTHERS: Sometimes these reports are very voluminous. Not long ago a man who was very fond of talking and of writing was chosen by the two parties to act as chairman, and he wrote out a great many pages containing a discussion of the whole question of capital and labour and all kinds of suggestions for the determining of disputes between employers and employees. If I had strictly followed the statutes, I should have published all this matter, but I say frankly that I did not. Many reports concerning questions that arise between operators and miners involve considerable detail, with page after page of particulars as to the pay of individual men, and so on. The present proposal is to confine the publication to the Labour Gazette, and to avoid any repetition in the annual report. The Labour Gazette is sent out every month to all labour organizations, the members of which have an opportunity of reading the reports of these boards. On the other hand, if the reports were published in the annual report only, members of these organizations would not obtain them until the end of the year. We are endeavouring to economize in printing, and

it seems to me that to publish all these awards month after month both in the annual report and in the Labour Gazette would be a waste of time and of paper. The suggestion is that the minister have power to publish the substance of the report, so that such matters as I have referred to, which have nothing to do with the report, may be omitted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If there was an appeal from the decision of the board, I would suggest that the report be published in full, if it is not too bulky. Many labour organizations are interested in those reports. Moreover, I receive many letters from people in the United States and elsewhere, who think that I am still Minister of Labour, inquiring about the operation of this law, which is followed with a great deal of interest by universities in the United States and other countries. I agree that when the report is too bulky, a fair summary could be handed to the editor of the Gazette and published as the report of the board. My hon. friend might, perhaps, amend the section to provide that the summary shall be submitted to both sides and agreed upon. I know that no better man than Mr. Acland, the deputy minister, can be found to prepare the summaries of these reports. He has had large experience in journalism and in literature generally, and he is so familiar with the operation of the Act and so conscientious and painstaking in its administration that I should have no hesitation in entrusting to him the preparation of such a summary.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister puts me in the position of insisting on more printing being done and more expenditure being incurred. That was not the idea I had in mind. He has put in this amendment a provision whereby he may determine what matter shall be printed—whether the report shall be published verbatim, or in the form of a summary. I do not object to the word "summary," but the information I want is this: The idea is to create a bureau of statistics to facilitate access to any information desired by the public. If the decisions of the board are published only in the Labour Gazette you have to go through twelve publications in order to find them, and they are more difficult of access than if they were published in the annual report. If the minister desires to curtail expenditure by summarizing the reports, why should he not compile them in one volume, so that access may be readily had to them? In this way he will get the same amount of economy, because whether the decisions are published in the Labour Gazette or in the annual report, everything may be omitted that is not required to give an intelligent statement of the decision of the board. I call the minister's attention to this so that he may not be at variance with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose idea is to facilitate access to all information which may be desired by the public.

Mr. CROTHERS: The Labour Gazette is bound in one volume every year, so that my hon. friend would not have to look through twelve separate volumes.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a good deal in the Labour Gazette that is not published in the annual report.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—minister may in certain cases, with or without application, order a board or recommend an inquiry:

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister explain why these subsections have been added to the original section?

Mr. CROTHERS: 63A is intended to meet two or three sets of circumstances. For instance, there is the case where feelings become strained between employers and employees, but neither apply for a board of conciliation. The proposition is that if a strike or lockout takes place in any municipality, and neither party applies for a board, the municipality itself or an official of the municipality may apply to the Minister of Labour, and the Minister of Labour may—he is not obliged to do so—on such application, establish a board. If neither of the parties, nor the municipality, nor an official of the municipality, applies for a board, the minister may of his own motion constitute a board of conciliation. That condition confronted us in Vancouver island some years ago. Another object in view is, where there are a number of workmen, perhaps all belonging to one organization but working for five or six or eight or ten employers, to enable us to provide that a conciliation board may be appointed to deal with the situation. Under the old Act, a conciliation board could not be appointed in such a case, unless all the employers consented to have one man act for them, because each employer would be entitled to have a representative on the board. We had a case of that kind in Thetford Mines, where there was a considerable disturbance. Another case was in the Cobalt district, where there were forty different employers with a large number of men, all or the majority of whom belonged to one

labour organization. We were unable, as the Act then stood, to appoint a conciliation board under the circumstances. This subsection is intended to meet a case of that kind.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On clause 6--Minister may in certain cases with or without application order a board or recommend an inquiry:

Mr. JACOBS: When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was about to explain that I was in favour of the principle of this amendment and would go further and extend its scope. The clause reads:

"Where in any industry any strike or lock-out has been long continued."

I do not like the expression "long continued." The word "long" is liable to cause a good deal of misconception and misapprehension, and should not be used in this connection, because it is too indefinite and elastic to suit the circumstances. In dealing with a subject of this kind, full explanation should interpret what is meant by "long" or "short." In the case of a lock-out the employer might consider the time was very short, while the employee, who is locked out and who probably is starving, might consider the time very long. I move to strike out the words "has been long continued, and in the public interest or for any other reason." It would then read:

Where in any industry any strike or lock-out it seems to the Minister expedient.

And so on. I understand the minister only interferes in cases of this kind where he is invited to do so, but it seems to me it should be his duty, in case of strike or lockout, to exercise his authority forthwith. The scope of the Act ought to be enlarged in such a way that the minister could really do some actual and tangible work in the matter of seeing that these strikes or lockouts are brought to an end within the shortest possible time. At the present juncture in our history, as hon. gentlemen know, labour and capital must come together more closely than they have ever done in the past. We know in England the labour party practically controls the entire situation, and it is right they should do so. We heard the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) state this afternoon, if I may be permitted to refer to it, that a very large majority of the men enlisted belong to the labouring classes, and we ought to see that the men belonging to such class are given all the protection possible. That also enures to the benefit of capital. It should be the duty of the minister to put an end to these strikes, if it is within his power to do so. At present we permit the strikes to continue as if they were diseases, we allow the fever to spend itself. The minister by this amendment only asks that he be permitted to interfere with matters of this kind when a strike has "long continued." Why "long continued?" Why not have him act at once? If he is capable of doing anything at the end of the chapter, why not have him do it at the beginning, or, in any event, make an attempt to do it? I am sure the duties of that department are not so onerous that the minister could not give his attention to matters of this kind as soon as the trouble develops. We know that when strikes occur bitter feeling is provoked at the beginning, and it continues until, towards the end, very often we have riot and bloodshed. If the minister were to obtain power to at once endeavour to bring the various factions togetner, it would be a splendid thing for both parties and would be an excellent thing for the community in general. Therefore, I move that the section be amended in the way I suggested.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would not be put quite in that form. The hon. member desires the section to read in this way?

Where in any industry any strike or lockout has occurred.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend has not read the whole section.

Mr. JACOBS: I think I have.

Mr. CROTHERS: Then I do not think the hon. gentleman has comprehended it. It is not confined to a strike or lockout at all. It says:

Or for any other reason.

The minister does not require to wait for strike or lockout. He may do this of his own motion at any time. That appears in the sixth line.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that not governed by the words "has been long continued?"

Mr. CROTHERS: The clause says:

or for any other reason it seems expedient to the Minister, the Minister may on the application of any municipality interested, or of the Mayor, Reeve or other head officer or acting head officers thereof, or of his own motion.

He does not require to wait for any one. However, I have no objection to the amendment proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is to strike out the words "been long continued" at the beginning of paragraph six, and insert in lieu thereof the word "occurred."

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendment read first and second time and concurred in.

ORGANIZATION AND CO-ORDINATION OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICES.

On motion of Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour) the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of Employment Offices, and for these purposes to appropriate and pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada during the fiscal year 1918-19 the sum of fifty thousand dollars, during the fiscal year 1919-20 the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, and during each succeeding fiscal year the sum of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and to provide that the moneys appropriated for each year shall be allotted and paid to the government of the respective provinces in the proportion which their expenditure for the maintenance of employment offices bears to the total of the expenditures of all the provinces for such purposes, but in no case shall the allotment to a province exceed the amount expended for the maintenance of employment offices by such province; and, further, that the payments shall be conditional upon agreement between the Minister and the government of the province and subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and that such officers as are required to carry out these purposes may be appointed under the laws relating to the Civil Service, and their salaries and expenses paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for that purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Explain.

Mr. CROTHERS: These labour exchanges are of several kinds; for instance, there are national, provincial, municipal, private, philanthropic and semi-philanthropic exchanges. Five of the provinces—Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia—have already established labour exchanges, but their operations are confined entirely to the particular province. It has been thought well that their labour exchanges should be linked up with a clearing house at Ottawa, and that we should contribute to the expense of establishing and maintaining them. The object of this legislation is to encourage the provinces in establishing these exchanges, and to assist in co-ordinating the work of the several provinces. No other country in the world that has established a national system of labour exchanges is at all situated like Canada. In England, New Zealand, and, perhaps, some of the smaller countries of Europe, there is a national system of labour exchanges, but on account of the vast extent of this country it has not been considered wise to establish a national system here. Sometimes interprovincial questions will arise in connection with having labour transferred from one province to another, and it was thought that if we had a clearing house at Ottawa to receive reports from the clearing houses of the several provinces we should here be able to get a bird's eye view of the labour situation in Canada, and could issue bulletins so that the people throughout the whole country would know exactly what labour conditions were in each locality.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The House will expect a fuller explanation on the second reading of the Bill, but the principle of the resolution will, I think, commend itself to the judgment of the House. Upon two different occasions—last session and the session before—I moved a resolution with the object of having my hon. friend introduce legislation similar to this. I do not know whether he was in fear of a certain lady who was very active in the proposed organization of labour bureaus, but he certainly was not very responsive to the requests which I then made.

Mr. CROTHERS: She has disappeared since.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am told that the lady in question, much to the relief of my hon. friend and possibly of the Prime Minister, is now in the employ of the Department of Labour in Washington. I certainly think the minister is taking a proper step in introducing this legislation. National labour bureaus were first started in England where they have met with very great success, as shown by statistics which I have given to the House on two different occasions. Labour bureaus have also been established in Australia and New Zealand, and to-day they are perfecting their organization in the United States. I am quite sure that in Canada, especially in view of conditions that will prevail in this country when demobilization takes place, and when the munition factories will be idle and the works of peace begin again, such bureaus will be absolutely needed in order to open the necessary channels for labour, and particularly for our returned soldiers. I am quite sure that when we have had

an opportunity to examine the provisions of the Bill it will commend itself to the judgment of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: From the terms of the resolution I would understand that it is not contemplated to have any Ottawa organization, but that this money is to be appropriated entirely to the provincial governments.

Mr. CROTHERS: These particular sums are to go to the provinces, but the Bill will provide for the establishment by this Government of one or more clearing houses.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolution says that the moneys appropriated for each year shall be alloted and paid to the provincial governments. I take it that it is intended to give them $50,000 the first year, $100,000 the second year, and thereafter every year, without limitation, $150,000. There is no limitation so far as I can see; it becomes a permanent grant.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is the proposition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there is a limitation based upon the expenditure by the different provinces.

Mr. FIELDING: But the resolution does not seem to me to provide for expenditure in any other way than by the provinces.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the object of distributing this money to the provinces and having them pay it out?

Mr. CROTHERS: The object is to encourage each province to establish these labour bureaus. In Quebec to-day there are three or four of these labour bureaus —one at Montreal, another at Sherbrooke, and there may be two or three others. In Ontario there are eight or ten. Our object is to have these labour exchanges established through all the provinces.

Mr. JACOBS: Why should not this department handle the matter direct?

Mr. CROTHERS: This country is so very large that it would be a great undertaking for the Government to establish labour exchanges throughout the country to see that men were sent, say, from Halifax to Vancouver. We thought it better to assist the provinces, as five of them have already engaged in this work.

Mr. JACOBS: If I remember correctly, some years ago the Government were opposed to handing over various sums of money to the provinces for the building of highways, on the ground that the central governments should handle that matter themselves.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman is mistaken; if he looks up Hansard he will find a different story. I think the idea of this legislation is this: The provincial governments have already established labour bureaus in many of the provinces, and it would be an unwise thing for the Federal Government to duplicate that endeavour and establish labour bureaus themselves. They cannot interfere with what has been done by the provinces. On the other hand it is desired to encourage the movement. Therefore, following a conference with the provinces on the subject, it has been decided to give them this much assistance for the purpose of extending the movement within each province.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand then the Government has changed its policy in connection with the payment to the provinces of sums of money out of the federal treasury?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Agricultural Aid Bill which was passed some time ago, he will find that this is precisely along the same lines.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Crothers thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 57, to Aid and Encourage the Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE BILL.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. C. C. Ballantyne (Minister of the Naval Service), for third reading of Bill No. 49, respecting the Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act 1911.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I do not intend to oppose this Bill, far from it, but simply to explain what is involved, to some of the members of the House who appeared a little nervous as regards the power given by this Bill to the various navies of the Dominions. I think it was my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) who said the other day that he did not accept with great complacency the idea that our own men

should be court-martialled in time of peace by, say an officer of the Australian navy. I am bound to say that for my part I am pleased that this legislation is at last brought before Parliament. It is in my judgment a vindication of the policy inaugurated in 1910 by the late Laurier Administration, and I am surprised that the Bill was not introduced long before. I congratulate the minister for having brought forward this measure, which is simply implementing the resolutions adopted by the Imperial Conference of 1911. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that in 1909 the Canadian Parliament unanimously passed a resolution in favour of the establishment of a Canadian navy, and the following year the then Prime Minister introduced a Bill based on that resolution by which the principle of a Canadian navy was launched, which, in cases of emergency, was to be placed at the disposal of the Admiralty. The Bill, for reasons which I need not explain now, was opposed by those who favoured the very principle of that legislation. However, the Bill was passed and the Canadian Navy was created in consequence of that legislation. During the summer of 1911 an Imperial Conference was held in London, and at that conference the Prime Minister of Canada was present accompanied by the late Sir Frederick Borden, and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur. I have before me the précis which deals with the regulations which were adopted concurrently by the Imperial and the Dominion authorities as regards the organization of the Canadian Navy. I make bold to say, Mr. Speaker, that this policy, agreed upon by the Imperial Government and the Governments of Australia and of Canada, was the most progressive, and let me say the most wholesome, policy that has ever been adopted as between the Imperial authorities and the Dominion authorities. At that conference it was decided that the naval service forces of Canada and of Australia would be exclusively under the control of their respective governments, and the second paragraph of the resolution on the navy deals precisely with that discipline of the naval forces of the dominions which this Bill regulates. It reads:

> The training and discipline of the naval forces of the Dominions will be generally uniform with the training and discipline of the fleet of the United Kingdom, and by arrangement, officers and men of the said forces will be interchangeable with those under the control of the British Admiralty.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is another paragraph which is also very interesting for us Canadians:

> The ships of each Dominion naval force will hoist at the stern the white ensign as the symbol of the authority of the Crown, and at the jack-staff the distinctive flag of the Dominion.

I have read on many occasions in the Ottawa Citizen and elsewhere that Canada had no flag, and that it was preposterous to assert that she had one. Well, the Imperial authorities think otherwise because it is declared that "the ships of each dominion naval force will hoist at the stern the white ensign as the symbol of the authority of the Crown, and at the jackstaff the distinctive flag of the dominion." I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this arrangement was a most progressive one and should make every Canadian proud of the navy which was then created. At that same conference, for the first time in the history of Canada, the British Government conceded to the Canadian Government the point that our navy would have charge on the Pacific ocean and on the Atlantic ocean of certain zones which are now before me on the map annexed to the report of the proceedings of the conference in question. We remember how the modest beginnings of the Canadian navy were treated. We remember how our friends on the other side of the House, some, not all of them, spoke of the tin-pot navy.

Mr. R. H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): What is the meaning of the term "jackstaff"?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought my hon. friend came from the Maritime Provinces, and that, after speaking as a naval expert the other day, he knew what the "jackstaff" was. I was pleased when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the Niobe and the Rainbow had been exceedingly useful during the present war. If the policy adopted by Parliament in 1910 had been carried out by the succeeding Administration possibly the coast cities of British Columbia would not have had to depend for protection upon the Japanese navy when the war broke out. Be that as it may, I am pleased to learn that the Minister of Naval Affairs has cheerfully accepted the legacy of the Laurier Administration, and is living up to its policy; a policy so Canadian and at the same time so British, and so sanely Imperial as was the Laurier naval policy. The Bill which is about to be read the third time simply carries out the policy

arrived at at the Imperial conference of 1911, and I shall support it cordially.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

SALARIES ACT AMENDMENT—INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden moved second reading of Bill No. 13, to amend the Salaries Act, and the provisions for preserving the independence of Parliament.

Mr. J. BUREAU (Three Rivers): Before the motion carries I wish to tell the Prime Minister that I do not exactly agree with the principle of multiplying departments and handling salaries as has been laid down by the Government. Two or three new ministries have been created, leaving aside various commissions that have been appointed, some to work in conjunction, some under the control of, and others apparently absolutely independent of any department of the Government. We understand that the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs is created for a purpose. It is created for all time, but I hope that the existing conditions which make it a necessity, or if not a necessity, at least an expediency, to multiply the number of departments will not exist forever. Another new department has been created by the subdivision of the Department of the Interior, which already had a slice taken out of it when the Mines Department was cut off and placed within the Secretary of State's Department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was formerly under the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. BUREAU: The Department of Mines?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then I was mistaken and I accept my hon. friend's correction. But, after it was taken away from the Inland Revenue Department, the fact that it is being merged with the Customs Department would not be a sufficient reason at the present time, because, before the Inland Revenue Department was merged with the Customs, this branch of the Inland Revenue had been taken away and put under the Secretary of State, if I am correct in my facts. I read the other day a statement made in the British House of Commons on the eve of the Christmas adjournment, wherein the ex-Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, commenting on the situation in replying to a review that had been made by Mr. Lloyd George, said that there was one great danger in the multiplicity of departments, that this policy tended to over-centralization. I believe we have had an example of that tendency here; we have had more than an example, we have seen it in operation. With the multiplicity of departments, the heads of departments attempt to take authority from the Governor in Council in matters which ought to be submitted to it, and to put themselves in the place of the Governor in Council, constituting themselves judges of final resort or sole arbitrators in cases which heretofore had to go before the Governor in Council. This over-centralization is gradually taking away from the representatives of the people the privileges which it is their duty to exercise in this House. As a matter of principle, on the score of expediency there may be justification for the creation of these departments. I do not know but that one of them could be dispensed with. Referring to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment, I believe that the best authority to deal with any matter concerning soldiers is the Department of Militia. Since we have taken away from the Minister of Agriculture the control of food, and given it to a commission under his direction, which, however, I understand, reports to him still, I do not see why it would not be as well to have a commission directly under the supervision of the Minister of Militia and Defence to deal with these military matters—I mean the Minister of Militia in Canada, not the minister for the British Isles, nor the minister for France, if there is one; there may be, I do not know. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I want to put myself on record as being against overcentralization, the multiplicity of departments, the assumption of the rights and privileges of Parliament, even of the Imperial Parliament, by the passing of certain Orders in Council, which I hope it will be my privilege to discuss further in this House.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse what my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has said with regard to the principle involved in the creation of so many new departments. But there are two other principles in this Bill to which I also object. One of these is the selection of new ministers, and the payment of salaries to members of Parliament, without submitting these members to re-election. It is the constitutional theory that any man who is selected as a new adviser of His Majesty must have his choice ratified by the people, through the

electors of the particular constituency which he represents in this House. I think that is a sound principle, and I do not see why there should be a deviation from this safeguard and guarantee of popular representation and of the sovereignty of the people. This is being done as a war measure, but I do not see how the fact that a minister is to be exempted from having his selection ratified by his electors is a step which conduces to the winning of the war. Another principle to which I object is that contained in section 2 of the Bill, which provides not only that new departments are created by Parliament, but gives to the Prime Minister authority to appoint new ministers without any department having been provided for by Parliament. The Prime Minister on his own authority will have the right to select one or more ministers not exceeding three, and to pay salaries to these ministers. Of course, this will be done by Order in Council, but the point is that it will not be provided for by Parliament. Parliament must remain supreme in a matter of this kind. Departments must be created by Parliament; the business which will be transacted by these departments must be provided for by Parliament, and surely we should not deprive ourselves of our rights in that respect and appoint the Prime Minister as the real dictator of the country. The Executive must not be the masters of Parliament but must remain its servants. I think there is a very bad principle involved in section 2 of the Bill, and for these reasons I object to the second reading.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to say just a few words chiefly in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe). I would call his attention to the fact that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was appointed on the 12th day of October, 1917, and he since has been elected to this Parliament. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization was appointed on the 12th day of October, and he since has been elected to Parliament. The Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is a member of the Senate, and, unlike the unfortunate mortals who are members of this House, he does not require election.

Mr. BUREAU: Might I be allowed a question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Two.

Mr. BUREAU: We are not taking particular exception to the present ministers. But supposing the Prime Minister desires to appoint another one? That is one of our reasons for objecting.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will get through with the present budget and then come to the other matter in a moment. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was previously the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence. He simply changed from one position to the other. My hon. friend is aware that under the provisions of the Act respecting the Independence of Parliament, and the Act relating to the salaries of ministers, if a minister resigns in one department and within thirty days accepts office in another, it is not necessary in that case for him to be re-elected. That is as to the present. Now, as to the future. It does provide, in Section 2, that:

> —one or more other Ministers, not exceeding three, Members of the King's Privy Council for Canada who may be named by the Governor in Council, may be paid such salaries or other remuneration as Parliament may from time to time provide, and they shall not, by reason of anything contained in the Acts mentioned in subsection two of section one of this Act or in any other statute or law, or by reason of being paid or receiving the said salaries or remuneration so provided by Parliament, be ineligible as Members of the House of Commons, or disqualified to sit or vote therein.

It is provided that this section shall continue in operation only during the present war and for one year thereafter. It is purely a temporary provision, designed, as I explained when I made a further motion in Committee not long ago, to cover the case of the present Acting Minister of Finance (Hon. A. K. Maclean), who is Vice-Chairman, virtually Chairman, of the Committee on Reconstruction and Development, and who in that position has imposed upon him duties just as arduous and important as those imposed on any minister of the Crown. Senator Robertson is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labour Conditions, and, in addition, is Chairman of the Canada Registration Board, which is undertaking the task of accomplishing a registration of all the men and women of Canada above the age of sixteen. In the capacity of Chairman of the Subcommittee on Labour Conditions, Senator Robertson has already given value to the country ten thousand times greater than any salary that is involved, by his indefatigable efforts in bringing about agreements between employers and employed in very important industries. Of course, the arduous duties imposed upon him as Chairman of the Canada Registration Board will last only a few months. So the purpose of this legislation is plain enough. We have not any leisured

class in this country, we have not men who are able to enter the Government and discharge such duties as these without reasonable remuneration. I think all will agree that the remuneration of a minister of the Crown in federal affairs is not excessive, and we have accorded to these gentlemen the same remuneration accorded to other members of the Government. If their time was not fully occupied; if they were not doing important work and fulfilling important duties, there might be some ground for criticism. Under the conditions as they are, it seems to me that this temporary measure might very well be accepted by the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1, subsection 1—salaries:

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that it is Senator Robertson's duty to act in labour matters which affect returned soldiers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, he is chairman of a sub-committee on labour. The Order in Council appointing him as such and defining the duties of the position has, I think, been laid on the Table. Senator Robertson has been associated with labour organizations all his life, and has had a great deal of experience in composing disputes that have arisen from time to time between employers and employed. Before he was a member of the Senate and long before he was a member of the Government he rendered very valuable service—about two years ago, I think—in settling a very difficult and important dispute between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its employees in western Canada. Not very long after that, in the autumn, he was appointed a member of the Senate, and when the new Government was formed in October last he was made a member of it, as specially representing labour organizations. Later a sub-committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee was formed, upon which it was intended to place men who would be in close touch with labour, men connected with labour organizations, in order that the Government, and especially the Department of Labour, might be in closer touch with organized labour throughout the country. Senator Robertson's work has been in connection with that committee and is carried on in perfect harmony and in the closest consultation with the Minister of Labour.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. BUREAU: That is exactly the point. This afternoon we gave the Minister of Labour absolute power to determine what should constitute a case for arbitration in labour disputes, and whether or not he himself should step in and force employer or employee to submit to arbitration. It would appear that Senator Robertson has the same duties. This afternoon I understood from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) that the inspectors whom we were giving him power to appoint would be expected to go round the country and inquire about labour conditions generally. Senator Robertson's duties appear to be in the nature of a buffer between employers and labour men, his qualifications for which are based, I understand, on his past relations with labour unions, as Chairman of the Telegraphers' Association of Canada. Is there not some overlapping here?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, none whatever.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not understand what the powers and duties of Senator Robertson are. This afternoon we gave the Minister of Labour carte blanche to do anything to improve conditions of labour, to make inquiry into them, to prevent and to settle strikes, to try to bring employer and employee together whenever occasion required. If Senator Robertson has the same duties, this would appear to be another case of duplication. Of course, I do not say that there is anything wrong in it. Not knowing the extent of the duties of Senator Robertson, or the exact work of the particular board of which he is going to be the head, I do not want to be understood as criticising his ability, qualifications or capacity. I am simply discussing the principle of this double authority. The Prime Minister says that there will be no overlapping, but there must be a perfect union of mentality and aspirations on the part of the two Ministers of Labour if they are going to act in absolutely the same field, come into contact with each other every day and at the same time not have any, I shall not say friction—this is no time for friction—but overlapping of authority in the scope of their duties and rights under these Acts.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can assure my hon. friend there is no overlapping. For example, one purpose, out of a great many that might be suggested, would be this: The Minister of Labour might, in respect of the last section of the Bill that was passed here to-day, refer to the committee which is studying labour problems

and the relations generally between employers and employees, the question as to whether he should intervene, under the power of that section, in relation to some particular labour disturbance.

Mr CANNON: In subsection 1 is mentioned the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What are the exact duties of this minister? Canada is a colony and all our international or diplomatic affairs must be transacted through the Imperial Government. Have we a new standing or a new arrangement with the Imperial Government whereby we can deal with such matters directly?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might refer my hon. friend, if he desires full information on the subject, to his leader who some years ago established that department by a statute which is available to any person who may desire to read it. It was established long before 1911. The Department of External Affairs is concerned with all matters of communication with the Government of the United Kingdom or with the Governments of other countries. It deals also with communications with the other Dominions. I suppose that, during the past three years, seven or eight thousand telegrams have annually passed through that department in respect of external affairs of one kind or another. Everything that relates to the external affairs of Canada passes through that
9 p.m. department. It gathers up, for example, from all the other departments any matters on which they are required to report, to express their opinion, to make a recommendation, and which have relation to the external affairs of this country. The appointment of consuls in this country which is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, communications with the British Embassy at Washington—all these are dealt with in that department. Under ordinary conditions the work is not, of course, so great as it is at the present time. During the past three and a half years it has been onerous and exceedingly comprehensive.

Subsection 1 agreed to.

On section 1, subsection 3—ministers not ineligible to be members or sit in House of Commons:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Subsection 2 of section 2 should be added to this section also, that is, that the provisions of this section shall only continue in operation during the present year and for one year thereafter. As subsection 3 of section 1 stands at present, those gentlemen who will be appointed as Secretary of State, Minister of Immigration and Colonization and Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment will never have to be re-elected.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend mean that those officers should be temporary?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BUREAU: When we were making our argument, the Prime Minister told us that we need not worry for the future, because this Act would be for the war and one year thereafter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was speaking of section 2.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it the intention of the Prime Minister, if, after the war, he should choose to take a member of the House for one of the positions named in this subsection, that such minister should not go before the people to have his position ratified in accordance with the existing law for preserving the Independence of Parliament?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. BUREAU: The restriction applies only to section 2?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought I made myself fairly clear with regard to the matter. I shall try to do so again. The office of Secretary of State for External Affairs is not a temporary office, it is a permanent office. The position of Minister of Immigration and Colonization is not a temporary office; it is a permanent office. As regards the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Parliamentary Secretary of that department, I explained to the House, when the resolution went through, that while these are not intended as permanent positions, nevertheless it is impossible at the present time to define any period within which they should cease to exist. I pointed out further that, under an Act which has passed this House during the present session, it is possible to dispense with them at any time, or to amalgamate that department with some other department.

Mr. BUREAU: I think the Prime Minister does not understand the objection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps I do not.

Mr. BUREAU: I shall try to make it again. The answer made to my hon. friend

from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) was that this Act would be only for the war and one year thereafter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That applies only to section 2.

Mr. BUREAU: And at any time after the war subsection 2 and subsection 3 of section 1 will be in force.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Subsection 1 will be in force certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: Subsection 3 says:

> Nothing in the Dominion Elections Act or in the Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapters 6 and 10 respectively, or in any other Statute or law, shall render ineligible any person accepting or holding any of the said offices of Secretary of State for External Affairs,—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think I understand what is in my hon. friend's mind. He thinks this provision is destined to prevent the necessity of an election.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, after the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BUREAU: What does it mean then?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It means simply that men appointed to those positions in October last need not be elected again, because they have already been elected. But if any gentleman in this House was appointed to one of those positions in the future, he would have to go before his constituents for re-election.

Mr. CANNON: The subsection says "accepting or holding." The argument of my right hon. friend would apply to the ministers who are holding office at present, but not to those who will accept office later.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly, it does not disqualify a minister from accepting or holding office, otherwise he would not be in the House of Commons; but when he accepts one of those offices he must go back to his constituency and be elected, the same as any other minister.

Mr. CANNON: If the hon. minister who is holding this position at present disappears, and a new man is chosen, this section would apply?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: And the new minister would not have to be elected?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He must go back and be elected.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. CANNON: He would not have to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not disqualify him, but he must go back and be elected.

Mr. BUREAU: If it does not disqualify him from sitting in the House, he need not go back for re-election. Under the old law, when a man accepted an office in which he received money from the Crown, his mandate from the people ceased, and he was no longer a member of the House. This section says:

> Nothing in the Dominion Elections Act or in the Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada 1906, Chapters 6 and 10 respectively, or in any other statute or law, shall render ineligible any person accepting or holding any of the said offices.

Under the old law, if he accepts a position where he receives emoluments from the Crown his mandate as a representative of the people ceases, and he must go back to be re-elected. But this section provides that nothing in these Acts shall hereafter disqualify him, if he occupies one of the specific positions mentioned in the section. Then we have the saving clause as to the time the Act will continue in operation. My impression of the Act is that after the war is over if you choose to appoint a members of this House to one of the positions he is relieved by this section from the necessity of going before the electors to have his selection ratified.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not understand that such is the meaning.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The old law used the same words with the following: "Whenever elected while holding the office." This would read as follows:

> —shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein whenever elected while holding the office.

That is the law as it exists to-day, and those words do not appear in the present clause.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no intention to make any change in that respect. The Bill was drafted by the Parliamentary Counsel, and I do not understand that the clause has the meaning my hon. friend suggests. If it has it should be amended, but it was not the intention to make any such change.

Mr. BUREAU: Leaving aside the fact that the Bill was prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel, if other members of the House agree with the interpretation given by my right hon. friend, I am willing to submit,

and I will say there must be something wrong with my interpretation of the English. I do not rise to criticise at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Let it stand.

Section stands.

On subsection 4—salaries to be paid from first appointment:

Mr. BUREAU: I think the same objection applies here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Why?

Mr. BUREAU: The last paragraph says:

And such payment shall not render the persons receiving same ineligible as members of the House of Commons or disqualify them for sitting or voting therein.

After they are appointed they can receive emoluments from the Crown, and disregard the provision of the statute which says that they cannot do so until they have gone back for re-election.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This particular section refers in its terms to those who are now holding office. It is not intended that they should be disqualified inasmuch as they have been elected and I do not think the subsection has any relation to any one else except those who now hold office.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Why should we not insert there the same words that are in the existing law: "whenever elected while holding the office"?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Because we know perfectly well they have been elected.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But some one else might be appointed to the same position.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He would not come within the terms of the section.

Mr. DAVIS: Would the insertion of the word "heretofore" or "hitherto" after the word "persons" in the first line make it clear?

Mr. BUREAU: Between the words "person" and "holding"?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no objection to the insertion of the word "now" between the word "persons" and the word "holding" in the first line of subsection 4 of Section 1, and I move that that word be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Should we not repeat the word in line 18, between the word "persons" and the word "receiving"?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the one amendment will suffice.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Three additional Ministers may receive salaries if same voted by Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I move

That clause two of the Bill be amended:
(a) by substituting the words "authorize" and "authorized" for the words "provide" and "provided" in lines twenty-eight and thirty-two, respectively;

(b) by adding the following clause as sub-clause two:—
"(2.) The provisions of this section shall be deemed to have come into operation on the twenty-third day of October, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, and to apply and extend to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Labour Problems and to the Vice-Chairman of the Reconstruction and Development Committee, and they shall be deemed to have been named by the Governor in Council under the provisions of this section on the said date, and shall each receive a salary of seven thousand dollars per annum."; and
(c) by changing the number of sub-clause two to three.

Mr. COPP: Have only two been appointed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. COPP: The Government has authority to appoint three.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no intention of utilizing that power at present.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I would suggest that if a third is to be appointed the Government should create the position of Minister of Fisheries, making it distinct from the Department of Naval Service.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will give the suggestion very careful consideration. We have had suggestions along that line already.

Mr. COPP: I would further suggest that he be appointed from Prince Edward Island.

Amendment agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 1—salaries:

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps it might be better for the Prime Minister to reserve subsection (3) for further consideration. Amending Bills of this nature are sometimes a dangerous thing, and I think there is something in the contention of my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) that the clause goes beyond what the Prime Minister intends. It might be just as well to reserve the Bill for further consideration,

after consultation with the Parliamentary counsel.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend suggests. We do not have it in mind at all that three ministers of the Crown should have this immunity from seeking a new mandate from their constituents. If the section does not mean what we intend it will have to be amended, and I am quite ready to accept my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. FIELDING: It is debatable.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There may be some question about it. As a matter of fact, I am not quite sure that all the provisions of the Bill were necessary. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) points out that in section 12 of chapter 10 there is a provision that,

> Nothing in this Act shall render ineligible any person holding any office . . . . which is hereafter created, to be held by a member of the King's Privy Council for Canada and entitling him to be a Minister of the Crown.

I do not know whether the attention of parliamentary counsel was directed to that particular feature of the Act relating to the Senate and the House of Commons. Some of the provisions of the Bill seem to be possibly superfluous. I am quite content to let the Bill remain in committee and we can deal with subsection (3) of section 1 on some future occasion.

Progress reported.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

COMPENSATION FOR SLAUGHTERED ANIMALS.

On motion of Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture) Bill No. 56, to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Compensation for slaughtered animals increased:

Mr. CRERAR: I beg to move that section 1 be amended by substituting the word "seven" for the word "six" in the first line thereof; it is an error in the printing.

Amendment agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

[Mr. Fielding.]

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Militia and Defence—Allowance Active Militia, $50,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Before we proceed with these estimates, may I ask when we may expect to receive the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report which is supposed to contain the detailed expenditure of the Department of Militia?

Major General MEWBURN: I cannot answer with respect to the Auditor General's Report, but a memorandum on the organization of the whole department, which was spoken of the other day, when the Militia expenditures were referred to, is in the hands of the printer and I understand will be available at the end of this week or the beginning of next.

Mr. BUREAU: The Auditor General's Report, containing the details of the Militia expenditure for last year, is what we are asking for. It contains the only data we have upon which to base our criticisms of the estimates for the present year.

Mr. J. D. REID: Does the hon. gentleman say that the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report has not yet been brought down?

Mr. BUREAU: It has not been laid on the Table and has not been distributed.

Mr. J. D. REID: In that case it may not be available for some time.

Major General MEWBURN: The report of the Militia Council has been brought down, and also the memorandum to which I referred. The latter does not contain any data as regards expenditure, but deals more with the organization of the whole department.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister give us some explanation of the reduction of $30,000 as compared with the estimates of last year? How is the item made up?

Major General MEWBURN: As my hon. friend is aware, having been in the Militia, the militia units in Canada have had very little assistance since the war started. In 1914 and 1915 the Active Militia units were the basis and foundation for the whole Canadian Expeditionary Force, and last year they were pretty well knocked to pieces all over the country. After providing for organization, allowance for pay, instruction, care of arms, and so forth, it is estimated that we can do with $30,000 less this year than last year.

Mr. COPP: Where are these arms stored?

Major-General MEWBURN: They are kept in the armouries of the corps. A very large number of the Militia units have kept their organizations together, and last year and the year before they were parading and drilling, particularly the city corps, at least once a week and keeping up to their old peace establishment. These units are mainly composed of men who are medically unfit, and they carry on their summer training. This is not so much the case with the rural corps, because they have not been in camp.

Mr. POWER: Is it the minister's intention to see to it that all militia officers now employed in the active militia are given the opportunity to serve overseas if they wish to?

Major-General MEWBURN: They not only have been given the opportunity; they have been urged. In fact, I think the Militia officers who have held commissions since 1914 will probably be a little more than requested to join the ranks in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Since the Military Service Act came into operation, no commissions have been given in the active militia, none at all. That clause in the proposed amendment embraces those who did not get to the actual theatre of war, and militia officers within the ages called. In fact, I am glad to say that a very large number of these officers have joined the ranks.

Mr. COPP: Did I understand the minister to say that a large number of officers in the training corps are still employed training men who are medically unfit to go overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: No; I said that in several of the city corps throughout Canada the corps have given far more than their establishment to the overseas service. Then, in these regiments, there are still a considerable number of men who were medically unfit or over or under age who still retained their identity with the active militia. These units in many cases have filled up their ranks with other men. For instance, members of Canadian and Rotary clubs joined these militia units at the time of the home guard movement, and have carried on their training without any pay, and have done a certain amount of musketry training on Saturday afternoons in the summer. In this way, many units have kept their organization together, and they were very largely the organizations which helped so well with voluntary recruiting.

Mr. POWER: A large number of these militia units could be very easily abolished, and the expense of their training saved. We have in Quebec a composite battalion composed, I understand, of the old 8th and 9th Battalions. I suppose there are some ten or fifteen officers and three or four hundred men. If the men are fit, why not send them overseas? If they are unfit, why keep them in uniform?

Major-General MEWBURN: For the information of the hon. member, so far as the unit he speaks of is concerned, any men in it who are medically fit will go overseas. Those who are not medically fit in all these units—there are some in Quebec and in other districts, some of which are known as Special Service Companies—we are organizing now what is known as a Garrison Regiment, which will absorb any of these men who are not required for overseas service. I hope that the unit referred to by my hon. friend will disappear off the horizon altogether.

Mr. POWER: I did not refer to the Quebec unit only. I understand there are a large number of militia units.

Major-General MEWBURN: They have been very materially cut down. There has been one on the Welland canal, and one at the Soo.

Mr. POWER: And one at Lachine canal.

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not know. There is one at Sault Ste. Marie, and there is a corps on the internment operations at Kapuskasing and at other points. And there were some that we have relieved and done away with in British Columbia. There is still a corps at Esquimalt and one at Halifax, but these have been practically reduced to nothing.

Mr. VIEN: Is the expense incurred by their maintenance under this heading?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, it is not.

Cadet services—For pay of instructors, expenses of teachers qualifying at Military Schools and contingent expenses—$75,000.

Mr. COPP: Will the minister explain what that item is for and what is going to be done with this money during the present year?

Major-General MEWBURN: The object of this vote is to maintain the different cadet units and encourage the cadet services throughout the country. It includes pay and allowances and transportation of organizers and inspectors amounting to

$27,000. The instruction allowances total $47,000; physical training course for school teachers, $600; and contingent expenses $400. The expenditure for the year 1917-18 was estimated at $90,000, and this year a saving of $15,000 will probably be effected by a reduction of the instruction allowances It seems in the interest of the country that these cadet corps, which are a very good organization all over Canada, should not be allowed to go to pieces.

Mr. CASGRAIN: How many are in the cadet corps in Montreal?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not like to give the actual numbers; I think there are about 150 or 160 corps throughout Canada. In some places they are stronger than in others. They are really run in connection with schools and colleges.

Mr. VIEN: The organization known as the Boy Scouts does not come under this vote?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. VIEN: Is there any money paid by the department to the Boy Scouts?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, there is not. A good many of the Boy Scouts are members of the cadets.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Are these cadet corps furnished with rifles and other necessary equipment?

Major-General MEWBURN: A number of the Ross cadet rifles are furnished to some of them. Of course, these rifles had to be taken away from the cadet corps to be used for training purposes, but I am glad to say they have been handed back to the cadet corps. They are in charge of the different schools.

Mr. PEDLOW: What was done with the Ross rifles taken from the rifle associations? Are they available now? If so, the rifle association of the town of Renfrew would like to receive their rifles back. There is a corps there of 100 members, and they have done good service. I would like to know if these rifles will be returned to the association.

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not guarantee that they will. The rifles which had been loaned to these associations had to be withdrawn, and it may be possible to give some of these associations the loan of some rifles this summer.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. PEDLOW: The members of the association have been disappointed because the rifles were taken away from them.

Major-General MEWBURN: The rifles were required and the Ross cadet rifles also had to be withdrawn from the cadets for training purposes, and there are other reasons which I do not think I would be at liberty to give, but I would be glad to explain them to my hon. friend.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am greatly interested in this question, because I was captain of the association at Renfrew for many years. Many members of our association enlisted and have done good service at the front. Are these rifles to be made available again, so that the organization may resume its work?

Mr. JACOBS: The minister could obtain a large number of rifles from the Montreal Home Guard Association, an institution which was stifled in its birth. My rifle is available if my hon. friend wants it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The rifle that the home guard were using is not at all suited for active service.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not useful for target practice?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not very good.

Mr. PEDLOW: It is called the Savage rifle—the name is rather significant. While the Ross rifle Mark III was not so efficient for actual service at the front, it was very useful for target practice.

Mr. CANNON: Who is inspector of cadets for the district of Quebec?

Major-General MEWBURN: Major Paquet.

Mr. CANNON: What is Major Paquet's military record? Has he been overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand that he was declared medically unfit.

Mr. CANNON: Was he not in command of an overseas battalion a few years ago?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am informed that he was in command of an overseas unit at one time, but that he did not proceed overseas because of his being medically unfit.

Mr. CANNON: Did his battalion proceed overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: In drafts, I am informed.

Mr. CANNON: If he is physically unfit, how can he hold this position?

Major-General MEWBURN: He is only a cadet instructor, drawing no pay or emolument.

Mr. COPP: Is any school or college throughout the Dominion that makes application entitled to allowance in respect of cadet corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: Any school that has a cadet corps officially organized and authorized can get the allowance.

Mr. COPP: Who authorizes the organization of the cadet corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is recommended in the usual way to the Minister of Militia and Council and approved here.

Mr. COPP: By the Minister of Militia or the department?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I have seen the boys training at Mount Allison University in my own town, and I have wondered whether they were receiving assistance from the Militia Department. What is the extent of the allowance?

Major-General MEWBURN: One dollar per cadet, and fifty cents each for those in excess of fifty in each corps.

Mr. COPP: That applies to any cadet corps properly organized, which makes application in the usual way to the Militia Department?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Who is inspector of cadets for the Montreal district?

Major-General MEWBURN: My deputy informs me that there is none at present.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is it the intention of the department to have one?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand that one of the staff officers of Military District No. 4 is temporarily carrying on.

Mr. COPP: Is there an inspector of cadets in New Brunswick?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think there are eleven inspectors altogether, one in each military district. New Brunswick now constitutes Military District No. 7; it formerly formed part of Military District No. 6—New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CANNON: Is there any truth in the report that some of the cadet corps have been deprived of their rifles?

Major-General MEWBURN: Mark III cadets rifles were called in all over for use in training in the C.E.F. We have taken steps to have these all replaced. The cadet corps only were not deprived of rifles; the rifles were withdrawn from all militia units throughout Canada for the same purpose.

Militia and Defence—departmental library, $1,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Are the honorary colonels admitted to the library?

Major-General MEWBURN: The library may be open to all respectable citizens of Canada, but I am not aware that any honorary colonels have ever taken advantage of the opportunity of studying military law.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister's answer prompts another suggestion. Since we are in the midst of a multiplication of departments and boards, would it not be well for the minister to appoint a board to make —what shall I call it?

Some hon. MEMBERS: A cleaning up.

Major-General MEWBURN: Grading.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I would not grade them; I would clean up a few hundred of them. This board might inquire whether these honorary colonels are going to continue to parade round the country without rendering any military service.

The reason I say this is that I do not think it is fair to those men who are real, genuine colonels, who devote themselves to the defence of this country and who work for the country, who have other men, who are only honorary colonels, graded with them. I do not mean to say that the honorary colonels are not honest citizens; I do not mean to say they do not deserve the rank they have been given, but I do not like to see a man who has never opened a law book in his life proclaimed Doctor of Laws by a university. It is not fair to those who have studied law, and I am sure the minister, who has been before the courts, hammering away at law practically all his life, will agree with me. The same thing ought to be true with regard to the genuine colonel and the "Turkish rug" or "parlour carpet" colonel. It would be a good move to appoint a board of examiners and have a clean-up of these honorary colonels.

Militia and Defence—engineer services and works, $430,000.

Major-General MEWBURN: There has been a reduction of $135,500.

Mr. CANNON: Will this include any work that might be done to the walls of the city of Quebec?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes. The item covers ordinary repairs and works; Halifax defences, Quebec defences, Esquimalt defences and so on. The upkeep of the Quebec defences is estimated to cost $26,000.

Mr. PARENT: How is the work done?

Major-General MEWBURN: By day labour.

Mr. MICHAUD: Was any money spent at St. John?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think so.

Mr. VIEN: Why is it that those repairs on the Quebec defences amounting last year to $50,000 were carried out by day labour instead of tenders being called for?

Major-General MEWBURN: As we have our own engineer services in charge of the work, probably that is the cheapest way in which, so far as the Government is concerned, it can be done. It is probably cheaper than having a regular contract.

Mr. VIEN: Is it not the general policy of the Government that, for any work amounting to over $5,000, tenders must be called for and contracts let? Is there not an Order in Council to that effect?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think this $26,000 is for one particular piece of work. It is for all the work on the permanent defences.

Mr. VIEN: I understand that every year a certain amount, exceeding $10,000, is spent for repairs on the walls. Why was that work not given by tender and contract? Is the minister not of the opinion that it would save the Government a great deal of trouble and the public
10 p.m. a great deal of expense if the policy was adopted of letting all that repair work by tender and contract instead of having it done by day labour?

Major-General MEWBURN: In some instances, owing to military exigencies, it is necessary to have work done in a hurry, and it might be quicker to have it done by day labour, and I am informed that in ordinary repairs more economy is shown by having the work done through the engineer services. I quite agree with my hon. friend that in the ordinary course work ought to be done by tender and contract.

Mr. VIEN: I am not aware of what goes on in other cities, but during an election campaign, for instance, on the day immediately preceding an election, I have seen an army of labourers working on repairs to the walls of the city of Quebec, and the very day after the election the repairs were stopped. If the minister looks into the matter, he will find out from the accounts of his department that my statement is correct.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall be very glad to look into the matter, but probably some of the work belongs to another department. Is my hon. friend referring to general work?

Mr. VIEN: I am referring to the work done on the fortifications of Quebec.

Major-General MEWBURN: I thought my hon. friend was referring to general work.

Mr. VIEN: No. I could make the same remark as regards the Marine and Fisheries Department or the Public Works Department, but I am now referring to the fortifications of Quebec. I do not object to the labouring classes of any city in Canada getting work during an election or at any other time, but it would be good policy to see that such work is not used as a political bribe.

Mr. JACOBS: I am rather surprised that this work should be done in Quebec during the election. I thought work of this kind was done only in doubtful constituencies.

Mr. VIEN: I see in the details of this item that ordinary repairs and works will amount this year to $269,000, as against $345,500 last year. Will the minister give us some explanation as to this item?

Major-General MEWBURN: These estimates are for ordinary repairs and works in Military District No. 1, $10,000; Military District No. 2, that is Toronto, $23,000; Military District No. 3, $12,000; Military District No. 4, $20,000; Military District No. 5, $40,000; Military District No. 6, $10,000; Military District No. 7, $5,000; Military District No. 10, $14,000; Military District No. 11, $6,000; Military District No. 12, $4,000, and Military District No. 13, $5,000. Those are the estimated requirements of the various districts. The amount has been cut down to what is estimated as the lowest possible minimum.

Mr. VIEN: I wanted to get from the minister the details of the items that come under that title.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have just given them.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. minister has given the expenditure in each district.

Major-General MEWBURN: No, the estimated expenditure that would be required.

Mr. VIEN: I would like to know what is meant by "ordinary repairs and works" What work, and what repairs?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am more familiar with military district No. 2, and I may say that we have repairs to armouries, Stanley barracks, and such as that. There are many armouries where local repairs are performed by engineers. Some of the main repairs, for instance putting on a new roof or anything like that, would be chargeable to Public Works, but the engineer service has the care of all the armouries throughout the various districts, and the expenditures has been much heavier particularly while the war is on. This year they can be reduced considerably. One or two armouries have been fitted up with bunks, and so on, which has been done by the engineer service.

Mr. VIEN: Would that include roads? For instance the road from Quebec to Valcartier camp?

Major-General MEWBURN: No. When we speak of roads, the only road I know of, off hand, is the road at the barracks at Kingston. I think there was work done around there.

Mr. VIEN: I think the same remarks I made a minute ago, as to the defences, apply to those repairs and works. Will the minister be prepared to say that no repairs or works involving an expenditure of more than $5,000 has been done by day work, and that such works have been carried on by tender and contract?

Major-General MEWBURN: My experience in the districts is that any expenditure over $5,000 has always been awarded by contract, we have always had three independent valuations.

Mr. VIEN: Will the whole item of $269,000 be expended?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not say it would all be expended. Where we have the engineers in the camps and sapper labour, a good deal of the work can be done much more expeditiously by them.

Mr. VIEN: The small works could be more expeditiously or properly carried out by day labour, but when it comes to any amount over $5,000, I think the House would like to have assurance from the minister that no expenditure will be authorized before tenders are called for.

Major-General MEWBURN: I can assure the hon. member, so far as my knowledge goes, that I think—I will not say positively, because I am not speaking with perfect certainty for the past—that in all cases of $5,000 or over contracts have been let. Where a contract has not been advertised, there have been at least three independent valuations, which have been submitted to headquarters, before being accepted, and the job has been done by day work as a rule. But while the war is on there have been many matters of an urgent nature which come under the engineer service. I know of many urgent cases, such as the fitting up of military hospitals. Take the case of the Exhibition Camp in Toronto; the work has been done by the engineers and sapper labour, and we simply bought the material. If we had let the work by contract, it would have cost more money, and would not have been done as rapidly.

Mr. VIEN: I suppose the repairs to public works at the Engineers' Camp at Lévis come under that item?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think so.

Mr. VIEN: Could the hon. minister tell me how much was expended last year on that camp?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have not that information before me.

Mr. VIEN: I will cite that case to my hon. friend. Almost every year several thousand dollars are spent at the Engineers Camp at Lévis. I do not complain of that, but I complain of the fact that it is always done by day work.

Major-General MEWBURN: The hon. gentleman thinks it had better be done by contract?

Mr. VIEN: Surely, and I think that is the policy to be adopted for every expenditure coming under the control of the department. We are at war, and are spending tremendous amounts of money lavishly for all sorts of things. I know for a fact that in various instances money has been badly spent, and works have been constructed that had to be torn down. I am quite sure that if a proper supervision of the expenditure had taken place hundreds of thousands of dollars could have been saved, and I think the Empire would be just as safe, and Canada would be better off. I submit to my hon. friend that in

future this policy should be carried out. Can the hon. gentleman tell me whether any of these expenses, amounting last year to over $345,000, covers any expenditure concerning the Ross rifle in Quebec?

Major-General MEWBURN: Not at all.

Mr. VIEN: Or repairs to or changes in the building?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. VIEN: I understand some expenditure was made in connection with the Ross rifle. Can the hon. gentleman tell me under what vote it comes, and if it is shown in the estimates.

Major-General MEWBURN: I know of nothing in the estimates except that we have an inspection branch in the building, the expense of which is charged to the appropriation, but nothing in these estimates.

Mr. VIEN: I know the Ross rifle in Quebec has been discarded to a certain extent, and they are now used at the barracks by the men. Under what head in the estimates come the expenditure incurred in connection therewith?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is a war appropriation estimate—nothing to do with this.

Mr. POWER: I understand that in connection with these engineering works the department is obliged at times to make certain purchases. I presume that they would have to purchase pickaxes, shovels, paint brushes and that kind of thing. Will the hon. minister express the laudable intention of some the other ministers, notably the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), and tell us whether or not in his department he intends to abolish the patronage list? I know that for many years in Quebec they had patronage lists, and when any purchases were to be made by the Militia Department certain men were asked for tenders. On looking over the Auditor General's Report this year, I am sorry to find the same principle seems to obtain. For instance, all the plumbing was done by one man, and almost all the painting by another man, and so on. I would like to suggest to the minister that he give a similar statement to that made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that in future all patronage whatsoever will be abolished.

Major-General MEWBURN: I will go a little further and say that when I took office as Minister of Militia on 12th October last, I did abolish all patronage, and I intend to follow out that policy as long as I have the honour to be in office. As far as I am aware those purchases were made through the War Purchasing Commission. And I may say, not only with regard to the purchases, but with regard to any other matter in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence, I certainly will hold up both hands for the abolition of patronage, and I intend to always carry out that policy.

Mr. POWER: I was referring to the small purchases made in the various districts. I understand these are made, as a rule, by the engineering officer in command of the district, or at his suggestion.

Major-General MEWBURN: That may have been some time ago, but not now.

Mr. VIEN: I am sure hon. members and the country will be glad to hear of the minister's declaration. When day labour is employed who selects the men? For instance, when repairs are made to the defences of the city of Quebec and the work is not done by contract, who employs the men? I know for a fact that everybody who applies cannot get work. There are foremen who have to abide by the list of the candidate or a friend of the Government.

Major-General MEWBURN: That is not the case now.

Mr. VIEN: Yes, absolutely. Only a few weeks ago day labourers in Quebec could not be taken on unless recommended by the ex-candidate or a friend of the Government. I am sure the minister is sincere in his wish to abolish patronage, and I mention this case to make more clear the necessity of doing work that involves a considerable expenditure by way of tender instead of by day labour. Who selects these day labourers?

Major-General MEWBURN: Work of that kind is left entirely to the engineer in charge. Surely we have to have confidence in our officers. If any patronage list is being used in my department it is news to me. I am heartily in agreement with my hon. friend as to the principle. As regards employing day labourers, the engineer in charge ought to be, and I think is, a responsible officer, not tied down by any patronage lists. I am not aware of any such lists and if my hon. friend will give me the details I shall be glad to have the matter investigated.

Mr. VIEN: Has the minister given instructions to his engineers in the different districts?

Major-General MEWBURN: There was a general instruction given out some time ago that there should be no patronage in the department at all.

Mr. POWER: When was that given out?

Major-General MEWBURN: It has been given out on several occasions, from the Militia Council and other places. I have never given any written order.

Mr. POWER: Was it given out before or after December 17?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think it was before the election in many cases. I determined when I took office I would have nothing to do with patronage.

Mr. POWER: Evidently the officers of the department in some parts of the country did not understand the intentions of the minister. I know a returned soldier who lost his job the day after the election for voting for me, and I only cite that as an instance of the lack of strict compliance with the instructions given by the minister.

Mr. VIEN: I hope the minister does not follow in the steps of his colleague (Mr. Reid), the Minister of Railways, who in a letter stated that Liberals and Conservatives who had supported Union Government would be equally provided for.

Major-General MEWBURN: There are no Liberals or Conservatives as far as I am concerned. The lowest tenderer gets the contract, no matter what his politics are.

Mr. VIEN: Did I understand the minister to say that no written instructions were given to his officers?

Major-General MEWBURN: I never gave any written order.

Mr. VIEN: Does not the minister think that a written instruction would make his intentions more clear to the local engineers?

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall be very glad to take that suggestion into consideration.

Mr. CANNON: I notice in the Auditor General's Report that a man by the name of Samson, of Levis, received $415 for removing snow from the road leading to forts in Levis. Was that work done by tender?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am informed that it was.

Mr. CANNON: I would suggest that the country might save money if this work was done by defaulters or fatigue parties.

Major-General MEWBURN: While they are in camp?

Mr. CANNON: Instead of placing the defaulters in a cell, why not make them work on the roads?

Mr. COPP: Every hon. member must appreciate the laudable determination of the Minister of Militia, but it is regrettable he does not implement it. Instead of simply making a declaration that he is opposed to patronage in his department he should go a step further and instruct his inspectors and engineers and those in charge of the different works of the department throughout the Dominion that all public works must be done without any patronage or pull. The minister, of course, is responsible for all work done under his department and he should see to it that the course he has determined on himself is pursued by his subordinates throughout the Dominion. I see that the first item of this vote refers to ordinary repairs and works. Has a very large amount of money been expended during the past year in repairs to different buildings throughout the Dominion? I have in mind particularly those buildings that are used temporarily as barracks for soldiers in training or waiting at different points in Canada for transport. Is that expenditure included under this item?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, that comes out of the $500,000,000 war appropriation.

Mr. FAFARD: How many of the engineers have graduated and how many have not graduated?

Major-General MEWBURN: I cannot say offhand, but all the officers of the Canadian Engineers are qualified—every one of them, and at least two-thirds of the rank and file are technical engineers.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Referring to the question of patronage, I think the minister should state that he intends to write to all his officers or overseas, to all those men who have been in the habit of following the system of patronage in their district or city, that this practice has to be discontinued. I am sure that the minister means well, that his intentions are good, but we on this side, knowing how these things are done, are sure that the patronage system will not be discontinued until the minister issues strict orders to his

officers that there must be no more of this system within their district. It is no use for the minister to tell us to-night that if he has the opportunity of meeting one of these officers he will inform him that the patronage system no longer exists in the department. That does not constitute a general order, and it would be more satisfactory to the House if formal instructions in accordance with the minister's well-meant intentions as expressed here to-night were issued by his department putting an end to the system complained of.

Major-General MEWBURN: I might say that I took occasion to have a conference in this city with all the officers commanding military districts in Canada, and with the members of the headquarters staff here, and I laid down the principles upon which I propose to carry on the Department of Militia and Defence. The patronage system was one of the strong points I took up at that time, and I made it clear that, as far as I was concerned, all patronage was abolished and I would not entertain the continuance of the system for a minute. There may have been some cases where the old system has been followed, but if so, I have no knowledge of it. I shall be very glad to take the advice of hon. gentlemen at any time for the betterment of the service.

Mr. VIEN: From the answers given in reply to several questions to-night, it is quite apparent there is confusion between what items come under the estimates and what items came under the war appropriations. I should like to know from the minister what class of items come under the one heading and what class come under the other. There must be a clearly defined line between them, and to enable us to thoroughly understand what is done I think this dividing line should be clearly explained.

Major-General MEWBURN: All expenses pertaining strictly to what is known as the Canadian Expeditionary Force—that is troops proceeding overseas, and all the work done in connection with them, for instance, the fitting up of barracks, which my hon. friend was speaking of a few minutes ago, and accommodation for troops, except in a few items where minor repairs are being done on the military buildings—are all charged to the war appropriation of $500,000,000.

Mr. VIEN: What about the permanent barracks?

Major-General MEWBURN: The repairs to permanent barracks, like Stanley barracks and other similar buildings are charged to Militia account here, but expenditures on temporary buildings—for instance, there have been a good many armouries erected all over Canada that were fitted up temporarily for the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the housing of troops where shower baths and other such conveniences have been installed, and special hutments constructed in camps—I understand these have all been charged to the war appropriation. Minor repairs to buildings are charged to the Militia Department, but large repairs, as I said before, are charged to the Public Works Department.

Mr. VIEN: Are there any expenditures charged to the war appropriation covering salaries for payments made to em ployees of the department?

Major-General MEWBURN: The salaries of temporary employees in connection with the war, that is all. There is one item, which I shall explain later on, in connection with the permanent force which is chargeable here. That is on a different basis.

Mr. BUTTS: There are one or two matters which I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia, in connection with naval affairs, not by way of criticism, but in order to afford the minister a little information. We all remember with a very considerable degree of regret the disaster which occurred in Halifax in December last. Naturally, that disaster occasioned a lot of talk, as would naturally be expected, and some things were revealed with respect to Sydney harbour that, perhaps, would not have come out had it not been for that disaster. Doubtless it is just as well that the minister should know this. Some short time after the Halifax disaster I was travelling on a train with a naval officer who spoke so familiarly with me, addressing me by name, that I did not care to ask what his name was. He told me that if the people round Sydney harbour had known of conditions as they existed during the past summer they might have felt very uneasy. Hon. gentlemen know those fellows that come around wearing brass buttons and that play tennis and attend five o'clock teas. They are not the men to look after a harbour, because in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you cannot import men from across the ocean to look after conditions on this side of the Atlantic. Those " haw-haw " fellows, those " Geordies," as they call them down in our country, those " gaiters," to use an-

other term, do not know anything about our conditions down there. Such men, for instance, as this man Pascoe, who has been down in Sydney for some time has no more right to be in charge of Sydney harbour than I have to be in charge of the Allied forces over in Flanders.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am very sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member, but I fear that his remarks apply more particularly to the Naval Department. If he will bring this matter up when the naval estimates are under consideration it may prove very interesting to the members of the House.

Mr. BUTTS: It is purely a marine matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not now considering the marine estimates, we are dealing with the estimates of the Militia and Defence Department.

Mr. BUTTS: These are Militia estimates?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BUTTS: What I have to say relates to the naval service and to defence.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that the subject introduced by the hon. member is not in order. I certainly will not take back the ruling, but the hon. gentleman has the right to appeal to the House if he does not wish to submit to it.

Mr. BUTTS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking now of militia and defence.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we will hear what the hon. gentleman has to say about militia and defence.

Mr. BUTTS: Yes, and I was going to speak of defence particularly, and I think it would be well that my hon. friends the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Marine—for I have no doubt that they have some interest in defence—should know some of the facts that I have here before me; and it is purely a matter of defence that I wish to speak on. As you, no doubt, know, Mr. Chairman, from Sydney harbour—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. Harbours have nothing to do with the Department of Militia and Defence. I have already given my ruling. I hope that the hon. member will respect the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. COPP: I understand that the whole item covering the $430,000 is being considered?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. COPP: There are one or two items in the $430,000 that I want to refer to. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia in regard to the Connaught rifle range—when this work was undertaken, in what condition it is now in, and the amount that has been expended so far, and how much will be required to complete the range?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand there was nothing paid on the Connaught rifle range in connection with its completion during the year 1917. I am informed that the $40,000 voted last year was not spent at all, and that a similar amount was put in this year in case it might be needed, but the department is not sure that it will be.

Mr. COPP: Has the range been completed?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, it has not.

Mr. COPP: How much land was purchased for this range, what was paid for it, and how much work has been done up to the present time on the range?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am afraid I shall have to ask my hon. friend to move for a return; I have not the details here to-night.

Mr. COPP: Possibly the minister will allow the item to stand, and bring the information down when his estimates are again before the committee.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall be glad to bring it down if you want to hold this item up.

Mr. COPP: I would like to get this information, Mr. Chairman. It is important, it seems to me, to have the information.

Major-General MEWBURN: Will it be satisfactory if my hon. friend discussed this matter under the war appropriation, when I would bring the information down?

Mr. COPP: I would as soon have the item stand. I may want to discuss it.

Major-General MEWBURN: Will the hon. member discuss it on the war appropriation? I understand some money was paid out of that appropriation in connection with this range.

Mr. COPP: I would like to have the opportunity of discussing it.

Major-General MEWBURN: I think some items in connection with it may come up in connection with the war appropriation.

Grants to Associations and Bands—For grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations, military bands and military institutes, $25,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Would the minister explain how this amount is divided among the various associations?

Major-General MEWBURN: This vote has provided for grants for maintenance of civilian rifle associations and for efficient bands of the active militia, and also for military associations of the different arms of the active militia, and for grants to Dominion and provincial rifle associations. The civilian rifle associations have been practically all disbanded temporarily, so that no payments will be made to them. Bands of the active militia have also been very much reduced in number, few grants having been made during the past eighteen months. For the same reason, grants to associations, such as the Dominion Artillery Association, Dominion Cavalry Association, etc., have been discontinued. Grants have been made during the past two years to provincial rifle associations, such as the Ontario Rifle Association, when the organization has been kept up. These also have been much reduced. The above estimate is based on the actual expenditure for the past two years, having been reduced from $50,000 to $25,000, which is the amount that may be needed.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood the minister to say that it might be possible to reorganize the rifle asociations during the current year.

Major-General MEWBURN: I hope so.

Mr. PEDLOW: If that is so, I would like to get busy on it.

Major-General MEWBURN: We would be glad to have the hon. member help it along.

Mr. CANNON: We have in the city of Quebec a most excellent military band attached to the R.C.G.A. Last year the band remained in the city during the summer months, so that public concerts could be given on the Terrace. But in former years, for some unknown reason, this band was withdrawn from the city at the very season when the concerts were usually given. I would call the attention of the minister to this fact and ask him if it is possible to see that these band concerts are kept up. The soldiers, I understand, are compensated to a certain extent by the city authorities. On account of the peculiar situation in Quebec city with the great number of tourists, soldiers and sailors there in the summer, I think it would be a good thing if the Militia Department arranged that the band shall remain in Quebec this summer.

Major-General MEWBURN: Was it not taken to Petawawa last summer?

Mr. CANNON: No, not last summer.

Major-General MEWBURN: I can quite appreciate the feeling of the hon. gentleman. I was under the impression, on account of all the artillery having been concentrated at Petawawa, that the band had gone there last year.

Mr. CANNON: It was there the year before.

Headquarters, Divisional and District staffs—For pay and allowances of the staff at Headquarters, and in the Divisions and Districts, $225,000.

Mr. POWER: There has been a good deal of criticism throughout the country with regard to the headquarters staffs. Ever since the war broke out members of headquarters staffs in the various military districts have paraded, particularly on Sunday, in staff cars. One of the greatest grounds for criticism, however, and the one of which we have heard the most, is that a large number of the men on these various staffs have not gone to the front—indeed have never set foot outside of the country so far as military service is concerned—while returned men who are quite capable of filling these positions are not called upon and are given no encouragement whatever to undertake such work. I quite understand that staff work is of a peculiar character, but it seems to me that it should not require more than five or six months' training to equip a man for looking after the staff work of an ordinary military district. Such training could easily be given to some of the returned men who have earned the right to wear the red tabs and gold buttons of which the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Butte) spoke.

Major-General MEWBURN: He was referring to the naval service.

Mr. POWER: They are prevalent also in the military service. What is the policy of the minister with regard to these staffs?

Major-General MEWBURN: My hon. friend, who is one of the fortunate ones who got over the top and got back again, must know that a large number of officers were retained in Canada against their will, by superior authority, on the assurance that they should be enabled to proceed overseas. These officers, who have been prevented

from going overseas through no fault of their own have done dog's work in organizing, training and sending reinforcements overseas. It has been no nice, comfortable, pussy-footing job, as some people think. I do not say that that applies to all staff officers, but it does apply to the large proportion of them. The magnificent work done by members of headquarters staffs is shown by the results attained by the units which have gone overseas. These officers, as I said the other day, are entitled to consideration; it is their misfortune, not their fault, that they have not gone overseas. I have laid down the policy, and I am endeavouring to carry it into effect as rapidly as possible, that returned officers, non-commissioned officers and men of other ranks, having regard to efficiency, shall in every instance get the preference. Of the officers appointed on the depot battalions which are being raised in each military district to handle the men under the Military Service Act, over seventy-five per cent are returned officers, who have seen service overseas. Appointments of other than returned officers throughout Canada are being made only temporarily, with the distinct understanding that when a returned officer is available, the temporary incumbent must relinquish his position. With regard to the district staffs, there has been a good deal of replacement in some of the districts—not in all,—but I hope in due course there will be a large preponderance of officers who have seen service. I am out for efficiency—I think that members of the Committee will back me up in this—and simply because I have an efficient technical officer who was not fortunate enough to get overseas—in many cases they have been medically unfit,—I do not think any one would suggest that I should kick him out and put a returned soldier in his place. I am however, trying to carry out the policy which I have laid down, having due regard to fairness and justice to all concerned.

Mr. VIEN: Of those specially employed on headquarters staff at Ottawa during the war, how many are officers of the militia and how many civilians?

Major General MEWBURN: There are no civilians except those temporarily employed, such as stenographers and so on. Clerks do not come under this item.

Mr. VIEN: How many of the headquarters staff officers are regularly employed and how many specially employed during the war?

Major General MEWBURN: I understand that some eighty-two are permanently employed on headquarters staff and in the various military districts.

Mr. VIEN: How many on headquarters staff at Ottawa?

Major-General MEWBURN: Thirty-two.

Mr. VIEN: How many are specially employed through pressure of work on account of the war?

Major-General MEWBURN: Between seventy-five and one hundred, I understand; I have not the exact figures here.

Mr. VIEN: These are temporary employees?

Major-General MEWBURN Yes.

Mr. VIEN: How many clerks, stenographers, and under-employees?

Major-General MEWBURN: Some 3,200.

Mr. VIEN: These are attached to the headquarters staff?

Major-General MEWBURN: In the different branches of the headquarters of the department at Ottawa—Assigned Pay and Separation Allowance, Records, Estates, Pay, and so on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Sometime ago it was decided that no officer should be appointed permanently to any of the staffs or permanent corps. Has that order been carried out?

Major-General MEWBURN: No permanent appointments have been made since I came into office.

Mr. VIEN: Of the 3,200 employees mentioned a moment ago by the minister, how many are male and how many female? I want to know if among those 3,200 employees there are many who come under the provisions of the Military Service Act, and who should report for duty.

Major-General MEWBURN: After the Military Service Act came into force, every employee within the ages of those liable to be called out, had to report for service and undergo medical examination. I understand that in the whole department seven exemptions were allowed, and those were only temporary exemptions, and there will not be a single employee of military age who will not enlist.

Mr. CANNON: Were any officers of military age exempted in the city of Quebec?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not know that any officers in Quebec were liable to service as privates.

Mr. CANNON: I could name a few.

Major-General MEWBURN: Who are liable? Who ought to go?

Mr. CANNON: Who will be liable to serve under the Military Service Act if they do not take advantage of the clause exempting them from military service as being militia officers. Has there been a change in the military command of District No. 5?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes. General Fages was temporarily holding the command while General Landry was overseas. General Landry, on his return, has resumed command of the district.

Mr. CANNON: Is General Fages still on the force?

Major-General MEWBURN: He has been retired on pension.

Mr. CANNON: Full pension?

Major-General MEWBURN: Having completed thirty-five years' service, he is entitled to his full pension.

Mr. CANNON: Has he been retired and is he receiving his pension now?

Major-General MEWBURN: General Fages has had thirty-five years' service. He was given leave of absence until the first of July when he will go on full pension.

Mr. CANNON: Did he ask for leave of absence or was he given it?

Major-General MEWBURN: There was no place to put him, and in view of his long and faithful service, he was considered entitled to leave of absence.

Mr. POWER: I wish to thank the Minister of Militia for the statement he made of his policy, but at the same time, I should like to ask him if it would not be possible to have some means of enforcing it. At the present time, we have, on various staffs, certain men. I presume, as soon as they see an officer who has returned from the front, they will not forthwith resign their position and say: "Here, Bill, take my job." Would the Minister of Militia make some arrangement whereby the returned officer would have the advantage, if not of being offered the position, at least of being made aware of the fact that his particular qualifications would be taken into consideration if he applied for a position at the time being held by some one who had not yet been overseas? While I quite appreciate the great services rendered to the country and to the Empire by those who remained here to train the troops, there is undoubtedly, in the country and in this House, a feeling that those who went overseas to continue their training in the trenches are probably more entitled to consideration than those who remained behind. For those reasons I would ask the minister to be more specific in his declaration of policy.

11 p.m.

Mr. CURRIE: Hon members from Quebec perhaps have a certain hesitancy in asking this question. Is it true that the son of the Premier of Quebec has been in khaki since the beginning of the war and has not gone to the front? Is he on the Quebec staff, and, if so, how long has he been on that staff and why has he not gone to the war?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am informed that he is in one of the infantry regiments in the city of Quebec, that he has not yet gone, but that he is going soon with the next draft.

Mr. CURRIE: How long has he been in khaki?

Mr. LEMIEUX: A year last January.

Mr. CURRIE: Are the sons of the late officer commanding in Quebec, General Fages, in khaki, and, if so, how long have they been in khaki without going overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: I believe he has a son who has been in khaki for some time and who has not gone overseas.

Mr. CURRIE: Who is he?

Major-General MEWBURN: General Fages.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In case my hon. friend would insinuate that the son of the Premier of Quebec was not in earnest, I might say, for his information and for the information of the committee, that he joined the forces with my own son a year ago last January.

Sir SAM HUGHES: More than that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He had an accident whilst on service in Quebec and he was operated on in New York. I came back with him from New York a few months ago, and I know he is ready and willing to go, and he will go soon.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I might say, in justice to this young lad, who is only a boy, that he was very keen. I know while I was minister, he was here trying to get his

training, but owing to his youth and other circumstances he was not allowed to enlist.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He had not finished his studies in the college at Quebec.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He was just a boy.

Mr. CURRIE: The reason I ask this question is simply this, that I have received a large number of letters from the city of Quebec in regard to the riot there, and all my correspondents, some of whom were anonymous and others not, laid at the bottom of the trouble in Quebec the fact that the military staff there was packed full of young aristocrats who had gone into khaki and had been holding down "cushy" jobs since the war began, and my correspondents could not see why they should be drafted while the "higher-up" officers did not go. I am glad of and accept the excuse given by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) for Lt. Gouin.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not an excuse, it is the plain fact.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was my endeavour while I was Minister of Militia to get a number of these sons of what might be called well known families to enlist. I never found a particle of hesitation on the part of one of them. The son of Premier Gouin is a mere boy. When he first tried to enlist he was so young that he could not be taken.

Mr. CURRIE: What about Armand Lavergne? He was one of the leaders.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Everybody knows I have a very high opinion of Mr. Armand Lavergne in many ways, and I am not going to turn from it here. So far as my association with him is concerned, it is this: He has always, from his point of view, taken the constitutional aspect of the case. He took the ground in the nationalist campaign that, until Quebec had a voice and vote and say in the declaration of war and the making of peace, they could not, constitutionally, be sent overseas or volunteer to fight. Armand Lavergne has since that time repeatedly asked me, while I was Minister of Militia, to put him on, or order out the militia, for home service, so as to get over the difficulty of his breaking his faith with his fellow countrymen, and, once he was in uniform, to send him overseas. I pointed out that I could not do that under the law. I could order him out for home service, but I had no authority, until the present Act was passed, to send him overseas, and I pointblank refused to do so. I pointed out that he would have to volunteer of his own accord. He was anxious to go overseas. I am not prejudiced against Armand Lavergne. If what people say he has said is true, he should be treated in a different manner.

I have never yet heard, or never found any evidence—and I tried to get it—that he said anything except what might be called shooting off sometimes, when he got excited, and said things that were not absolutely constitutional. I have reason to believe that the young fellow, if he got an opportunity to-day, would go to the front and fight. I have a high opinion of him. I think he deserves credit, rather than condemnation, for his conduct in Quebec.

Mr. CURRIE: Is there a gentleman named Paquette and a Captain Durocher, who are on the staff in Quebec, who refused to go overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: I could not answer offhand.

Mr. POWER: Aimé Durocher, of whom we heard considerable last week, I understand did very great service for the Government during the recent riots—at least reports from him were read to us, and we were told he was a very good character.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There was a Duroche over to the front.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is there yet.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Do not confuse the men.

Permanent Force, $2,575,000.

Mr. CURRIE: Might I ask the hon. minister if the same policy is being pursued with reference to the members of the permanent force fighting in France, with respect to salaries, as has been adopted with respect to the men in the other departments? That is to say, a man belonging to the permanent force in France is paid according to permanent force scale. He is given certain allowances.

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: I understand an Order in Council is about to be passed that will make every man at the front dependent entirely on his military pay, without any additional pay from the Crown. Does that apply to the officers on the permanent force?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is the Civil Service.

Mr. CURRIE: They all belong to the Civil Service.

Major-General MEWBURN: It does not include the members of the permanent force.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I did not catch what the hon. member said. I saw in the paper the other day that an Order in Council had been passed the effect of which would deprive those members of the Civil Service who had joined the force in 1914 in the First Contingent, of certain pay. I have in mind the case of my own secretary, Major Verret, the Assistant Deputy Postmaster. He joined the force in 1914 and went abroad. I am speaking of civil servants who joined the force in 1914 on the understanding that they would get their salaries as civil servants, and their military pay.

Sir SAM HUGHES: With a guarantee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: An Order in Council was passed to that effect at the time. Major Verret was decorated by His Majesty the King on the field of battle. He received his pay as colonel. If I mistake not an Order in Council was passed a few days ago denying him this double pay. Is that a fact?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think there were several scales of pay. I am not quite positive. I think the men of the Civil Service—and this had nothing to do with the question brought up by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie)—who went overseas with the First Contingent in 1914 were to draw both military and civil pay, and I understand that there was a subsequent arrangement when men went over, I think in 1915 who got either their civil or military pay, whichever was the greater. I understand, if an employee in the Civil Service, is drawing so much in the service, and his military pay is less, he gets the higher pay of the two, but not double pay. I understand the large bulk of the men who went over in the First Contingent returned. They get the greater pay now. If the military pay is less than the civil pay, the difference is made up to them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was just going to raise the point mentioned by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). Remember, when a man joined the service there was no condition whatever arranged. The Government and the various departments arranged the matter of their own free will, and an Order in Council was passed providing that these men should get certain pay. I must say it is rather strange to drop off now the few that are left, especially when we see the separation allowance granted to the wives and families of officers who have never seen France, who stayed in Canada. Some of these men could not be induced to go to France, and others were anxious to go, but I understand the separation allowance is now paid to the wives and families of men in Canada who have never seen the ocean.

Major-General MEWBURN: These men in France all get separation allowance.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not speaking of that. I am speaking of the waste of money. If it is a question of saving money on the one hand by cutting off the pay of the civil servant, or spending it on separation allowance to those in Canada on the other hand, I do not see why we should save money in that way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not say that I approve of the first Order in Council, giving the salary plus the pay.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never did.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But as a matter of fact an Order in Council was passed, and the men left with that vested right, that they would draw their salary and get their pay. I have just mentioned the case of Col. Verret. I have another case in mind, a namesake of mine in Montreal. After having raised two companies, he left with the first contingent on the understanding that he would get his salary, as he was in the Post Office Department, Outside Service. He went to Europe and was made a captain. He married a Canadian nurse over there, and is there yet. He has been there four years with that understanding—that vested right. Is it right that the Government should now pass another Order in Council, and say to that man: "While it is true you left on that understanding, we have now changed our minds, and you will get only your single pay." I do not say from the beginning I would have given the double pay, but, as the Government had done it, it does not seem right to withdraw it.

Mr. CURRIE: This discussion might perhaps more properly come under some other item, but I just wish to make this observation. Eatons, of Toronto, and other firms are still paying the wages of their men who went with the first contingent. While they are still carrying out faithfully the obligations they then undertook, the Government turns round and says to these men of the first contingent, "We volunteered to give you your pay but we are now too hard up." There are not many of them, and it looks to me very much as if the Gov-

ernment was not desirous of carrying out the pledge given to these men. I think this matter should be reconsidered, because I do not think the public will think anything more of the Government for going back on their pledge than if they had still continued to pay these men as they promised. The men of the first contingent are saying, "Oh, it is only in line with everything the Government does; it hits the men of the first contingent." The men of the first contingent did not ask for anything when they enlisted, but the Government voluntarily undertook to give them this pay, and I think the Government should keep its pledge to these men until the end of the war.

Mr. P. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I am very much surprised to learn that such a state of affairs exists. If there is anything this Government cannot afford to do, it is to break their pledge to the valiant men who are fighting for them. If it is a case of saving money, I think it would not be hard to find many places where you could pare off the small amount of money that would be saved by breaking faith with these men. I think it is an absolute—I was going to say, disgrace—that the Government after giving a pledge to these men who went over there voluntarily to fight for this country, should now go back on its pledge after the men have gone "over there."

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think there are many of them, but what the hon. gentleman says certainly has my sympathy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are quite a number of them "over there" yet, and it seems to me that the minister should delay final action on the question until it has been reconsidered.

Major-General MEWBURN: Perhaps this might better be discussed by the Premier under the War Appropriation vote. I certainly think the proposal should be reconsidered.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not only Eatons who are continuing to pay their employees, but many of the banks as well. If you go into the Bank of Montreal to-day the clerks are all girls, and the young men who have left the bank to go to the front are still being paid a large portion of their salary. If private institutions can do that, surely the Government, which has given its pledge to these men, should not go back on them.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the present Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) receiving his salary as a Cabinet Minister and at the same time drawing his salary as a colonel in the overseas forces?

Major-General MEWBURN: I am informed on very reliable authority that he has not drawn any military pay.

Mr. JACOBS: He is relying on his salary as Postmaster General?

Major-General MEWBURN: I could not say as to that.

Mr. POWER: In the permanent force of Canada there were a large number of n.c.o's who went overseas at the outbreak of the war and through good conduct on the field have won promotion. What is the policy of the department with regard to these men when they return? It would be extremely difficult for a man who was a corporal in the permanent force before the war, and has since become a major or colonel in the C.E.F., to return to his position as corporal, and I think it would be well to set the minds of these men at ease by a statement from the minister.

Major-General MEWBURN: No policy has been determined on yet. I do not know myself what is going to be done, but it is a problem that is confronting us and has got to be given very early consideration. There may have to be a complete reorganization; in fact, I fancy there will have to be a reorganization of all the forces. To-day we have the Canadian expeditionary forces, the overseas military forces, the permanent force, and the active militia, and at the present moment it is doubtful what the status of a good many of these men is. I have given the matter a good deal of consideration, and I am thinking of appointing a committee of different officers who are now out of the service, and who have a thorough knowledge of the old militia, to go into the whole question. I hope that some of the old militia units in Canada with a history behind them will not be obliterated. No definite policy has been worked out, because other more pressing matters are engaging my attention at the moment. No harm will be done to these chaps, however.

Mr. VIEN: Are the members of the Permanent Force who are now with the Canadian Expeditionary Force still being paid by the Permanent Force?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is one of the items I referred to. The men in the government corps are being paid out of what is known as the permanent corps vote, except the field allowance and the difference-

in-rank pay, which they get from the overseas paymaster.

Mr. VIEN: They just get the difference from him?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Salaries and wages, $260,000.

Mr. VIEN: What comes under this item?

Major-General MEWBURN: This vote is to provide for the salaries of caretakers of armouries, clerks, charwomen and messengers. Additional help of this kind employed since the war has been paid out of the war appropriation vote. The increase of $10,000 is accounted for by an increase in wages to some of the caretakers. I can give my hon friend the details if he desires them.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item be carried?

Mr. VIEN: No, Mr. Chairman do not let us be in too big a hurry.

The CHAIRMAN: No one is in a hurry, but if no honourable member rises, the Chairman must declare that the item is carried.

Mr. VIEN: I will ask the Chairman to be a bit more patient and to give us time to consider the items that come up for our consideration. I would like the minister to state whether any of these items have reference to the Ross rifle?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. VIEN: Under what item of the estimates does the Ross rifle come?

Major-General MEWBURN: Under the war appropriation.

Mr. CANNON: Is Mr. McBain still the caretaker of the camp at Valcartier?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is an old and familiar name.

Major-General MEWBURN: Is it Colonel McBain or Major McBain to whom the hon. gentleman refers?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know who the caretaker of Valcartier Camp is, but McBain is a very honoured name. It is enjoyed by the descendants of Major McBain who fought at the capture of Quebec and settled at Valcartier. Ever since that time the name has been an honoured one in the locality. I do not know the caretaker of Valcartier camp, or whether the office is filled by a McBain, but if it is the gentleman comes of a good family. Let me tell the committee that Colonel William McBain is a gentleman who has done yeoman service for this country since the war broke out. He has saved the department hundreds and thousands of dollars, and Canada, and the city of Quebec in particular, owes him a deep debt of gratitude.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: Speaking of Valcartier camp, did not this Mr. McBain make the expropriations of land there?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is not the same man.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have the expropriation cases all been settled?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand that all but three or four cases have been settled.

Mr. CANNON: How much does Colonel McBain receive?

Major-General MEWBURN: The officer in question is not Colonel McBain, but Captain A. E. McBain, and as camp superintendent he receives a salary of $1,320.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member (Mr. Cannon) asks what Colonel McBain receives. He does not receive anything.

Major-General MEWBURN: I beg the ex-minister's pardon. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cannon) to say the superintendent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let us be accurate about it, he said Colonel McBain.

Major-General MEWBURN: At any rate Captain A. E. McBain, superintendent of Valcartier camp, receives $1,320 a year salary. That is not one and the same person as the other McBain.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Now you have got it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He belongs to the same family.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He belongs to the province of Quebec, and to a prolific family.

Transport and freight—Transport of staff, $20,000; transport of permanent force, $15,000.

Mr. POWER: Transport of the staff is estimated to cost $20,000, whilst transport of the active militia is estimated at $15,000. The staff cost $20,000 for transportation and the troops only $15,000. These items appear to be funny, because surely there are more troops than staff to be transported?

Mr. VIEN: I understand that every time a staff officer travels he receives a requisition for transportation on the railway. Is that paid for in the item under consideration?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is all charged back to the department and has to be paid for out of this vote.

Mr. VIEN: Is payment made to the Government railways for the transportation of officers?

Major-General MEWBURN: To all railways.

Training Areas—Purchase of land for training areas in the various districts, $50,000.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister tell us what lands he intends to purchase for training areas?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is about $10,000 still to be paid on account of Valcartier camp. There are three or four small parcels of land to be purchased in Nova Scotia for defence purposes, probably costing between two and three thousand dollars. There are, therefore, at the present moment some $15,000 needed to meet existing engagements on account of land purchases, and a vote of $50,000 will leave $35,000 for any additional purchases that may be required during the year. It is possible that the negotiations for the purchase of the outstanding properties at Valcartier camp will be completed this year, and the payments consequently met from current appropriation. Nearly all these cases, however, are before the Exchequer Court and it is quite possible that court may not render its decisions before the expiration of the fiscal year, and therefore the Department of Justice advise that provision had better be made in next year's estimates for the payment of the compensation due.

Mr. VIEN: Can the minister give some details as to the expenditure of the $200,000 voted last year?

Major-General MEWBURN: That all appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CANNON: According to the Auditor General's Report, much to my surprise, I see that Mr. Armand Lavergne has received a certain amount for legal services. Is he retained by the Militia Department?

Major-General MEWBURN: He may have been employed by one of the people whose land was taken, and judgment was given and probably this relates to his costs. I have no knowledge of his being employed by the Militia Department or any other department.

Mr. COPP: He is evidently on the patronage list.

Mr. CURRIE: Are there any payments for camp Borden in this vote?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, that comes under the war appropriation.

Mr. CURRIE: One of the members for Toronto wished to know if the Borden camp matter was likely to come up, as he desired to make some observations with respect to it.

Major-General MEWBURN: It will come up under the war appropriation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let us adjourn now, we have done a good day's work.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. J. D. REID the House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.

Thursday, April 18, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 58, respecting certain patents of The Dynamic Balancing Machine Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 59, to incorporate the Gospel Workers Church in Canada.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis.

Bill No. 61, respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General) moved:

That the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 25, respecting bankruptcy, be granted power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 62, to amend the Insurance Act, 1917.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of this Bill is threefold. The Insurance Act now provides that British and foreign companies shall maintain a deposit with the Department of Finance at least equal to their total liabilities in Canada. The pur-

pose of this Bill is to require that the deposit shall not only equal the amount of their liabilities in Canada, but shall be in excess of their liabilities to the extent of 25 per cent. The second amendment proposed is to increase the initial deposit required of British and foreign companies prior to the commencement of their insurance business in Canada. The amount required to-day is $50,000, and it is proposed to raise that to $100,000. The third amendment proposed is to section 125 of the Insurance Act, which requires Canadian companies to maintain assets at least 15 per cent in excess of their total liabilities. The Bill proposes to raise the amount of this percentage to 25 per cent.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 63, to amend the Fisheries Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This Bill is introduced for two specific reasons. The first provision refers to the British Columbia salmon fisheries. Heretofore it has been the custom to have the packages or cases labelled to show that the salmon was caught legally, or that the salmon was caught during the open season and not during the closed season. The department has found that this provision of the law has not worked out as satisfactorily as was hoped, and the object of the Bill is to abolish clauses 22, 23, 25, 65 and 66, as a result of which no one will be allowed to catch fish outside of the areas that are closed during the closed season unless he has a license, or unless the boat is licensed. The Indians have a habit, during the closed fishing season, of catching a considerable number of salmon. While they are allowed legally to catch salmon for their own use, they are forbidden to catch salmon and offer them for sale either to the canners or the dealers. The object is to prevent any one offering salmon during the close season to any canner or dealer, unless either the boat or the man is licensed.

During the close season in Canadian waters it has been the practice of some of the Canadian lobster fishermen, and also of some of the American lobster fishermen, to catch lobsters outside of the territorial waters. It is proposed by this legislation, concurrent legislation being passed by the United States Congress, to prevent the Canadian and American fishermen from catching lobsters during the close season outside of the territorial waters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

MR. R. A. PRINGLE, K.C.

Mr. EULER:

1. On what Government Commissions has R. A. Pringle, K.C., officiated since October 1, 1911, and how much did he draw from each?
2. Is he still connected with the Price of Paper Investigation? If so, how much has he drawn from this?
3. What is the total amount drawn by said Mr. Pringle out of the public exchequer since October 1, 1911?
4. Does the Government contribute in any way to the rent of the offices at present occupied by the firm of Pringle & Co. in a building on Wellington St., Ottawa? If so, how much?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The question is answered by a return which was tabled to-day.

ST. NICHOLAS STONE QUARRY.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the St. Nicholas quarry, which was purchased by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, been worked since 1st May, 1915?
2. If so, what quantity of stone has been taken from said quarry?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No.
2. No stone was taken out during this period.

DREDGES AND STEAMERS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What are the names of the steamers and dredges which were owned by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec on the 1st November, 1916?
2. Have said Commissioners sold any of these steamers and dredges?
3. If so, to whom and at what price?
4. Did said Commissioners sell direct to the purchasers or was an agent employed to negotiate the sale of the steamers and dredges sold?
5. Have the Commissioners purchased other steamers and dredges since the 1st November, 1916?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Grain boat No. 1, Dredge No. 1, Dredge No. 2, tug "Aviso Courcelette," tug Diver, Clam Shell Dredge No. 6, launch Gossom.
2. Yes.
3. Grain boat No. 1 sold to St. Lawrence Navigation Corporation for $100,000. Dredge No. 1 sold to Compagnie Générale D'Entreprises Publiques for $185,000.
4. Both sold direct to purchasers.
5. No.

PURCHASE OF REMOUNTS IN CANADA.

Mr. ROSS:

1, What amount of money was spent in Canada on purchasing remounts by the Militia Department during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

2. What amount was spent in purchasing remounts elsewhere, and where were they purchased?

3 What is the expense attendant thereon in each case, and on what basis was the expense incurred, by commission, or so much per animal allowed to buyer? Or how, if otherwise?

4. Who were authorized to purchase in Canada, and who outside of Canada?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. $261,042.73.

2. Nil.

3. For horses purchased in Canada, a buyer and veterinary surgeon were employed, for which they received $10 per diem for their services, for the period May 4, 1916, to September 23, 1916.

4. Mr. R. Graham and Veterinary Surgeon S. C. Tambin, under the supervision of Col. Sir Adam Beck, Remount Commissioner, purchased in Canada.

MR. J. P. JAFFRAY.

Mr. JACOBS:

1. What are the duties of J. P. Jaffray, who is in the employ of the Canadian Trade and Commerce Department, of Philadelphia?

2. What salary does he receive?

3. What are his annual expenses?

4. Since his appointment what results, if any, have come from his efforts in the position he occupies?

5. Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce aware that Mr. Jaffray, since his appointment, contributes to newspapers, articles of a violent partisan nature?

6. Is the Minister aware of the opinion that results justify the retention of this gentleman in office?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Mr. J. P. Jaffray is Canadian Government agent and immigration inspector at the port of Philadelphia, and is employed by the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

2. $2,000.

3. $1,474.75 for the fiscal year 1916-17. This sum includes rent of office and travelling expenses.

4. It is impossible to tabulate the results of Mr. Jaffray's work. He is engaged in general publicity work, with the object of encouraging settlement in Canada. The department has reason to believe that Mr. Jaffray has been successful along this line. Prior to the cessation of European travel, Mr. Jaffray inspected a considerable number of immigrants and passengers arriving at the port of Philadelphia, destined to Canadian points. Mr. Jaffray's office is looked upon in Philadelphia as a general information office on all matters relating to Canada, and his services have been utilized to a considerable extent by The British-Canadian Recruiting Mission.

5. The Department of Immigration and Colonization is not aware that Mr. Jaffray has, since his appointment, contributed to newspapers, articles of a partisan nature. On July 31, 1917, the Hon. Mr. Proulx made a similar inquiry in the House. Mr. Jaffray was asked at that time for information and he denied, under date of August 6, 1917, having written or contributed any articles of a political nature since his appointment to a position in the Civil Service of Canada.

6. Yes.

SHIPMENTS OF BREEDING ANIMALS IN QUEBEC.

*Mr. TOBIN:

With reference to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1917, volume 1, page A-72, A. J. Lyster, Kirkdale, Quebec, freight charges on stallions, $43.45.

1. From what point were the said stallions shipped?

2. How many stallions were so shipped?

3. To whom were they consigned and for what purpose?

4. Were the said stallions used for work in lumber camps?

5. If so, was this done with the consent of the Government?

6. Where are the said stallions at the present time?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Three were shipped from Richmond, one from Ste. Henedine and one from Point Levis.

2. Five.

3. The first was sent to the Association Ste. Genevieve de Batiscan. The second was sent to the Association at Ste. Marguerite. The third was sent to the Association at St. Georges. The fourth was removed from Association Ste. Marguerite, shipped from Ste. Henedine station to Richmond. (C. N. Lyster's.) The fifth removed from Association Neuville, taken to Richmond (C. N. Lyster's). These stallions were loaned to the associations for breeding purposes.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. The stallion shipped to Ste. Genevieve de Batiscan is still there. The stallion removed from Ste. Marguerite is now in the province of Alberta. The horse shipped to St. Georges is now at C. N. Lyster's. The horse shipped from Ste. Henedine (Ste. Marguerite Association), has been sold.

The horse shipped from Point Levis to Richmond has been sold.

*Mr. TOBIN:

In reference to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1917, volume 1, page A-72, C. N. Lyster, Kirkdale, Quebec, care of bulls and stallions, $1,947.08, freight, $104.10.

1. To whom was the sum of $1,947.08 paid?
2. From what point were the said bulls and stallions shipped?
3. How many bulls and stallions were so shipped?
4. To whom were they consigned and for what purpose?
5. Were the said stallions used for work in lumber camps?
6. If so, was this done with the consent of the Government?
7. Where are the said bulls and stallions at the present time?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. C. N. Lyster.

2. One bull from Ste. Christine de Bagot; one bull from Disraeli; one bull from Compton; two bulls from Coaticook; nine bulls from Point Levis; one stallion from La Prairie; one stallion from Matane; one stallion from Robertson station; two stallions from Point Levis.

3. Fourteen bulls and five stallions.

4. All with the exception of five bulls were consigned to C. N. Lyster to be cared for and conditioned. These five bulls were included in a car of eight shipped from Levis consigned to C. N. Lyster at Richmond for resorting. These five were left in the car and shipped on from Richmond to the Point St. Charles stock yards, Montreal, and sold for beef.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Four bulls are in the hands of associations in the province of Quebec. One is at a feeding station at Ulverton. One is dead. Eight have been sold. Three stallions were sent to the province of Alberta in 1917 and loaned to associations there. Two have been sold.

MAJOR J. F. BELFORD.

Mr. TOBIN:

*1. Is Major J. F. Belford, of Richmond, Quebec, employed by the Department of Militia and Defence or by the Department of Justice at the present time?
2. If so, what salary and allowance does he receive?
3. Was he employed by either one of said departments in the month of November, 1917?
4. If so, what salary did he then receive?
5. When was Major J. F. Belford first employed by the Department of Militia?
6. What amount has been paid to him from that date to the present time on account of, (a) salary, (b) separation allowance, (c) travelling and living expenses, and (d) other disbursements?

[Mr. Crerar.]

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, by the Department of Militia and Defence.

2. Pay and allowances of his rank in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

3. Yes, by the Department of Militia and Defence.

4. Answered by No. 2.

5. May, 1916, but did not begin to draw pay until July 3, 1916.

6. (a) $3,431.75; (b) $964; (c) $528.18; (d) $1,661.76. Recruiting expenses not personal.

GRANBY POST OFFICE.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What was the total cost of the Post Office building at Granby, in the county of Shefford?
2. When was the said building completed?
3. How much has been paid out for repairs to the said building since the first of October, 1911?
4. Upon whose recommendation were the said alterations and repairs made?
5. Has the Government been requested to increase the post office box accommodation in the said building?
6. If so, have any steps been taken to grant this request?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. $27,502.41.

2. Completed in 1903 and tower clock installed in 1906.

3. $3,065.83.

4. Recommended by the Clerk of Works for Montreal District.

5. No information.

6. Answered by No. 5.

BREEDING ANIMALS—SHERBROOKE.

Mr. HUNT:

1. Has the Government an office in the city of Sherbrooke, Quebec, for distributing live stock for breeding purposes?
2. If so, in what year was the office established?
3. How much has it cost each year up to the present?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue this office?
5. Who is in charge of same, and what salary does he receive each year?
6. How many persons has he in his employ?
7. Who are they, and what salary does each receive?
8. What has been the total cost of said office each year since it has been opened?
9. What has become of animals bought?
10. Has the Government many on hand?
11. If so, who cares for said animals and what price is paid?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. The live stock branch of the Department of Agriculture maintains an office in the city of Sherbrooke, in the province of Quebec, to facilitate the general work of the branch in that province, a part of which

is to distribute live stock for breeding purposes.

2. December, 1915.

3. The total cost for all purposes is as follows: fiscal year 1915-16 (balance), $1,034,94; 1916-17, $3,790.74; 1917-18, $3,865.50. The cost is not apportioned to the different purposes for which the office is maintained. (Included in these amounts is the salary and expenses of the officer in charge, salary of stenographer, rent, cost of telegrams, telephone charges, etc.)

4. Yes.

5. A. W. Giard, present salary $1,900 per annum.

6. The office staff consists of one stenographer. Mr. Giard has also the supervision of a number of temporary inspectors.

7. The stenographer, Miss L. Boulanger, receives a salary of $600 a year. The inspectors are paid at the rate of $4 a day for such time as their services are required. At the present time the following are employed as temporary inspectors: G. F. Cowan, Scottstown; J. A. Marion, St. Edwidge; A. Genest, St. Bernard.

8. Answered by No. 3.

9. Animals purchased have been loaned to associations throughout the province and have been left on their hands as long as they were satisfactory for breeding purposes.

10. Yes.

11. Animals loaned to associations are cared for by caretakers on arrangements made with them by the respective associations. The terms vary with the districts and circumstances, but all are subject to the approval of the Dominion Live Stock Commissioner. Bulls which are shipped to feeding stations for refitting purposes are paid for by the department, at the rate of $7 per month or 35 cents per day for terms of less than one month.

PATENT MEDICINE STAMP TAX.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. What is the yearly revenue from stamp tax on patent medicines?

2. How many persons of the Outside Service are employed in connection with the enforcement of this regulation?

3. What are their names and salaries?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. War Tax Revenue for 1916-17 from stamps duty on cheques, patent medicines, wine bottles, perfumes, etc., etc., received by Inland Revenue, $900,118.01.

2. 95. Our Preventive Officers are engaged in all kinds of Preventive Service work and it would be difficult to specify what part of their time they have given to this special service. Some of the Preventive Officers are employed in Excise work according to requirements.

3. Carson, J. F., $1,000; Smith, J. F., $1,000; McCort, J., $1,000; Goulet, A., $1,000; Laverdure, E., $1,000; Floody, E., $1,200; Lamont, S., $1,000; Pauzé, C. E., $300; Fidler, E., $1,000; Joughin, W. J. C., $1,000; Richards, D. H., $1,000; Talbot, J., $1,200; Kearney, D. J., $2,000; Hanham, J. H., $1,000; Miller, C. W., $1,000; Boyle, H., $1,000; Rowan, W. E., $900; Kelso, J. P., $1,000; Wickens, A., $1,000; Roy, A., $1,000; Brown, R. H., $1,000; Quinn, T., $1,000; Carmichael, D., $1,075; Forde, F W., $1,400 (suspended from 17-7-17); Coutu, E. C., $1,000; Davis, T. J., $1,000; Danis, J. M., $1,200; Dalgetty, J., $1,000; Johnson, J. D., $900; Grantham, J. A., $1,000; Lalonde, A. E., $900; Paquin, J., $1,200; Clarke, E. J., $800; Blondin, E., $800; Dager, H. J., $1,500; Champagne, J O., $900; Rainville J. E., $1,200; Lalor, T., $1,000; Labonté, F. X., $1,200; Loranger, G. A., $1,000; Guilbault, A., $1,000; Ouimet, J. A. F., $1,000; Labelle, J. D., $1,000; Lefebvre, S., $1,000; Dansereau, G. A., $1,000; Paquette, E., $1,000; Belleau, Ste. F., $1,000; Coté, F. X., $1,000; Fortin, J., $1,000; Duggan, E., $1,000; Bolduc, L. P., $1,000; Paquet, L., $1,200; Fiset, A., $1,000; Traversy, F. X., $1,000; Bouchard, J. M. A., $1,000; Poirier, W., $1,200; Brossard, W., $1,200; Houde, J. A. D., $1,200; Cousineau, H., $1,000; Deschambault, E., $1,000; Smith, D. J., $1,000; Thérien, E. E. C., $1,000; Laurence, E., $1,000; Pageau, J. G., $1,000; Barnes, F., $1,000; Poirier, J. B. E., $1,000; Robitaille, L. P., $1,200; Gagnon, J. D., $1,000; Coté, A. R., $1,000; Somers, T. S., $1,000; Cadotte, J. A., $1,000; Raymond, J. C., $1,000; Surprenant, J., $1,000; Chaput, N. J., $1,000; Lamoureux, H., $1,000; Ledoux, H., $1,200; Cowling, A. E., $1,000; Masson, J. A., $1,200; Hughes, M., $1,000; Coté, B., $1,000; Gauthier, W., $1,000; Navert, C., $1,000; Ross, W. A., $1,000; Warren, G. S., $1,000; Bessette, E., $1,000; Richard, J., $1,000; Quesnel, G. A., $1,000; Trudel, L., $1,000; Thivierge, P., $1,000; Kelly, J. T., $1,000; Healy, T. J., $1,000; Arsenault, J. F., $800; Cosgrove, J. B., $1,000; Bélanger, A., $1,000; Ashton, H., $1,000.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PURCHASE OF COAL IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. KENNEDY:

1. How many tons of coal were purchased in the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918, by the Railway Department for use on the Government Railways?

2. At what point or points was delivery of such coal taken?

3. What price per net ton was paid therefor at the delivery point or points in Canada?

4. What quantity of such coal was transported from Montreal and delivered to points in Canada east of Montreal?

5. What was the maximum distance east from Montreal that such coal was transported, and what was the cost of transportation?

6. What was the average cost of transportation of such coal to points east of Montreal?

7. What was the price per net ton paid by the Railway Department to Nova Scotia Coal Mines for coal delivered during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. 568,971 net tons.

2. St. John, N.B., Quebec, St. Hyacinthe, St. Lambert, Montreal and Fort William.

3. At Montreal, St. Lambert and St. Hyacinthe: Average price, $6.90 per net ton, f.o.b. cars, all charges paid, including duty and war tax. At Quebec: Average price per net ton, $7.85, delivered f.o.b. cars, all charges paid. At Fort William, Ont.: Prices, $5.35½ to $5.50½ per net ton, delivered f.o.b. cars, all charges paid. Special purchases made owing to coal shortages:—At St. John, N.B., 9,352 tons at $6.40 per net ton, delivered f.o.b. piers, Port Richmond or Greenwich, Pa. This coal was carried by boats owned by the department. For delivery at Fort William: 80,000 tons at $4.75 per net ton, delivered f.o.b. Mines, United States points—cost delivered f.o.b. cars at Fort William, average price $7.44 per net ton, all charges paid.

4. 32,179 tons.

5. Maximum distance transported was to Campbellton, N.B., 406 miles; cost of transportation, $1.65 per net ton.

6. Average distance, 108 miles; cost of transportation, 45c per ton.

7. $3.79, $4.13, $4.25 and $4.50 per net ton for run-of-mine grade of coal, and 22.4c per net ton additional for screened coal.

DUTIES AND DRAWBACK ON AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What were the total receipts from Customs tariff during the fiscal year ending March, 1917, on the following goods entering Customs ports west of the Great Lakes:—ploughs, traction engines, threshing outfits, self-binding reapers, threshing separators, other farm machinery and repair parts, respectively?

2. What was the total amount of drawback paid by the Government to Canadian manufacturers of farm machinery, during the fiscal year ending March, 1917, on mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments for binders?

3. Are repair parts for mowing machines and reapers subject to the drawback?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON:

1. Ploughs and parts thereof, $305,132.43; portable engines with boilers in combination, and traction engines for farm purposes, $874,045.87; threshing machine separators, parts of, including wind stackers, baggers, weighers, and self feeders therefor, and finished parts thereof, for repairs, when imported separately, $118,795.05; harvesters, self-binding, $79,954.35; threshing machine separators, $348,862.28; other farm machinery and parts thereof, viz.: Binding attachments, cultivators, weeders, drills, rollers, harrows, hay loaders, tedders, horse rakes, manure spreaders, mowers, potato diggers, reapers, fanning mills, grain crushers, hay presses, fodder or feed cutters, horse powers for farm purposes, and parts of agricultural implements, $115,818.51.

2. Home consumption: Total amount of drawback paid to Canadian manufacturers of farm machinery, on mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments for binders, $51,666.76. Export: Amount paid to Canadian manufacturers of farm machinery, on all kinds exported during fiscal year 1916-17, $111,470.16. Particulars of drawback for export are not classified separately. It would require some time to make the detailed compilation asked for in this inquiry.

3. Repair parts exported are subject to drawback.

MILK SUPPLY IN LARGE CENTRES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the Government aware that the undue raising in price of milk prevailing in large centres is causing untold injury and suffering to the younger children of the communities?

2. Has the Government taken any action on the report of the Milk Committee appointed by the Food Controller's Bureau, in the matter of reorganization of milk distribution?

3. Has any recommendation been made to the Government by the Baby Welfare Committee praying, that effective measures be promptly instituted to remedy the above conditions of affairs existing in the large centres of populations?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. The department is not aware that there has been undue raising of the price of milk. Milk has not increased in price out of proportion to the increased price of all foods.

2. The report of the Milk Committee recommended that no action be taken in fixing the price of milk to the producer. It recommended that the spread between the producer and the consumer be fixed, which has been done by Order No. 9, published in the 2nd Extra of the Canada Gazette, of December 27th, 1917. The report pointed out that the initiative for the reorganization of the distribution of milk should be taken

by the municipal or provincial authorities.

3. The Baby Welfare Committee of Montreal, made representations in the form of a resolution, and it was pointed out to them that whatever remedy was possible lay in getting the municipal or provincial authorities to take action in the reorganization of the milk distributing business.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

Mr PARENT:

1. Has a contract between the Government and the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, for the purchase of the company's line, been entered into? If so, at what date?

2. Does said contract include the terminals at Quebec or only cover a portion of the line?

3. If for only a portion, what portion, and at what price?

4. If for the whole line, what price has been agreed upon?

5. Has any money been paid the company by the Government for the purchase of said line? If so, how much?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. An agreement dated July 25th, 1916, as authorized under provisions of chapter 16 of statutes of 1915, and chapter 22 of statutes of 1916, of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls, and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons.

2. Includes (b) a line of railway from and inclusive of its terminals in the city of Quebec extending easterly, etc.

3 and 4. The agreement provides for acquiring as described in statutes mentioned in answer to first question.

The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways to be as provided by section 2, of chapter 22, of statutes of 1916.

5. No.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT TEMPORARY EXEMPTIONS.

* Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is the Government aware that a large number of applicants for exemption under the provisions of the Military Service Act obtained temporary exemption for a definite period of time?

2. Is the Government aware that in many cases the local Exemption Tribunals which granted these temporary exemptions advised the applicants that when the period for which the exemption had been granted had expired, they could, if they had sufficient reasons, make application for further exemption, or in other words, have the said delay extended?

3. To whom should those who have legitimate reasons to ask for an extension of their exemption, make application and submit the reasons why the said exemption should be extended?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. The Government has no information on the subject, but if such advice was given it was correct.

3. To the appropriate registrar, under regulation 76.

MILITARY MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

* Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is the Government aware that many Local Exemption Tribunals and several Appeal Tribunals have refused exemption to men of military age without obliging them to undergo the Medical Examination required by the Military Service Act?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to draft said men without giving them the opportunity of undergoing the said Medical Examination?

3. In cases where men who have been refused exemption without a Medical Examination have since been examined and placed in Category B, C, or E, is it the intention of the Government to oblige the said men to report for duty?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The Government has no information on the subject.

2. No. Every man drafted will be medically examined.

3. Not at present if they were placed in category "C," or category "E."

MR. TUCKER.

Mr. PORTER:

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. Tucker, appointed by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, as agricultural representative on the Leave of Absence Board of No. 3 Military District, was in the recent Dominion Election a strong, active opponent of the endorsed Union Government Candidate in East Hastings?

2. Is it the policy of the Government to appoint such opponents to office?

3. If the Government at the time of this appointment was unaware of the fact stated in question No. 1, will it now satisfy itself as to the fact and take action? If so, what action?

4. Was any private member of the Union Government in Military District No. 3 consulted or advised with in regard to this appointment? If not, from what source was the information obtained to satisfy the Honourable Minister who made the appointment?

5. What were the necessary qualifications the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, by inquiry, ascertained Mr. Tucker possessed for the position to which he was so appointed, enumerating them?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5. The policy of the Government is to select the persons best qualified to fill any office or position of trust. In selecting an agricultural representative on this and other Leave-of-Absense Boards the Government endeavoured to obtain necessary information from various sources as to the knowledge, experience and good judgment of the person proposed to be appointed. The Government is satisfied that Mr. Tucker possesses the necessary qualifications

for the efficient discharge of the duties of the position to which he was appointed, and, as at present advised, it does not propose to take any further action in the matter.

MILITIA CENSORS AND DECODERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysboro):

What are the names of all officers at Hazel Hill and Canso, N.S., employed as censors and decoders or in any way connected with said Branch of the Service, and the gross amount paid to each during the calendar year 1917?

Major-General MEWBURN:

Name.	Rank.	Gross Amount Received during 1917.
Rice, H. A.	Censor	$2555 00
Hart, Major G. W.	Asst. Censor	1825 00
Self, George	"	1825 00
Hambling, T. P.	"	1825 00
Rutherford, J. McG.	"	1825 00
Fraser, R. G.	Deputy Asst. Censor	1460 00
Cousins, John A.	Decoding Clerk	1104 00
Hadley, E. H.	"	1104 00
Keating, F. M.	"	1104 00
MacDonald, A. H.	"	1104 00
Strople, Harold	"	147 50
Smiley, Miss E. St C.	Typist and Stenographer	101 50

PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysboro):

1. Has any money been paid for printing by the Department of Militia and Defence, either in Canada or Overseas, or by the Government, during the year 1917, to L. Upcott Gill & Son, Limited, 55-57 Drury Lane, London, W.C., or to Canada Newspaper Company, Limited, Kingsway House, London, W.C.?
2. If so, how much, and when were the said payments made?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. On March 31, 1917, the sum of $605.41 was paid to Messrs. Upcott, Gill & Son, Ltd., for printing and stationery by the Chief Paymaster Overseas. There is no record of any payment to Canada Newspaper Company.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT LEASES IN OTTAWA.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. How many buildings have been rented by the Government in the city of Ottawa since January 1, 1910, for the Post Office Department?
2. Who are the owners of the said buildings?
3. What rent per annum was paid for these buildings or parts of buildings?
4. For what time or term are buildings rented?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

Description of premises.	Lessors.	Rental.	Term of lease.
		$ cts.	
22980 square feet in eastern portion of Union Bank building, facing Sparks street.	R. L. & R. Blackburn	22,695 00	5 years to July 16, 1918.
10160 square feet in portion of Union Bank building at rear of Langevin block.	" "	8,666 67	Premises first occupied January 6, 1912. Present lease is for 3 years and expires January 6, 1920.
Rooms 608-609 and 611 in Union Bank building.	" "	1,154 00	August 1, 1914 to July 15, 1918.
3rd floor of Hope building corner Sparks and Elgin streets.	Jas Hope & Sons	2,500 00	Premises first occupied January 29, 1913. Present lease is for 2 years and expires on January 29, 1920.
West offices of the ground floor of Rideau Club building, Wellington street.	The Rideau Club	1,800 00	Premises first occupied May 1, 1912. Present lease is for 5 years and expires May 1, 1922.
15980 square feet in Robinson building, Queen street.	Hiram Robinson	6,346 28	Premises first occupied September 1, 1912. Present lease is for 3 years and expires September 1, 1918.

WOMEN'S CONFERENCE.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Was a conference held at Ottawa during the present year between the President of the Council and certain women delegates invited to be present thereat?
2. If so, was the cost of holding the said conference defrayed in whole or in part by the Government?
3. How much was paid by the Government in connection with the said conference?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. A conference was held at Ottawa, February 28th-March 2nd, between the War Committee of the Cabinet and certain representative women from the several provinces.
2. The expenses of the conference were defrayed by the Government.
3. $4,427.91.

SPECIAL TRAINS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have any special trains been used by the President of the Council since his appointment as a member of the present Government?
2. If so, how many, and what was their total cost?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. The Unionist Committee of Ontario provided an engine and caboose for the President of the Council, from Mitchell to Seaforth, a distance of twelve miles, to keep a speaking engagement during the last election campaign. Apart from this no special train has been used by the President of the Council.
2. There has been no cost to the country.

CONFERENCE WITH ORGANIZED LABOUR.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Was a Conference held at Ottawa during the present year between Members of the Government and certain representatives of organized labour invited to be present thereat?
2. If so, was the cost of holding the said Conference defrayed in whole or in part by the Government?
3. How much, if any, was paid by the Government in connection with the said Conference?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. $4,427.

TORONTO SECRETARIAL FUND.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many persons, if any, who were previously employed in connection with the Secretarial Fund at Toronto have been or are now in the employ of the Government, either in one of the Departments thereof, or in connection with any Board or Commission appointed by the Governement?
2. What are their names, duties and salaries?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government has no knowledge or information with regard to the fund alluded to.

REFRIGERATION COMMISSION.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Is there a commission known as the Refrigeration Commission? If so, who are the members of it, and who is chairman?
2. What are the duties of this Commission?
3. Who appointed them?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman would state what department of the Government he alludes to in this question, he will receive an answer.

Mr. JAMES STARRATT MARSHALL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has there been since August, 1914, a person named Jas. Starratt Marshall, of Spa Springs, Annapolis County, in the Active Militia of Canada?
2. If not, when did he leave the service?
3. If so, when did he join the service, and what has been his occupation?
4. What amount has he received during the period in which he was employed?
5. Has the Government any information as to whether or not whilst in the service he carried on the work of laundryman either in his public or private capacity?
6. If in the former capacity, what extra pay did he receive?

Major-General MEWBURN: If the hon. member would give some information as to the unit in which Mr. Marshall served, a thorough search will be made.

MR. W. C. REAN.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has Mr. W. C. Rean been employed in any capacity in connection with the War Trade Board?
2. If so, what was the date of his appointment, and what were, or are, his duties, and salary?
3. What were his occupation, duties, and salary immediately prior to his appointment?
4. Before coming to Ottawa, was Mr. Rean employed in the Secretarial Fund Office at Toronto or had he any connection with the Secretarial Fund?
5. Has Mr. Rean received an appointment to go Overseas and engage in Y.M.C.A. work? If so, is the Government to pay any part of his expenses or salary?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, for a temporary engagement to assist in the work of organizing the office.
2. February 22, 1918, until April 6, 1918, as assistant secretary at $250 a month.
3. Prior to his temporary appointment with the War Trade Board, Mr. Rean was temporarily employed in the office of the President of the Council from January 21, 1918, until February 4, 1918, as assistant

private secretary, at the rate of $1,750 per annum.

4. The Government has no knowledge of the secretarial fund referred to.

5. The Government has no knowledge of Mr. Rean's present occupation.

ICE CONTRACT AT MULGRAVE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What are the names of the parties tendering for ice (1917-18) for use of the Government Railway at Mulgrave, N.S., and points in that vicinity, and the amount of each tender?

2. To whom has the contract been awarded, and for what amount?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. For Mulgrave, N.S., 3,000 tons: S. W. Hagerty, Mulgrave, N.S., $1.85; delivered and stored in icehouses. E. L. Hadley & Jos. A. Cesale, Mulgrave, N.S., $1.35; delivered and packed in icehouses. James Dunlap, Leitches Creek Station, C.B., 85c.; delivered on cars, Leitches Creek Station.

For Sydney, C.B., 300 tons: R. V. Hall, Sydney, C.B., $1.25; delivered on cars, Sydney, C.B. James Dunlap, Leitches Creek Station, C.B., 85c.; delivered on cars, Leitches Creek Station.

For New Glasgow, N.S., 150 tons: E. B. Cumming, Piedmont, N.S., 95c.; delivered on cars, Piedmont, N.S. James Dunlap, Leitches Creek Station, C.B., 85c.; delivered on cars Leitches Creek Station.

2. To the lowest tenderers in each case, cost of haulage and handling considered:

For Mulgrave, N.S.: E. L. Hadley & Jos. A. Cesale, Mulgrave, N.S., $1.35; delivered and stored in icehouses.

For Sydney, C.B.: James Dunlap, Leitches Creek Station, C.B., 85c.; delivered f.o.b cars, Leitches Creek Station.

For New Glasgow, N.S.: E. B. Cumming, N.S., 95c.; delivered f.o.b. cars, Piedmont, N.S.

SHERBROOKE POST OFFICE.

Mr. McCREA:

1. What is the total number of men employed in the Sherbrooke Post Office Inspection Office?

2. What are the names of each employee, their respective salaries, and duties?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Twelve.

2. Dastous, L. E. M., $2,900, inspector; Soles, C. E., $2,400, assistant inspector; Lallier, Joseph, $1,700, field officer, Rural Mail delivery work, inspecting Rural post offices; Mullins, G. (Miss), $1,300, clerk-in-charge of inquiries re missing mail matter; Frechette, R. $900 (on military service); Marechal, M. B. M. (Miss), $600, stenographer and typist; de Lottinville, Maurice, $600, clerical work; Bousquet, P., $3 a day, messenger; Lefebvre, J. P., $3 a day, chauffeur and porter; Downing, J. D., $1,500, temporary clerk, field officer, Rural Mail delivery work; Choquette, J. (Miss), $600, temporary clerk, stenographer and typist; Dussault, N. T., $1,400, temporary clerk, field officer, rural mail delivery work.

POSTMASTER AT INDIAN POINT.

Mr DUFF:

1. What is the name of the Postmaster at Indian Point, Lunenburg County, Nova Scotia?

2. Was the said appointment made by the Civil Service Commission?

3. When was this appointment made?

4. What information was obtained as to the peculiar qualifications of this man for the appointment?

5. Is the post office situated in the centre of the district?

6. Have there been any complaints from the people of the locality with regard to the inconvenience caused by the situation of this post office?

7. What salary does the Postmaster receive per annum and how much was paid his predecessor?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Mr. Artemas Ernst, Postmaster of Indian Point, who was appointed on the 1st November, 1912, tendered his resignation on the 7th September last. His successor has not yet been appointed.

2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. See answer to No. 1.

7. The salary attached to this office is $60 per annum.

POSTMASTER AT DUBLIN SHORE, N.S.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What is the name of the Postmaster at Dublin Shore, Lunenburg County, N.S.?

2. When was this appointment made?

3. Was it made on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, and what are the peculiar qualifications of the appointee which led to his obtaining the position?

4. Have any complaints been received from the people of the locality to the effect that they were seriously inconvenienced owing to the fact that the post office is situated far from the centre of the district?

5. What salary does the Postmaster receive? How much was paid to his predecessor?

Hon Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Lemuel J. Bell.

2. On the 5th January, 1918.

3. No. The appointment was made before the Civil Service Commission was authorized to make these appointments. The department is not aware that there was anything peculiar about his qualifications.

4. Representations have been made that the post office is inconveniently situated, and this matter is now under enquiry by the department.

5. $81 per annum His predecessor recieved the same salary.

ROYAL NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE—COMMISSIONER PERRY.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Has Commissioner Perry of the Royal North West Mounted Police resigned?
2. If so, what was the cause of his resignation?
3. Was there any correspondence between the Commissioner and the Government prior to the resignation? If so, will the papers be laid on the Table of the House?
4. Has Assistant Commissioner Wilson sent in his resignation? If so, what is his reason for resigning?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2. The reasons are set forth in the following telegram from Commissioner Perry:

"While I recognize the necessity of taking all effective members of the Force for overseas service, I maintain that they should have been sent as a unit and in view of the assurance contained in the Prime Minister's letter of 5th July last, that if more cavalry were required a regiment or regiments from the Mounted Police would be sent, I feel my position as Officer Commanding the Force has been most seriously affected, and therefore in the interest of the public service I should resign. I respectfully request that I may be retired to pension as soon as convenient to the Department. I am prepared to hand over command whenever directed."

Every effort has been made by the Government to arrange for the force going over and proceeding to the front as a unit but the military exigencies have been such that the military authorities in Great Britain have not so far been able to arrange it. Their request is for reinforcements for existing units.

3 No.

4. Yes; no reason given. He has offered to serve in any capacity the Government may desire.

MR. NAZAIRE LEBEL.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. Nazaire LeBel, a Preventive officer at St. Arsène, in the County of Temiscouata, made a report to the Inland Revenue Department, for each year since 1911?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to dispense with the services of the said officer who is at present incapacitated and whose work is absolutely needless?

Hon. Mr SIFTON:

1. Made a report in 1913.

2. Services dispensed with from February 1st, 1918.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the value of intoxicating liquor imported into Canada since December 22, 1917?
2. What is the value of intoxicating liquor imported into Canada under the regulation made January 19, 1918, permitting the importation of intoxicating liquor purchased prior to January 31, 1918?

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What has been the number of clerks employed during each year from 1911 to 1917, in the following Post offices: Victoria, Vancouver, Regina, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Montreal, Quebec, Fredericton and Halifax?
2. What sums have been paid as salaries to the clerks of the above offices in each year of the said period?

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Minister of Finance issued certificates permitting the offer and sale of debentures in pursuance of the Order in Council, dated 22nd December, 1917, in relation thereto?
2. If so, how many permits were granted or certificates issued?
3. To what provincial governments, municipal corporations, school boards or other legally constituted bodies were permits granted or certificates issued?
4. For what amount were permits granted and certificates issued, in each case?

Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Has the Minister of Finance refused to issue certificates permitting the offer and sale of debentures, in pursuance of the Order in Council, dated 22nd December, 1917, in relation thereto?
2. If so, how many permits or certificates have been refused?
3. What provincial governments, municipal corporations, school boards or other legally constituted bodies have been refused said permits or certificates, and what reasons, in each case, were given?
4. For what amount, in each case, was authority asked for?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of the correspondence concerning the resignation of Commissioner Perry, C.M.G., as head of Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Government Notices of Motions and Government Orders shall have precedence on Mondays, until the end of the Session, over all business except questions by Members and Notices of Motion for the production of papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think that we on this side of the House cannot be accused of obstructing the business of the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So, I would be obliged if my right hon. friend would give us another Monday, making the motion commence with the first Monday in May.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Under the circumstances I accede to the request of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. BUREAU: When the debate on the question of titles was adjourned I understood that a date would be set when that matter would be brought up again. Might I ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to fix a date when this question will come up again?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have not had an opportunity yet of fixing a date. I shall take the matter up in due course.

Mr. BUREAU: Will a date be fixed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I expressed my intention at the time.

Motion amended to read: "on and after Monday, the twenty-ninth of April."

Motion as amended agreed to.

THE WAR.

REGULATIONS RESPECTING MILITARY SERVICE.

On the motion being called for the resolution respecting Military Service Regulations:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a very important motion, and I would expect that, as is usual, a day would be fixed to discuss it. I understand that my hon. friend wishes to proceed now, but I did not expect the resolution to come up to-day, and I ask if it would be possible to have it postponed until to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter is urgent, but in view of the fact that my right hon. friend has had but little more than twenty-four hours' notice of it, I do not think his request is unreasonable, and I grant it at once. But I do so in the hope that we may be able to conclude the debate to-morrow if possible.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the motion?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is the resolution with regard to military service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What about the preceding motion regarding the censorship of the official debates?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It stands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think I can say to my right hon. friend that, on our side of the House the debate will close to-morrow.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crothers, Bill No. 48, to amend The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1906, was read a third time and passed.

SALARIES ACT AMENDMENT.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

House again in committee on Bill No. 13, to amend the Salaries Act and the provisions for preserving the Independence of Parliament.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When subsection 3 of section 1 was under consideration, the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) was good enough to call my attention to what is apparently an oversight in section 3. The point was that the section as drafted would permit the member filling either of these positions to take office without going back to his constituents. Clearly that was not the intention, and while I am not quite sure that the Act would bear that interpretation, nevertheless my thanks are due to the hon. member for bringing the matter to my attention, and I agree at once that the section should be so amended as to be perfectly clear. I have submitted to the member for Kamouraska the amendments which I propose, and they are:

That subsection 3 of section 1 be amended by striking out the words "accepting or" in the 26th line and substituting the word "now."

The section would then read, in the 25th and 26th lines, "any person now holding any of the said offices."

Amendment agreed to.

I move that the Bill be further amended by adding the following section as section 2 thereof:

Nothing in the Dominion Elections Act or in the Senate and House of Commons Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapters 6 and 10 respectively, or in any other statute or law, shall render ineligible any person hereafter accepting and holding any of the said offices as Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Minister of Immigration and Colonization, Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment and Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, as a member of the House of Commons, or shall disqualify him for sitting or voting therein if he is elected while he holds such office and is not otherwise disqualified.

Amendment agreed to.

I move also that section 2 of the Bill as introduced be section 3.

Amendment agreed to, and section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

WAR GRANT $500,000,000.

House again in committee on Bill No. 38, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1.

Mr. BUREAU: In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia when we were last in committee, some members made inquiries about the detailed expenditure which it was understood, should be contained in the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report. We were informed that this report was being printed and that it would be available within a short time. Some hon. gentlemen on both sides are asking when they may expect this report, so that they may examine the details of the expenditures and in that way be in a position to put intelligent questions to the minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am under the impression that the details of the expenditures, so far as they are available in a convenient form, are to be found in the Report of the Militia Council, which is before the House, and which has been printed for distribution.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend was not in the House when the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was conducting some stage of the resolution. It was pointed out then in connection with expenditures that it was desirable that details of the amounts paid for publicity and advertising, the moneys which were taken out of the War Fund, should be given. The Acting Minister of Finance undertook to bring down statements of such expenditures under those items as are not contained in the published volume to which the Prime Minister has just referred, and which, as he says, has been distributed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that has been distributed, and it contains details in a general way.

Mr. MURPHY: But the Acting Minister of Finance undertook to bring down additional details which are not contained in that volume.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have, with regard to various departments, some details with which I did not think it worth while to trouble the House. I could give those if that would be of any advantage. I think I already gave the details with regard to one department.

Mr. BUREAU: Either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Militia—I do not exactly know which—made a statement of the various amounts which would be appropriated to each department for war purposes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, and I have some particulars of the expenditures in the various departments.

Mr. BUREAU: I saw a statement of the expenditures in one of the departments, either the Department of Immigration or the Department of the Interior. The amount was small, and the statement just gave a list of names with the amounts paid to each individual. No further information than that was given. All that we knew was that a certain person had received a certain sum of money. That money might have been spent for war purposes, but we do not know whether it was or not. We should like to have that information. We desire to know how the Department of Immigration or the Department of the Interior is being connected with war service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: When the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn) was speaking on this subject some few days ago, I had not the honour of being present while he was taking up the question of the disbandonment of the 5th Division. In the year 1916, in order to get the Canadian forces properly organized with a view to meeting conditions that we expected to arise in the future, and that have since materialized, I drew up a memorandum recommending to General Sir Douglas Haig, General Sir William Robertson and Mr. Lloyd George—and I sent a copy of it to the Prime Minister of Canada—that Canada, to have a perfect force, should have two army corps each consisting of three divisions. The usual British army corps is made up of two divisions, each division being made up of four brigades, with odd battalions for pioneer and other purposes, and from time to time various additions to that have been made in the way of machine gun sections and so forth. Each brigade is made up of four battalions, each numbering 1,000 men. The British force had not at that time, as the Minister of Militia very properly stated, maintained any fixed standard, but two divisions constituted an army corps. Following that rule, Canada, from the moment we had four divisions organized, should have had two army corps in the field. I submitted my plan and I discussed it with Sir Douglas Haig, Sir William Robertson and all the leading officers. My idea was that we would hold, with six div-

isions or two army corps, no more trenches than we did with one army corps or four divisions. Our frontage would be exactly the same, and consequently our losses would be neither more nor less than they are now. In order, however, that the men might get proper rest, my scheme was that we should have one division in the front trenches, one division in support and one division in reserve, resting. I made plans for six divisions, constituting two army corps. My plan met with the approval of Sir Douglas Haig, Sir William Robertson, Mr. Lloyd George and every officer in Europe whom I consulted and whose opinion was worth anything. In fact, my scheme met with so much approval that six or seven or eight months afterwards the German army was remodelled on the identical system that I had the honour of devising beforehand. Later on, the British army, always conservative and slow in the way of taking up anything new, adopted a similar principle, and to-day the principle generally adopted in the British army is to have three divisions constituting an army corps. I shall not enter into the details of the composition of the army corps, but the standard which I had set was not lived up to. I had also planned that in addition to the men in the three divisions in each corps each battalion should have men in rest, and that at Havre we should have a camp prepared for reinforcements which we could send hither and thither as the need might become urgent. I merely point this out to show to the House and the country that the statements made here that the British army has not adopted the principle of three divisions to a corps and that the German army has not adopted it, are not in accordance with the facts. I do not hold any body here responsible for that because the statements come from the other side. I devised my scheme early in 1916, and the boys would have been much better off if it had been adopted. It would not have taken one man more than the present system because the area held by our forces would not have been any greater. If my scheme had been carried out, we would not have had some of the massacres that we have had at the front. I do not think anybody overseas in the Canadian service considered the matter sufficiently to be able to give an intelligent opinion as to what was really needed, or we certainly should have had two army corps instead of one.

Mr. BUREAU: Would that imply a reorganization of the present system?

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: There are now four divisions. In 1916 I had four divisions in the field and two additional divisions, in all six, all ready to form into two army corps. The scheme was held up on my retirement, but I am in a position to say without fear of contradiction that with the exception of the first division, which was the best shooting division in the world, the fifth division was the best trained in the world. Upwards of six to eight hundred men in every battalion had received sufficient training to handle a machine gun section, and about eight hundred out of every thousand men were instructors. There were plenty of men to form another division. If that had been done we would have had two corps instead of one, and at the same time we would have had no more frontage to look after—no more men exposed to fire than now—but there would always have been one division in each corps in rest billets. Let me again emphasize that I submitted this proposal to Sir Douglas Haig and the British War Office and received their approval. The Germans have adopted the same system; it is only common sense to have one division in attack, one in support, and one in rest all the time. I had also plans for having a couple of hundred men in each battalion right at hand to fill up gaps, and then there was the training camp at Havre. All these plans have since been carried out in detail with the exception of forming the two corps. The British are also adopting the system of having three divisions to a corps. I want this to be made clear. The statement furnished by the Minister of Militia and Defence is not in accordance with the facts, so far as the British army is concerned, because they have already adopted the policy of three divisions to a corps.

Mr. MURPHY: The discussion to which I drew the attention of the Prime Minister a few minutes ago took place on the afternoon of Friday the 12th of April, in connection with the explanations given by the Acting Minister of Finance of the expenses connected with the Victory Loan. Referring to a request made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition the Acting Minister of Finance said:

> As he evidently desires that this information be submitted prior to the introduction of the War Appropriation Bill, I ask the leave of the House to make a statement which will give him the information he desires.

Arising out of the explanation given, some discussion of details took place, which are reported on page 711 of Hansard as follows:

> Mr. Pedlow: Do the items of $163,000 and $207,000 cover the entire cost of the publicity

campaign? On what basis was that allotment negotiated? Was the price paid for that publicity at the ordinary commercial rate charged for the space used, or was it on a different basis from that usually negotiated in an ordinary commercial transaction?

I need not read the rest except that towards the end I asked this question:

Mr. Murphy: Will the details the Minister promised to give the house include the names of the firms and papers which received advertisements and the amounts paid?

Mr. A. K. Maclean: If that is desired.

Mr. Murphy: It is highly desirable to know the amount paid to each newspaper.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: You wanted the names of the newspapers?

Mr. MURPHY: As I understand it, the Acting Minister of Finance mentioned two amounts—$163,000 and $207,000—and I think he conveyed the impression that they were given to some agents. We wanted the amounts in detail.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will speak to him about it. In the meantime is there any other information wanted in regard to any other departments?

Mr. VIEN: When this Bill was under discussion some time ago information was obtained from the Government as to the authority of the Overseas Minister of Militia in connection with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I understand there is a Militia Council in England, acting in an advisory capacity to the overseas minister. Has this council and the Overseas Minister of Militia full authority to appoint officers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force? If not, who has control of the appointments and promotions, and who gives commanders to the various brigades and divisions, even to the army corps? Does the Overseas Minister of Militia report to the Government by despatch or otherwise as to how our troops were ordered into action, and how they came out of action? Is the Canadian expeditionary force entirely under his control, and what is its relationship to the War Office? This is a most important matter, because if Canada is a nation, as we have often pretended, when we have organized an army of 500,000 men it seems to me we should be proud enough of ourselves as a nation to direct these matters ourselves and to have full reports sent to the Government as to the movements and organization of our army. I quite agree that so far as the higher command is concerned unity of action is essential, and that the troops should be under the supreme command of General Foch. On the other hand, I do not think Canada should abdicate her power; she should retain the right to direct and control the organization of the army. What is the power of the Overseas Minister of Militia and of his advisory council as to the appointment of officers, and what information is received from the commanders overseas as to the movements of our troops?

4 p.m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as our position as a nation is concerned, of course the military direction of the Canadian forces at the front under the commander of the British forces, and in common with the British and American forces our troops are under the supreme direction of General Foch. It would be entirely undesirable for us in Ottawa to interfere with military appointments at the front. These appointments are made on the recommendations of the military commanders at the front. The Minister of Overseas Service would naturally have these matters placed before him, but he would be wise enough, I hope, not to attempt to interfere on his own initiative, because he could not possibly have the same knowledge of the fitness of the men recommended as those who are at the front and who know what the service of each man has been, what his qualifications are, and his suitability generally for any position to which he might be appointed. It has already been explained to the House that the general policy at the front is to give promotion from the ranks to non-commissioned officers, and from non-commissioned officers to commissioned officers, and so on. The Government of this country has the same voice in respect to these matters that the Imperial Government has in respect to its own matters of a similar nature.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the Prime Minister had used the phrase "military direction of its forces" at the front, his statement would have been fairly accurate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is what I was alluding to.

Sir SAM HUGHES: So far as the appointment of junior officers is concerned, no one interferes with them; I do not suppose any minister would interfere with the recommendations made in the case of these men. But so far as the senior officers are concerned commanding battalions, divisions, brigades or a corps, I certainly feel there is a very great need of supervision of appointments. Let me give an instance of how these appointments have been made.

They have not been made, I am sorry to say, on merit. A very charming English lady undertook once to reason out with me why a certain officer should not have a promotion in connection with the service. She had made quite a canvass to secure the promotion of this officer, but I would not yield to her solicitations. I pointed out that the officer whom she named was entirely unsuited in many ways, that he might be a very fine courtier, or "pink tea" gentleman, but that he was not fitted for the position to which she desired to have him promoted. Finally she made the retort that she did not see what Canadian politicians had to do with the appointment of officers anyway. I told her that the people whose boys were at the front and who paid the money should be as much interested in it as the society ladies of London. I took that ground and I carried my point. I am sorry to say that my stand was not subsequently observed. The ground which I took was fully conceded by Lloyd George, when Minister of War, Sir William Robertson, General Whigham, Lord Kitchener and Sir Douglas Haig later. Nobody would desire that the junior appointments should come under this rule. I do not suggest that the minister could keep in touch with the battalion officers, but as to the senior appointments, in so far as promotion was concerned, I always took it upon myself to examine these men and to satisfy myself that the best men were put in positions of responsibility. I think that the subsequent career of the men I selected bear out the claim that I exercised very good judgment in the matter of promotions. It may be said that these senior officers should be promoted. That may be a proper principle as a general thing, but there are senior positions to which men should not be promoted on the basis of ordinary seniority. A man who may be a qualified battalion commander may not have the necessary qualifications for a divisional commander. I might go into this matter a good deal farther, but I think that I have outlined my ideas. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the authorities here have not always exercised good judgment. I think the authorities should assume the full responsibility and they should insist on having the say in reference to these senior appointments. The plan which was pursued by me was to get the recommendations of the officers concerned. I would consult the officers. It has been pointed out by the Prime Minister that the officer in command in the field must be in a position to know. I have no hesitation in saying that the army commander at the front is not in a position to know what sort of men the battalion commanders may be other than from the report which he gets from some sprig of a staff officer who may or may not be at the front. When General Byng pointed out that I was three thousand miles away while he was only forty miles away, I replied that I got my reports from different sources while he got his from a certain staff officer who never saw these officers and that my information was more accurate than his although it might take a week longer unless one sent a telegram. The Government should exercise, and the people will hold them responsible for exercising, a proper control over the appointment of senior officers, and seeing that society, clerical and other influences cannot get these appointments in the Canadian forces as they are got in the British forces.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have never heard of any society or clerical influence in regard to senior appointments. I think that General Currie's proposals in regard to senior appointments have usually been accepted here.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is all right; but they should be carefully reviewed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, we would be venturing upon very dangerous ground if we should undertake to overrule the commander of the Canadian army corps in regard to matters of that kind. There was only one question that I found it necessary to take up with the British authorities when I was in England a year ago, and I took it up with Sir Douglas Haig, with the Secretary of State for War, Lord Derby, and with Mr. Lloyd George himself. I came to the conclusion while I was over there, after conferences with General Currie and General Turner, that the divisional and corps staffs did not have in their personnel a sufficient proportion of Canadians.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We had men who, in the course of a year and a half or two years experience, had obtained or could have obtained the training which would qualify them for important staff positions. More than that, we had men who, while they were not perhaps qualified to take the higher positions on the staff, might very well have been appointed to junior positions on the divisional staff or corps staff, and in that way might have fitted them-

selves for taking higher staff positions. The representations which I made to Sir Douglas Haig, the Secretary of State for War, and the Prime Minister, had effect, as I was informed subsequently, and I believe that in consequence Canadians are now represented much more fully than formerly upon the divisional and corps staffs.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: In regard to the Canadian force, a question which I desire to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence from curiosity, was stimulated by an article that appeared in the press some little time ago as coming from Ottawa. The article appeared at the time certain representatives of the "Originals," as they were called, the First Contingent, return to Canada. The question under discussion in the article was as to whether or not the power was vested in the Canadian Government to give these men, who had been granted a furlough, a further furlough in Canada, if that was desired. The despatch from Ottawa read:

> The Government is not likely to vary the conditions under which furlough was secured for men of the First Division. Resolutions, and also letters from individuals, are being sent here inquiring that as these brave men have done their bit and stood the brunt of very hard service for over three years, they should be allowed to remain at home.
>
> It is conceded that in many cases, sending them back involves real hardship, but when the announcement was made that they were coming it was accompanied by a warning that they would have to return to service.
>
> It was stated that this was a specific agreement with the British authorities, on the strength of which the respite was secured. If it is broken, then the department says it will be a case of good-bye to leaves of absence for other contingents. A hundred men who had their furlough have already gone back.
>
> An exception is likely to be made in the case of men who are physically unfit. In such cases, the weeding out will probably be done in Canada, rather than on the return to England.
>
> It is the agreement with the British authorities stipulating that the men were to return to service that now is particularly cited as a reason why the repeated applications for discharge cannot be granted.

That despatch would seem to lead one to the conclusion that the Government admitted that they had no authority to withdraw from Europe to Canada any men of the Canadian contingent without the consent of the British Government. I do not want to take a too narrow or academic view of this question but it would seem to suggest the question as to what the position of Canada in this war is. I always had the idea that in this war we occupied a different position from that which Canada has occupied in any other war. In the South African war we allowed our men to go but the British Government paid the bill and, they paying the bill, the contractual relation between the soldier and the British Government probably gave them the right to insist upon the retention of any man. But in this war, we are paying the bill. We are paying not only the wages of the soldier but we are paying for his maintenance and equipment in the field. True all the equipment is not being supplied directly from Canada. Some equipment is being supplied by Britain on our account, but the disbursement is being charged against us.

Now to put it briefly, and perhaps epigrammatically, the point I want to insist on is this: that we are there as allies and not as vassals. I think the Canadian Government should make it perfectly clear to the Canadian people that our men in Europe are under our control, not in relation to matters of promotion, because I quite agree with what the Prime Minister says that it would be ridiculous from three thousand miles away for us to endeavour to determine who should have promotion, but surely our men are under our control to this extent—that if there should be a disaster, or something should occur that the Canadian Government thought occurred from mismanagement abroad, we, as a Canadian Parliament, would have the right to ask the Canadian Government for an explanation, and the Government would be obliged to lay that explanation on the Table of this House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: And I resent a little the position that apparently has been taken, if the memorandum which I have just read is correct, because it seems to imply that we have no fullness of control over the Canadian army. That I think the Government should insist upon, and I believe the Canadian people will support them in that insistence.

Major-General MEWBURN: In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston regarding the furlough granted to some men of the First Canadian Contingent, I might say that the matter was taken up last summer to see if some of the men could be brought back. Again last fall, after Sir Edward Kemp went to England, there was some correspondence on the subject. Negotiations went on for some time, and we finally, after a great deal of effort, arranged to get the married men of the

First Contingent, who had families in Canada, three months furlough in this country. The Australian and New Zealand Governments endeavoured to make the same arrangement, but were not successful. These men were given three months furlough to Canada on the understanding, as any soldier who is granted a furlough knows, that it is his duty as a soldier to return when that furlough expires.

Sir SAM HUGHES: With whom was that arrangement made?

Major-General MEWBURN: The arrangement was made, starting with the Overseas Minister of Militia in London, England. It was taken up by the corps commander in France, and everybody knows that that officer is the supreme authority in the field over the men under him. General Currie took the matter into consideration, and it became a question whether he could afford to allow all these men to leave the front in view of the difficulty of replacing them by experienced soldiers. The idea was that when the first soldiers who had been granted furlough returned, additional men would be given the privilege; it was simply a matter of keeping faith with the men that were left at the front in the hope that it would be possible for them to enjoy a similar furlough. The War Office had nothing whatever to do with the matter; it was a question for the corps commander of the whole British force, of which the Canadian corps is an integral part, to deal with. Well, the condition was as I have described; it was a case to be dealt with by Sir Douglas Haig, who was Commander in Chief of the British forces in France, including not only the British army but the military forces from the Overseas Dominions—what we look upon as the British army. The forces are entirely under Field Marshal Haig's control; he has the right to say whether a man can be allowed to go on furlough, or be given any other privilege, and his power is absolute.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who is the army commander over the Canadians to-day?

Major-General MEWBURN: Do you mean since General Byng left? Our men are directly under General Currie.

Sir SAM HUGHES: General Currie is only the corps commander, who is the army commander?

Major-General MEWBURN: I could not state offhand. However, to continue, these men did get leave, and it has been a very big problem to know exactly what to do in the matter. My hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) knows of the large number of men that were brought back from the front since 1914. —officers on leave, and men on furlough— whose leave or furlough was extended from time to time, and of others who were permitted to remain in Canada. In this particular instance it is a very great hardship when these men come out here, these married men, to force them to go back at the expiration of their furlough, but I am glad to say there have been very few cases of men refusing to go back. When these men return to England before their furlough has expired, under our new organization, they are taken into one of the depot battalions in the district to which they go until the expiration of their furlough. A large number of the men of the First Contingent have returned to England before their furlough was up. In fact one of our good soldiers from the Emerald Isle, who went back before his furlough was up, when asked why he went back before he had to go, said he had been in a good many fights in which there was always a policeman to stop him, but in this case there was no policeman, and he desired to get back before the fighting was over. No doubt this is the view of a good many of our men. The Government, of course, has power to say whether these men of the First Contingent shall be discharged, or whether they shall remain and continue on military duty in Canada. We can take that action if we so desire. It is not a question of any action by the War Office, who have nothing to do with it; it is a matter of keeping faith with the men still at the front, and of having those who received a furlough go back when that furlough expires.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: How many men are there altogether.

Major-General MEWBURN: Altogether I think about nine hundred, a large number have already gone back.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): In view of the statement of the Minister of Militia that the General in command of the forces in the field has supreme authority over our men and their movement, this would be an opportune time to call attention to several incidents which occurred during the recent general election, when a number of colonels and lieutenant-colonels were apparently ordered to come to Canada to conduct political contests. My own opponent in South Renfrew was a lieutenant-colonel in the construction battalion. I heard that officer himself state

on the platform on several occasions that he was ordered home from France, or ordered by cable to report from France in London, and that when he arrived in London he was ordered to return to Canada to enter the contest in South Renfrew. I would like to know from the Minister of Militia upon whose authority Lieutenant Colonel Martin returned from France to London, and by whose authority that officer returned from London to Canada to enter the political contest in South Renfrew? I understand that this is only one case in a hundred of the kind. I understand that many colonels were ordered back from France in order to enter the contest during the last election, in various constituencies throughout the Dominion. Was that in the interest of the army in France? Was it by authority of the Minister of Militia that these colonels were ordered home to enter political contests, or was it by the permission of the general in supreme command of the British army in France?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it is pretty well understood both in this country and in Great Britain that where a man who is serving in the army is called upon to become a candidate in a constituency, he is granted leave of absence for the purpose——

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know of no reason why men who have served their country at the front should not be elected to this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If there is any good reason why they should not become candidates after they have performed a patriotic duty to their country perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pedlow) will tell us what it is. I think it was entirely proper that men, whether on one side of politics or the other, who might be desired as candidates in any constituency in Canada, and who were serving their country at the front, should be given the opportunity. So far as I am concerned I am prepared to take full responsibility for Colonel Martin, or for any one else, who has been brought back to this country for that purpose.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Colonel Martin was not ordered back.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I should think he would get leave of absence.

Mr. PEDLOW: The point I have raised has been missed, I think.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the point.

Mr. PEDLOW: The question I asked was who was responsible for ordering Colonel Martin back from the front, and by whose authority did he return from the front? Was it at his own personal request that he returned, or was it at the request of some one in Canada? My information is that Colonel Martin knew nothing whatever about why he was being called from France until he got to London. I heard him say it himself, that he was ordered from France to London, and until he reached London he did not know why he was wanted there. When he reached London he was ordered back to Canada to enter into the political contest. Now, I have no fault to find with military men entering politics in this country. I think they have every right to do so. But I do want to know by whose authority these men were ordered back from France—

Mr. MURPHY: When they did not have the disposition to enter the contest themselves.

Mr. PEDLOW: Col. Martin made the statement on every platform in the campaign that he knew nothing whatever as to the reason for which he was ordered from France to London until he reached London.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should be very much surprised to learn that any coercion was exercised upon him in London for the purpose of forcing him to go to Canada to take part in the election. As a matter of fact, I have no doubt whatever but that leave of absence was asked for in the ordinary way, and he obtained it, just as any other man would under the same circumstances.

Mr. PEDLOW: But the right hon. gentleman will make it more clear, if he will state distinctly by whose authority Col. Martin was ordered home. I know myself from his own lips. In my own hearing at a political gathering Colonel Martin stated distinctly that he was ordered from France to report in London. I have a letter from him in my own possession indicating that he knew nothing whatever about his being required to enter the contest here. As a matter of fact, the letter I have from Col. Martin is dated two weeks after his election address was dated and inserted in the papers of this country. My point is this: that Col. Martin was brought back regardless of his wishes or desires in the case. Now, I want to know from those having charge of the Military Service of

the country, by whose authority were these colonels—I only mention Col. Martin as an instance; there were others—brought home to enter the political contest? The same question will apply to a number of others.

Major-General MEWBURN: In reply to the hon. gentleman, I will state, as Minister of Militia and Defence, that I gave no order to bring Colonel Martin back. I issued no order, or made no request, directly or indirectly, asking any officer to return from the front or from England. I had no knowledge of it. There was no order issued from my department ordering any person back from the front.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to ask the minister by whose authority do these men move?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The spirit moves them.

Mr. PEDLOW: Well, "spirits" have been moved from the province of Ontario by Order in Council, so we cannot deal with them any more in this section of Canada. But I would like to know by whose authority Colonel Martin came back. He protests he had nothing to do with it himself. I believe Colonel Martin when he makes the statement that he did not enter the contest of his own volition. As a matter of fact, his entry into the contest was announced two weeks before he knew it himself.

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Chairman, the matter is quite clear——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Of course.

Mr. CURRIE: Possibly Colonel Martin would have had better success in the riding if he had remained abroad. The facts are these: the duty that a man has to perform is the duty his senior officer asks him to perform. From the time of Cromwell, no military authority has the right to prevent any man from attending to his duties as a candidate for Parliament, or as a member of Parliament. That is a matter of privilege. And, no doubt, as soon as Col. Martin was nominated for Parliament, it would naturally, following the ancient British custom, be the duty of his commanding officer, the corps commander, to notify him and tell him that he had to go home, and to order him home. Of course, if he wished to be relieved from that order, he could do so. But he had a perfect right to come here, and no military authority could stop him, once he became a candidate. I stand up for the privileges of the members of this House. I say there are members on the other side of the House who came home to attend to their parliamentary duties, and to run in the elections. There is nothing wrong about that. A man's supreme duty, over and above his duty in the war, is his duty to be here to see that this Parliament carries on the war, to see that it does its duty to the war. And if Colonel Martin happened to be so unfortunate as to run against the hon. member, and be defeated, I am sorry for him, and also that the people of South Renfrew did not know enough to send a soldier from the trenches to represent them here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PEDLOW: In reply to the hon. member from Simcoe, I beg to inform him and the House that we are not dealing with ancient history. Thank Heaven, men like Cromwell have nothing to do with the management of the military or governmental affairs of the present day. The member for Simcoe made the statement that, if a military man, doing his duty on the field of battle, had been nominated for a constituency in this country, he has a perfect right to return and enter the contest if he so chooses. I heartily agree with that statement; I have no fault to find with a statement of that kind. But, in this case, the facts are altogether different, as the hon. member for Simcoe will understand, if he will listen to me intelligently. Colonel Martin was not nominated for the constituency of South Renfrew until three minutes before the closing of the hour for receiving nominations. Nor did Colonel Martin receive the endorsation of the Unionist convention, when that convention was regularly called for the purpose of selecting a candidate to contest the riding. I can assure the hon. member for Simcoe that the people of South Renfrew have no regrets to offer to themselves or to this country for the selection they have made.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PEDLOW: I can assure the hon. member for Simcoe that neither he nor any other member in this House, especially to the right of the Chairman, need shed crocodile tears over the result.

Mr. MURPHY: Perhaps the hon. member will say who did receive the Unionist nomination and what became of him.

Mr. PEDLOW: If the House will bear with me, I will, perhaps, enlighten hon. gentlemen on the subject of the circumstances surrounding the nomination in South Renfrew.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am quite willing that the hon. member should give the facts connected with the candidature of this military officer in the election of South Renfrew. But anything connected with the civilian candidates who took part in the election I do not think would be quite in order.

Mr. MURPHY: He is not going to do that; he is going to tell why Colonel Martin did not take part.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is not relevant to a discussion of the War Vote.

Mr. PEDLOW: In view of what has been said on the subject, it is necessary that I should go into the history of that nomination, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall cover the ground as briefly and as concisely as possible. At the regular convention called for the purpose of selecting a candidate——

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this discussion is not relevant to the consideration of a vote for $500,000,000 to carry on this war.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The subject was introduced by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie).

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest that the thing be settled by the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) delivering some of the speches he made on the hustings.

Mr. MURPHY: I delivered only one.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, give us that.

Mr. MANION: Generally speaking, when a man serving at the front goes back to England, on political business or otherwise, he does so not under orders from this side, but after making application to his commanding officer for leave. In the case of Colonel Martin, the officer to whom such application should be made would be the Brigadier-General, who would put the matter before the divisional commander or higher officer. I understood from Colonel Martin's own lips that he was at the front a year. I assume that he asked to get leave to go to England. I do not think that the militia on this side should be held responsible for an officer's return in a case of this kind, in view of the fact that application has to be made to the superior officer on the other side for leave.

Mr. PEDLOW: Colonel Martin did not ask to be returned from the front in order to enter the contest; he was ordered—that is his statement,—to report in London, and when he reached London he was ordered to Canada. I think this committee has a right to know who issued these orders.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was he brought over in bonds?

Mr. PEDLOW: His bonds were that he should enter the contest in South Renfrew, and that bond was doubtless negotiated before he left for the front. The member for Fort William (Mr Manion) has said that Colonel Martin was at the front twelve months. I know, as a matter of fact, that not more than four months elapsed from the time he left Canada until he returned.

Mr. CURRIE: That is more than you were.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am not of age. I assure the hon. member that I have done as much for the cause of Empire and of our Allies in the present war as he has done. I take second place to no man within the four walls of this building in that regard. I am not at the front, because the military regulations prevent my being there. I have done as much as any man in this building in proportion to my ability, and a good deal more, both in money and in work, than most members of the House.

Mr. MANION: I did not state that Colonel Martin was at the front a year; I said that he himself told me he was at the front a year.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: I am posted on the Colonel Martin incident; I have talked it over with him fully and very often. Certain mails and cablegrams were despatched to a party in London, addressed to Colonel Martin.

Mr. PEDLOW: By whom were those cablegrams sent?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) has the floor.

Mr. H J. MACKIE: To save time I may say that cablegrams were sent to London, and a friend of Colonel Martin's in London cabled him in France asking him to obtain leave and to go to London, which he did. He was not by any means ordered.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Minister of Militia has more power than he thinks with relation to the Canadian troops. Under section 177 of the Army Act, soldiers in the Canadian service who are paid by the Dominion of Canada, including those in

the fighting line—excepting the commander in chief in the field—are under the control of the Canadian Government.

Major-General MEWBURN: I was referring only to the men of the first contingent who were here on leave. The question was, whether we had power to discharge them here, or permit them to remain on this side.

Mr. COCKSHUTT We are voting a large sum of money for war purposes. I do not know where it is coming from but I assume it will be raised by loans. What I am especially interested in, however, is how this money is to be paid out. I represent a constituency that has sent a good many men to the front, and a great many cases of deferred payments have been brought to my attention. I assume that every member of the House has had the same experience. The matter of assigned pay and separation allowance may seem to be one of detail as compared with the large question of the management of our armies, but it is very important that the wives and mothers of the boys who have gone overseas should receive these payments promptly. There would appear to be too much delay in the distribution of assigned pay and separation allowance. I am not holding the minister responsible; he no doubt is making the best of a difficult situation. But I know of many cases in which payments have been delayed three, four, even six months, and I do think that an effort should be made to distribute this money more promptly. The assurance is always given: "the Government of Canada owes you this money, so you will be sure to get it." But that does not pay grocery bills or other liabilities that may accumulate. Moreover, that spirit is altogether too evident in matters dealt with by departments of the Government generally. My idea is that payments made by the Government should be just as promptly attended to as are collections for Government purposes. If the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments demand cash on the spot for goods received, the Government should exercise the same principle in making payments; they should discharge their obligation just as promptly as the individual is expected to discharge his to the Government. There is a tendency in many of the departments—the Militia is not the only offender in this respect—to delay payments unduly, and many private individuals suffer from time to time as a result. I speak on behalf of the returned soldiers, men who are wounded, men who are depending upon their military pay, when I urge that the payments to which I have referred be expedited to the greatest possible extent; that they be distributed whenever they fall due. I have no doubt the minister can assure me that improvement will be effected in the near future, as improvement is being made even now to a certain extent.

Major-General MEWBURN: I not only say it will be improved, but I can honestly say that it has been improved 90 per cent during the last two or three months. I made a statement in the House about a week ago with regard to the assigned pay and separation allowance branch, which pays out about $5,000,000 a month in separation allowance and assigned pay. I do not take credit for the improvement that has been effected; I want to give credit where credit is due. There has been a great deal of difficulty in that branch; many mistakes were made—there is no use denying it. But I can also say that during the last two or three months there have been very few complaints that the women have not received their cheques promptly.

The officer whom I have in charge there, Major Stiff, at my earnest solicitation, took that position temporarily, so that he might re-organize the department. He is anxious to get back to his own business. He has been overseas. He is a man of the highest standard in accounting and in business generally. He has surrounded himself with efficient help, and if any hon. gentleman in this House could spare ten or fifteen minutes, or even half an hour, to go through the offices of the separation allowance and assigned pay branch with Major Stiff, it would be an object lesson to him to see what has been and is being accomplished and the enormous quantity of work that is being done. I would appreciate it if any hon. gentleman would take the trouble to go through those offices, because hon. gentlemen receive letters from many of their constituents who have soldier relatives overseas, and we welcome any information in regard to delays. We are there for the purpose of straightening out any complaints. That branch has a big responsibility, as have many others, and I believe if any hon. gentleman would go through it with Major Stiff, he would get an eye opener.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yesterday, I had occasion to go down to the separation allowance and assigned pay office on behalf of a lady who lives in the northern part of my constituency and who had not received

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

her separation allowance cheque for over two months. The probable reason for the delay in her case is that when a soldier goes overseas, separation allowance cheques are paid from the Ottawa office, and when the soldier returns from overseas the cheques are paid from the military district in which he is located. I have on two or three occasions visited the separation allowance and assigned pay office, and I have been very greatly impressed, not only with the enormous quantity of work which is being carried on there, but with the earnestness and efficiency evidenced. Yesterday morning, when I called at the office, I failed to obtain an interview with Major Stiff. His assistant was not in at the time, but a young lady stepped up to the counter. I told her what I wanted, showing her the letter I had received from this person in my constituency, and she took hold of the matter in a very businesslike way. She was a very bright and intelligent young lady. In the afternoon I received a communication from the office showing that they had taken vigorous steps to have the matter rectified.

In regard to this vast amount of money and how it is to be expended, I want to mention just one case as an illustration of the way in which I think money for military purposes is not being properly expended, or is, in a sense, being misappropriated. In the Department of Justice there is an official who acts as purchasing agent for the penitentiaries, and who has been receiving for that work a salary of $3,300 a year. From all I can learn, I believe he is quite an efficient man. I understand, however, that in addition to acting as purchasing agent for the penitentiaries, he was required to act as purchasing agent for the internment camps.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where is that officer?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know where he is—somewhere in Canada, I presume. His name is Dillon, and he is purchasing agent for the penitentiaries. I presume his head office is in the city of Ottawa; I do not know the street number. The hon. member can get the information by applying to headquarters. I do not know that the work of purchasing supplies for the internment camps added very materially to his other work, but if it did, it seems to me the proper way to deal with the matter would be for the Government to inform the House, and if this gentleman is not receiving as large a salary as he should receive, then his salary should be increased. Instead of that course being pursued, the very roundabout method was adopted of saying: This can be very easily fixed; we want to increase your salary; we shall simply make you a captain and give you a captain's pay. His salary was boosted from $3,300 to over $5,000 by the simple expedient of making him a captain.

An hon. MEMBER: Captain of what?

Mr. EDWARDS: Captain of the Lord knows what. I do not know what.

Mr. POWER: He must be the only captain who draws as much pay as that. I can assure my hon. friend a captain's pay is not as large as that.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it not eighteen hundred and some odd dollars?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps he is an honorary captain.

Mr. EDWARDS: If he holds the rank of honorary captain, one thing is quite certain, that if my hon. friend had been Minister of Militia at the time, Mr. Dillon would not have been given that rank; he would have been made an honorary colonel. My hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) was in the habit of making one batch of honorary colonels before breakfast and if his food agreed with him, another batch after breakfast.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was very particular in the matter of selecting men for the rank of honorary colonel.

Mr. EDWARDS: I cannot agree with my hon. friend in that respect. There are many military matters in which I do not think my hon. friend has been particular, and not only in regard to appointing honorary colonels but also some who were neither honorary nor honored. The ex-Minister of Militia says that he has a high and lofty regard for a certain man who holds the rank of colonel down in the province of Quebec. As to my hon. friend's regard for that colonel—well, the sky is the limit, it is so high. I refer to Colonel Lavergne, and the first article in Colonel Lavergne's political belief is that this country shall do absolutely nothing to help Britain in this or in any other war. Nevertheless, he was one of the colonels who retained his rank all the time my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) held the office of Minister of Militia.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I rise to a question of privilege? Armand Lavergne was not a colonel all the time that I was

minister. He took his training, and then I made him a colonel. I did not make him an honorary colonel. I may say here again, that I have nothing to retract in regard to what I said about Colonel Lavergne. He has performed all the duties that have been assigned to him. He was ready to go voluntarily if certain conditions were complied with. It is due to Colonel Lavergne that my hon. friend sits on the right side of the Speaker to-day.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend permit me a remark?

The CHAIRMAN: Order

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member who is addressing the committee at the present moment does not owe his position in this House to Colonel Lavergne nor to the efforts of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said "on the right side."

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not so much concerned as regards the opinion which the hon. member has of Colonel Lavergne, nor do I think the country will be very much concerned about that, because Colonel Lavergne is not the only one of doubtful character who has been championed in this House and out of it by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton. There have been men who have cut large swaths in the business life of this country and who have been anxious to make use of this war to line their pockets, and who have been championed by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Col. J. Wesley Allison—and I am just as proud of him as I ever was and I am not going back on Lavergne.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend must have some little conscience left that he catches on so readily to my allusion. However, he has a perfect right to be proud of anybody he likes. Col. J. Wesley Allison was at one time an honorary colonel, but I believe his rank was stripped from him for some reason or another. He was made an honorary colonel by my hon. friend, along with a great many others of like doubtful character and service to this country. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton may be proud of him, and proud to act as champion of Armand Lavergne, who says that his first article of political faith is that this country shall do absolutely nothing in the war. I wish him joy of his views along that line. As regards Col. Lavergne's desire to get overseas, who had a cable on him keeping him on this side of the water?

Some reference has been made by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) to interference in the handling of men overseas. I would ask those hon. gentlemen who are a little scared that this blessed autonomy of ours which so frequently crops up will be interfered with by something or other done over the water: what in Heaven's name has Great Britain ever done that we cannot trust her? When has she ever tried to put the shackles on this country, that some person is always getting up and saying we must keep the power in our own hands and not let the control be over there. Such a declaration always brings a round of applause from some hon. gentlemen, particularly from those on the other side of the House, who have never distinguished themselves by doing anything for Great Britain or Canada. That is the situation. What have the officers in this country connected with our militia ever done to make us think we could better rely on their judgment than on the judgment of the men who are handling the situation overseas? What has my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) ever done in the past that we should take his opinion on matters overseas, in preference to the opinion of the men handling the situation over there? Where has he buried his dead? Where is his private cemetery? If we had a man in Canada, including my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton, big enough in a military sense to go overseas and make his bigness felt, not only England but every one of the Allied nations would be only too glad to place him in supreme command, and the men of England and the men of France would take their orders from him without any fear of losing their autonomy. I am sick and tired of this cheeseparing in regard to what they do over in England and at the front in regard to our Canadian troops. England and France appreciate every effort that has been made by this country in the war, and they have no idea other than to be absolutely fair and just to the men who left our shores to help them in the fight. And it ill becomes us in this House to say anything which in the least savours of a reflection upon those across the water who have charge of the conduct of this war, and especially in connection with their treatment of our Canadian troops.

5 p.m.

Mr. CURRIE: To revert to the subject of the returned soldier, I know a number, in fact, virtually all, of the married men remaining of the First Division who are home on furlough; there are about 800 of them altogether. These men who have served in the trenches for over three years have been allowed to come back and see their wives and children, but I understand in a number of cases the ships they came over on were delayed in England on account of submarines to such an extent that some of the men have only had a week at home. I would appeal to the minister to extend the leave of all these men in this country by thirty days, and also to give them a medical board before they go back, so that we shall be sure we are not sending cripples to the front. They should at least be allowed a full month at home with their wives and families. There are not so many of them that it would cause any great difficulty. I know I am asking this in the face of a great battle in which our men may become engaged, but I understand a number of these returned men were in billets in England for a few days or weeks before they left. So I think I might ask the minister to soften his heart a little, and if he does, I am sure the cause of the allies will not suffer, because every one of these men has his heart in the war and is anxious to go back. I think it is only fair they should be given the full leave they have been deprived of by the submarine menace.

Major-General MEWBURN Arrangements have already been made for giving these men a medical board before returning, and an effort has already been made to have extended the furlough of those who were delayed in coming across.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: The other evening I promised that when the militia estimates were under consideration I would make a statement as to the duties of the Director of Public Information and the work he is carrying on. As his salary will be paid out of the war appropriation, this is probably a suitable time to make the statement. The work of the Director of Public Information, on the limited scale applicable to Canada, is similar in character to that being carried on by the Bureau of Public Information in the United States, and to the Ministry of Information in Great Britain. As the hon. members of the House are aware, in all the countries at war there are departments that deal with dissemination of information relating to the war among their own people, as well as branches of the service dealing with propaganda abroad, and the idea back of the creation of this directorship of public information in Canada was exactly the same. If we are to sustain the spirit of the people; if through the long and trying years of this struggle we are to retain their continued interest and enthusiasm in supporting the war effort of the country, we must endeavour to supply them with the fullest possible information in connection with the conduct of the war. One of the primary objects in creating this branch of the public service was to supply still fuller information to the people of Canada in reference to the progress of the war and Canada's participation in it. There has also been placed under the charge of the Director of Public Information the publication of the Canadian Daily Record for our troops overseas. This paper is edited and conducted by returned officers who have served at the front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who is the head of this department?

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Nichols.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Late of the Montreal Daily Mail?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. Capt. Wallace is in actual charge of the publication of the Daily Record.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not our hon. friend from West York?

Mr. ROWELL: No, he is a newspaper man who has served overseas and is now back in Canada. The information is cabled over and the Daily Record is published for the information of the men in the trenches. News which would interest the men at the front is being supplied every day. I am informed that in so far as the supplying of home news is concerned, the Daily Record is recognized as being the best publication going to any of the troops overseas. The arrangements for the publication of the Daily Record and its supervision were placed under the direction of the Director of Public Information in January or February of this year. I am sure the members of the House will all agree that it is a wise thing that the men overseas should be kept in touch with what is going on in Canada, that they should have the news from Canada and that the home ties should be maintained through such a publication.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How many words are sent daily?

Mr. ROWELL: From 1,000 to 1,500 words of the general news of Canada are cabled daily.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is this the Record from which were omitted the names of certain soldiers who were candidates in the last election?

Mr. ROWELL: I have no knowledge of that matter. The supervision of the Record came under the charge of the Director of Public Information in January or February of the present year, some time after the election, and I have no knowledge of conditions prior to that time. The paper is printed in London and is despatched to the soldiers overseas. I suppose most of the members have seen this paper; it is a small publication of four pages. The Director of Public Information is also responsible for seeing that news which the Government receives in connection with the war and which can properly be made public reaches the press of the country.

Mr. ROSS: I understand that this Record was published before January. Under whose charge was it published before that time?

Mr. ROWELL: The news was being supplied by officers of the militia; I presume under the Militia Department. It was published in London, the information being sent from Canada. In addition, the Director of Public Information is responsible for seeing that news of important decisions of the Government, particularly relating to the war, reaches the public press. In the ordinary course, information as to the important acts of the Government, in the great majority of cases, is communicated direct to the press either by the Prime Minister or the ministers in charge of the different departments. But, it is the duty of the Director of Public Information to keep in touch with the various departments and to see that their important acts are communicated to the press. One of the difficulties of all ministers, and of departmental officers, is that there is such a pressure upon their time and attention, especially during a period of stress like this, that not sufficient attention is given to communicating to the public news of importance. The public is entitled to the fullest possible information as to what is being done by the Government, in order that it may be kept in touch with the situation. That is an important phase of the work which must be developed as time goes on.

Mr. POWER: Are the advertisements which appear in the Record paid for?

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot say as to that. It is published in England. All we are responsible for here is sending over the news.

Mr. POWER: Are you responsible for the advertisements published in it? For a period of about three weeks previous to the election, the Daily Record was plastered with advertisements asking the soldiers to vote against the friends of the Kaiser. Were these paid for, and, if so, by whom?

Mr. ROWELL: The Record was not under the control of the Director of Public Information at that time, and I have no knowledge of the matters to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. POWER: Under whose control was it?

Mr. ROWELL: It was published in England.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Power) if he has any objection to the advertisement to which he has referred?

Mr. POWER: I have an objection to the manner in which the words were used, and I have a grave objection to pointing out the people on this side of the House as being friends of the Kaiser. I have, as well, a particular objection to the members of the Government, who were candidates at that time, treating their opponents as such.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is there a complete file of that publication in the reading room of the House? If not, I think it would be wise to keep a complete file of the paper so that it would be available for reference, and so that we could check up the matters appearing in it.

Mr. ROWELL: I will make inquiries as to the point about which the hon. gentleman asks. I do not know whether there is a file or not. I have no doubt there is a file in the department of the publication since it came under the charge of the Director of Public Information.

I propose now to speak of the propaganda work of the Director of Public Information. The members of the House would not expect me to go into matters of detail in connection with the question of propaganda outside our own country. Yet, I am sure, they will recognize that there are conditions under which it might be desirable that Canada's war efforts, and what we are doing in this country, should be made known outside of Canada. We are one of the allied nations and it is important that

the facts in connection with our participation in the war should be kept before other peoples as well as our own. That is becoming increasingly important in connection with our relations with our neighbours to the south. This is a matter which comes under the charge of the Director of Public Information. He is in touch with the American Committee of Public Information and they are rendering help and assistance to each other. He is also in touch with the British Ministry of Information and arrangements have been made for co-operation between the British Ministry of Information and the Director of Public Information here. They are placing at our disposal much of the literature which has been published there insofar as we desire to use it in Canada. Many pamphlets, of very great value, dealing with certain war conditions in Europe have been placed at our disposal for use and distribution in Canada. That arrangement was made only recently.

There is another aspect of the work of the department to which I would like to draw attention and that is what is known as the War Lecture Bureau, or what might be described as oral propaganda. I am sure we realize the invaluable service which the press of Canada has rendered during this war in placing before the people of Canada the facts in connection with the war and in sustaining the spirit of the people during the whole course of the struggle.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it in recognition of the splendid services of the press of this country in stimulating recruiting that hundreds of dollars have been paid out to Le Devoir for Government advertising?

Mr. ROWELL: The advertisements that have been printed in the newspaper to which my hon. friend refers do not come under the cognizance of my department, and, therefore, I cannot give my hon. friend the information he desires.

I was going on to say that we all recognize the value of the press, but nothing will fully take the place of the oral appeal, the living voice in appeal, to the people in connection with the war, and in communicating to them the facts bearing on the war. That has been one of the most important developments in the work of the Bureau of Public Information in the United States, and of the Ministry of Information in Great Britain. In both those countries they have organized volunteer speakers, who discuss the varying issues and phases of the war before the people in order that the whole nation may, so far as is practicable, be kept in the most vital touch, not only with the war situation, but with the efforts of the nation itself in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the personnel of the Bureau?

Mr. ROWELL: It consists of a travelling secretary, who is organizing these voluntary groups or associations in the various cities and towns. The workers are all volunteers throughout the cities, towns and rural sections of Canada. There is also an official who assists in the office with the work of this bureau, as well as with the press work.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What are the names of the officers who assist in the work here? I may as well confess that I am suspicious of the entire outfit.

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot help my hon. friend's suspicions; I can only state the facts.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like to get their names.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Frank Yeigh, of Toronto, is the organizing secretary of the War Lecture Bureau throughout the country, and Mr. LeSueur is associated with Mr. Nichols in the office. He assists not only in the work of the War Lecture Bureau, but also in the work for the press.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is he a son of the former secretary of the Post Office Department, the late Mr. LeSueur?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know the position of Mr. LeSueur's father, but this gentleman was identified with Y.M.C.A. work before he entered upon his present duties.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think he is the son of the late Mr. LeSueur of the Post Office Department, who died a year or so ago, and who was a member of the Royal Society of Canada.

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot say as to that, I would be very glad to give my hon. friend the information if I had it.

The procedure adopted in connection with the War Lecture Bureau is to distribute a weekly bulletin containing information and material for speakers. This information goes to the clergymen of all denominations throughout Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It goes to public school inspectors, to school teachers, and to all volunteer speakers in connection with the War Lecture Bureau's work. I understand

that one hundred and fifty localities have been organized throughout Canada with speakers who undertake to give short talks, on the themes suggested for them, in moving picture shows, theatres, Canadian clubs, and societies of all sorts; the object being to reach the people in this way with the living voice through pulpit, school, theatre and club.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask, is this work along the same lines as that of the committee of one hundred sanctimonious gentlemen organized in Ontario as a general committee, with branches in every county in the province? Is this work along the same lines, and is it to be utilized for political purposes?

Mr. ROWELL: No, my hon. friend is quite in error. This bureau has nothing whatever to do with the committee to which he refers. Its work is just as I have explained. Perhaps I could not better define the work than by reading what President Falconer, of Toronto University, who is chairman of the advisory committee, has said. In a communication which I received from him in reference to the work, he states:

> Since the beginning of December leaflets have been issued at frequent and fairly regular intervals dealing with themes which we thought would stimulate the mind of the people and give them useful information in regard to the war. These leaflets have gone to all the clergy of Canada, and to a large number of teachers.

I have already stated that in some 150 localities between the Atlantic and the Pacific, these local committees have been organized in the object of securing volunteer speakers who attend at the places which I have mentioned where they have the opportunity of addressing what they describe as really great audiences.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Can they get audiences to turn out to hear this sort of stuff?

Mr. ROWELL: They do apparently, surprised as the hon. gentleman may be, and apparently the audiences enjoy it; I have a great many letters to that effect. However, this is what president Falconer says:

> The experience of these months has demonstrated that there is a wide field of usefulness for such work. We know that both the army at the front and the Government at home depend to a great extent upon the moral quality of the country. That quality is undoubtedly good, but under the severe strain which we are suffering at present endurance may flag unless it is stimulated. Courage and patience are needed in these critical months. The people must be informed and stimulated by telling them facts that will strengthen their resolution by keeping before them regularly the purposes of the war, by cheering them as to the accounts of its progress, or in times of darkness by buoying them up with hope, and by setting before them the plans of the Government which will contribute to the winning of the war. The hearts of the people must be kept high. Of course the debt that is owed to the newspapers is enormous, but there is need also of the spoken utterance, of the direct appeal to the people supported and authorized by the Government. We know what President Wilson has done in the United States and that Britain has appointed a Director of Propaganda. To this there are two sides, the press and organized public address.

President Falconer, and other men of like outstanding position in Canada, are freely giving voluntarily of their time and their ability to carry on this propaganda at home in order that the spirit of the Canadian people may be sustained clear and strong through these days of stress and struggle.

In order that my hon. friend may have some idea of the weekly bulletins which are sent out, let me draw attention to the last number issued in which the subject is headed, "A Lesson from the Napoleonic Wars." If any hon. gentleman wish to read this bulletin I shall be glad to have them furnished with copies. I venture to think they will not find anywhere a better summary of the critical situation which existed during the Napoleonic wars, and of the position which Great Britain had to face at that time, vastly more serious than that which she faces to-day. A message of courage and cheer such as this bulletin contains must necessarily be very helpful at the present time, and will reach thousands of people throughout Canada in a direct and effective way through the volunteer speakers of the War Lecture Bureau.

This particular article was prepared by one of the best known professors of history in Canada who is glad to give his time and ability to this work.

The work of this department commands the confidence and support of patriotic citizens all over the country, who are deeply interested in the success of Canada in the war and in sustaining the spirit of the Canadian people. My hon. friend wishes to know how it is appreciated by the clergy. All over Canada, the clergy of all denominations have expressed appreciation of these statements sent to them, giving them information in connection with the war and subjects bearing directly upon the war. I have here page after page of letters which have been received from clergymen all over Canada, expressing their appreciation of these bulletins. Among the thousands of letters, I have one from Rev. Charles E.

Coughlin, of Assumption College, Sandwich, Ontario, who wrote to the Bureau the following letter:

> May I state that I am firmly convinced of the necessity of prosecuting the war with undiminished vigour. This conviction is based not only on patriotic premises but also on the religious principles which I as a Catholic Priest approve. Whenever I have an opportunity to address my fellow citizens or co-religionists, be assured that I shall endeavour to inspire them with the "Win-the-War" spirit.

We also have letters from men like Principal Dyde, of Robertson College, Edmonton, who says:

> You address willing ears. I am willing to do all in my power in pulpit and platform and will place myself at the disposal of any committee or council which is, or may be formed. This is without reserve.

If my hon. friends are interested, I have pages of extracts from letters from the foremost clergymen of all denominations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, thanking the bureau for sending them these weekly publications which they say contain valuable information. Man after man says that it should have been established before, that it helps them in presenting the facts to their congregations. Many clergymen living in out-of-the-way sections of the country, away from metropolitan centres, where the large papers do not circulate so freely, say that the information contained in these statements is of great value and that they use it Sunday after Sunday in presenting to their congregations the war situation and the demand upon our energies and resources which each day makes more urgent. I will not trouble the House with reading these communications unless my hon. friends wish to have some of their contents presented to them.

Mr. CANNON: Are those publications translated into French and circulated also in the province of Quebec?

Mr. ROWELL: They are.

Mr. CANNON: By whom, may I ask?

Mr. ROWELL: They are translated here at the office; I do not know who translates them. But all the clergymen in the province of Quebec receive these statements, and they are translated into French for the benefit of those who speak that language. And may I say here that the department will heartily welcome the co-operation of my hon. friends from Quebec in getting these subjects, which are so cordially received in the other provinces, just as cordially received in the province of Quebec. And if any hon. member of this House has any suggestions to make as to how the bureau can carry on its work more effectively in order to get the real facts of the war situation before all the Canadian people they will be most heartily welcomed. For I think we must all recognize that in all sections of Canada there are still some of the Canadian people who do not appreciate the real seriousness of the conflict in which we are engaged. Anything and everything the Government can do, it is its bounden duty to do, to get before the Canadian people the real issues of this war, the urgency of the present situation, and the necessity for Canada to throw her whole strength into the struggle. It is in order that we may do this more effectively that this bureau has been organized, and the limited staff, such as it is, has been created. That is, in brief, an outline of the general situation. If there is any further information hon. gentlemen desire I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. PEDLOW: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Devlin): I promised to see the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton next.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was on my feet when the hon. member who has just taken his seat concluded, to dispose of another issue; and as I may not have the privilege of being present to-night until late, I will take the occasion now. I want to say a few words regarding the position in which Colonel Armand Lavergne stands before the people of Canada. I hold no brief for Armand Lavergne. But I have had Armand Lavergne's speeches reported when other gentlemen did not; I have had him interviewed when other gentlemen have not. Armand Lavergne's speeches and actions have been accepted by the party to which I had the honour to belong in the election of 1911.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And through the exertions of Armand Lavergne and others of his ilk the Liberal Conservative party came into power, for the welfare of the country. I shall not enter into further details now. Armand Lavergne is an impulsive young fellow, the same as my good friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), and as your humble servant. On occasions, possibly, a little balance would do any one of us no harm. I have had reported Armand Lavergne's speech that I understand was made in Quebec on a certain occasion, with

the object of taking it up with the department if I could possibly find that he was using language that could be construed by any lawyer into being treasonable. I have not failed—and as to this the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will bear me out—to urge that, if there was any possibility of reaching him under the law, it should be done. So far as I am concerned, I have never yet found an occasion when he has uttered one treasonable word or one word that could be construed as any worse than lots of language that has been published in the Toronto Globe and other standard publications of that kind. I am devoid of prejudice in this matter. Because Armand Lavergne is a Frenchman is no reason why he should not have full justice. I have seen any number of these young French lads go over to the front and do splendid work there. And the trouble is not, as I view it—and I can speak ing frankly and fairly—because the French Canadian people are opposed to this war, but it is chiefly because of the influence of the ultramontane wing of the Roman church in the province of Quebec—not the old, broad, tolerant, Bleu or the progressive, steadfast Liberal, or the radical wing—that the idea has been disseminated, largely through the influence of Bourassa to whom every one bows, which have held up enlistments on the present occasion. I think that is the position. I have no corner to turn on the subject. And if my hon. friend from Frontenac has the evidence that he claims he has, his duty is clear, and complaint should be lodged against Armand Lavergne, and he should be arrested under the law and brought up for treason. So far as any personal references of the hon. gentleman to my association with Colonel J. Wesley Allison are concerned, I may say that history is already turning, the lane is being turned, and to-day J. Wesley Allison stands higher in the opinion of the British Government than do any of his detractors. He is consulted to-day by the British Government; he is of more assistance to-day to the British Government than all the gentlemen who have maligned him in this country or in the Empire.

He is of more importance in the eyes of the British officers to-day than are these gentlemen, or than any of them ever will be. The wheel of fortune, therefore, is taking a turn. I should not be surprised to see J. Wesley Allison a baronet if he keeps on.

As to the statement of my good friend the President of the Council, I will take the liberty of replying to it. In the first place,

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

I understand that the gentleman whom he has chosen for Director of Public Information is a half-brother to the Minister of Finance, and is the same gentleman who edited the Montreal Daily Mail and the Montreal Evening News, two papers which were started with the definite object of booming the Finance Minister to be Prime Minister of Canada, getting rid of a gentleman who, they claimed, had no backbone, and incidentally maligning your humble servant on any and every occasion. I could imagine from the line on which he conducted the paper that the gentleman in question could not expect to commend himself to a great many of the people of this country who held other views than those to which he gave utterance. I object to the principle with which my hon. friend has associated himself. I do not especially know the gentleman concerned, so I will not deal with that aspect of the matter. The thing is in harmony, however, with an organization which has been engineered, I understand, largely by the hon. gentleman himself—a very good organization, but it does not work—to go into the counties. For instance, I understand that the organization was to have a committee of a certain number of men—one hundred, I think—to work for a little time when people do not get their eyes open. People are connected in the city of Toronto with those in various other parts of the province, and when the button is touched, politics and all else swing into the line laid down by my good hon. friend. It was tried in my county, but it did not work. The people of that county were too well posted; we had preceded our friends with literature of another kind. All this solicitude may be good for the poor, innocent, ignorant people of the Dominion of Canada, but I have this faith and experience, that the good people living in the remote parts of the country are just as well posted on the causes of this war and how to carry it on as is the hon. gentleman who presides at the head of the Council, or many others of us who may think that we know it all and that these people do not know anything. There was one of those gentlemen who came into my riding. We took him out to the back part of the county to practise a little, and get his hand in, and he came back utterly amazed to think that the farmers could teach him many lessons in politics. The same thing may be found all throughout Canada. This attempted solicitude, this paternalism, this hypnotism, this chloroforming that is going on throughout Canada among the great masses of the people is,

to my mind, absolute nonsense. The people are fully alive to the situation—those who could be impressed by this sort of thing,—and those who are not impressed must be reached by the legislation which we are bringing up to-morrow, bringing them out by compulsion. I have listened, of course, with great pleasure, to the complimentary remarks made by clergymen. I can easily realize how clergymen in the country districts would gladly get this stuff and unload it on their congregations on Sunday. It would save them the trouble of preparing a sermon, and would therefore be a very handy thing to have. However, so far as the practical use of it is concerned, it does not run in my line of practicability.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened with a great deal of attention to the answer given to-day by the President of the Council to the objections which I urged the other evening against the appointment of Mr. Nichols. Much as we are indebted to the President of the Council for the elaborate explanation he has given, I still submit that a better choice could have been made; indeed, that the post was not needed at all. It is, shall I say a libel?—it is a libel on the press of this country to say that people in the far-away districts are not well informed, and that there must be a central bureau in Ottawa to impart to them information about the war. Mr. Chairman, I am a reader of the press; I was a member of the press in my younger days. I read the press of the United States. I read some of the papers published in England and in France, and that of the various provinces of Canada. I daresay that there are no better informed papers than those published in the large centres of Canada, and in the rural districts as well. On the question of the war, surely you can open any paper published in the rural sections of Canada and get just as much information as you will get in the daily press. From that point of view, therefore, I do not think the appointment was needed. As regards the personality of Mr. Nichols, I have this to say: Mr. Nichols never impressed me as a successful man in his own business. It is a well-known fact that he killed two newspapers in Montreal because he could not gather the support of the Conservative party in Montreal by reason of his attempting to destroy my hon. friend the then Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). He was also, I must tell my hon. friend, mixed up in a very questionable business, when with his business partner he attempted to expropriate for this Government that hotel in Montreal known as the Carslake hotel. He asked the Government something like $600,000 or $700,000 for this building, which really was not needed by the Government, because the Post Office Department had a lot at a stone's throw from the Carslake hotel—a lot which was vacant, and had been purchased when Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General. Nevertheless, by his intrigues, he succeeded in landing that Carslake hotel on the Public Works Department. He was ready to get something like $700,000 from the Government, but when the expropriation proceedings took place in Montreal it was found that the whole building and the whole lot were not worth more than $150,000 or $200,000. I read the other day the sheet which my hon. friend held in his hands a moment ago. What is said there about Napoleon and Wellington and the battle of Waterloo as compared with the present struggle—why, it has been published time and again since the beginning of the war. The Prime Minister two years ago, in his speech delivered in this House, used exactly the same parallel. You can find it in any third-class school history. In any back concession third-class school you will find that history of Waterloo and Wellington and Blucher and all the details about how many men were gathered there, and so on. Surely my hon. friend will not try to convince me that this is a chef d'oeuvre. I believe that to incur this expenditure is a pure waste of money, when the people of this country are straining every nerve to pay their tax bills, their income tax, and their customs dues. It is quite right to vote the money needed for the carrying on of the war, but when it comes to creating fat offices for men who have been failures in their business, that is another matter. I am told by the ex-Minister of Militia that not only is this organization for giving information to the public on the question of the war, but that it is really nothing else but politics.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I correct the hon. member? I did not say that. I asked if it was in harmony with a kindred organization formed in the province of Ontario some years ago whereby my hon. friend would get in touch with the better elements of the country along certain lines, and then when he wanted to use them politically all he had to do was to push the button and the thing would go. I want to know the names of the men on the committee formed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. minister can explain that himself. One aspect of the question which does not please me at all is that of the publication of the Record. In view of the huge amounts we shall, during this week, be called upon to vote, how can you expect, Sir—and I appeal especially to the Prime Minister—to have national unity in this country, when you ask the taxpayers of Canada, Liberals and Conservatives, to vote money for publications in which one-half of the people of Canada are being libelled and slandered? After the last election I received from my son, who was at Witley Camp, a bundle of those Records containing the vilest statements about my right hon. leader and about the French Canadian generally. Do you believe, Sir, that the publication of that Record is a national necessity? The elections are over. The Record did its work in the trenches in the last campaign. Drop it, for Heaven's sake; we do not want it any more. If you want to have the respect, the backing, of the country for the huge sums which you are asking us to vote and for the stringent measures which you are taking in order to make the Military Service Act more effective, for decency's sake do not ask the people who are being slandered and libelled to say " amen " to such nonsense.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should like very much to see the issues of the Record to which my hon. friend refers, and which, according to his conception, contained vile slanders upon the right hon. leader of the Opposition and upon French Canadians. They have never been brought to my attention. So far as this newspaper is concerned, I am not aware that any public money of Canada is paid out for its publication, except that which is expended in sending messages containing news from Canada for the men at the front. When the hon. gentleman talks about abolishing the Record, I should like to tell him that according to my information every man in the Canadian forces at the front would protest against the idea of abolishing the Record, because it is the chief means they have of getting home news from day to day. I think those who have served at the front will bear me out in that.

In regard to a question which was asked, I think, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), with respect to a list which appeared in the Daily Record of the candidates at the last election, I may say that that subject was brought to my attention some time ago by the War Veterans' Association, I think, and I made inquiry concerning it. The inquiry was made by the director of public information at my request. I sent for him and asked him to investigate. He has given me this memorandum in reply, and it is proper that the House should know it. This is a memorandum from Captain William Wallace, M.C., Officer in Charge for Canada, Canadian Daily Record, regarding publication of nomination list in the Canadian Daily Record:

On November 14, 1917, I received a cable from the Canadian War Records Office, London, asking me to see that a complete list of nomiations throughout Canada was sent overseas and to indicate the time it would be available so they could prepare for an enlarged issue.

I replied stating the Government was required by law to send a list of nominations overseas and that I was informed that the General Returning Officer would cable the list to Colonel Purney, c/o High Commissioner's Office, about November 20.

I suggested the list could be obtained from Col. Purney, my idea being to save cable tolls from this office. On November 15th I received a cable saying this arrangement would be satisfactory and that the Canadian War Records Office would arrange to get the list from Col. Purney.

Therefore, no official list of nominations was sent from this office.

When the question of the omission of certain names from the nomination list published in the Canadian Daily Record was brought up by the newspapers here, I cabled the Canadian War Records Office on February 27, 1918, asking if any explanation could be given why the names of McCormack, (Parkdale); Cockburn, (East York); McLaren, (West Hamilton); and Sutherland, (North Oxford), were not included in the nomination list published in the Canadian Daily Record on November 27th.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Was the name of Mr. Harry Cockshutt, of Brant, in the list?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am reading the memorandum. If my hon. friend will be good enough to withhold any questions until I get through with the memorandum I shall be pleased to answer them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The Prime Minister is reading the names.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am reading the names, and it would be well to have the whole thing in consecutive order:

The London office replied that the nomination list published in the issue of November 27th was exactly as received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, through the courtesy of Col. Purney in London. The reply also stated that a second nomination list containing additional names was published in a special edition on November 29th and that this list was received through the same channel. The cable also pointed out that the distribution of

the second list published on November 29th was exactly the same as the distribution of the first list published on November 27th.

On March 1st another cable was despatched from this office in order to ascertain positively if the names of the four soldier candidates were published on November 29th and stating that copies of this issue had not been received in this office. Replying on March 5th, the Canadian War Records Office stated the names of McCormack, (Parkdale); Cockburn, (East York); McLaren, (West Hamilton); and Sutherland, (North Oxford), were included in the issue of the Canadian Daily Record for November 29th.

The London office also stated that through an oversight, copies of this special edition had not been mailed to Canada, but the distribution among the troops Overseas had been the same as the edition of November 27th containing the previous list.

I may state that copies of the issue of November 29th have not yet arrived but should be received within a week.

(Sgd.) William Wallace,
Captain.

Since then this letter has been received by Captain Wallace from Captain J. Harold Watkins:

Canadian War Records Office,
14 Clifford St., Bond Street. London, W.I.
March 1st, 1918.

To Captain William Wallace, M.C.,
Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

Dear Captain Wallace:

We received a cable from you yesterday with reference to certain omissions from the first list of nominations published in the Canadian Daily Record of Novembtr 27th, 1917 I cabled you in reply as follows:

"Reference 5445 list published November 27 exactly as received from Clerk of Crown in Chancery through courtesy Col. Purney here (stop) Second list containing additional names published in special edition November 29 received through same channels (stop) Distribution of second list exactly same as distribution first list."

We received the list that was published on November 27th from Colonel Purney who was in charge of the election here, and I understand that he received it direct from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Two days later he sent us a revised list and we issued a special revised Nomination Edition of the Canadian Daily Record, which was dated Thursday, November 29th, and which contained all the names you mention.

The distribution was the same in each case, so that everyone who read the first list also had the opportunity to read the revised list.

I send you herewith a dozen copies of the November 29th issue in case you would like to send them to the newspapers who have taken up the matter with you.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) J. Harold Watkins,
Captain,
For officer 1/c Canadian War Records.

My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has asked me about the name of one of the candidates in the county of Brant. The candidates in that county were, John Harold (Paris), Blackwell Doran (Burford township), and Henry Cockshutt (Brantford.) What appears to have happened is this: Under the Military Voters Act the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government were required to give certain recognition to candidates. Apparently the list which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery first telegraphed over contained only the names which were so recognized, and then he immediately afterwards telegraphed all the names. The first list was published on November 27th. The second list, which had exactly the same distribution, was published on November 29th.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When did the second list circulate, and to what extent?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The communications which I have read state that the distribution of the second list was exactly the same as the distribution of the list of November 27th.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: At what time was it distributed? Probably after the elections were over.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not indicate the date on which the issue of November 27th was sent out, nor the date on which the issue of November 29th was sent out, but I suppose we might very well reach the conclusion that they would hardly prepare these issues and then store them somewhere without sending them to the men at the front. I assume that in both cases the issues were sent out as soon as printed, and I do not know of any reason which would lead me to a contrary conclusion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is Mr. Cockshutt's name in the list of November 27th?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it is in the list of November 29th.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At six o'clock I was giving some explanation in regard to the issues of the Canada War Record of 27th and 29th November. I have nothing to add in regard to that. But, there are one or two words which I would like to say in regard to the Director of Public Information. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has found some fault with

his appointment for the reason that he alleges he was connected in some way with the purchase of a property in Montreal, the value of which was not fixed by the Government but was fixed by the Exchequer Court. I am perfectly confident—I have Mr. Nichols' word for it—that he had no more interest in that property than had the hon. member for Maisonneuve and that he had no more to do with fixing the value than had that hon. gentleman.

Some comment was also made on the fact that he is a relative of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). I happened to know something of the way in which Mr. Nichols was appointed. My hon. friend the president of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) brought to my attention, and to the attention of his colleagues, the proposal for the establishment of a directorship of public information. He has set out the reasons this afternoon on account of which he thought that proposal would be a valuable one in the public interest. He mentioned to me the name of Mr. Nichols and I am in a position to state that the Minister of Finance had no more to do with the appointment of Mr. Nichols than any hon. gentleman in this House. Mr. Nichols was not appointed in any way on account of his relationship, nor did the Minister of Finance know anything at all about it until the matter was proposed in Council by the President of the Privy Council. I think it is only right and just to Mr. Nichols, and to the Minister of Finance as well, to make that public statement in this House.

Further, as to the editorial policy of newspapers in Montreal with which Mr. Nichols is said to have been connected, I am not in a position to speak or to give any opinion upon that policy. As a matter of fact, I do not have time to read newspapers at all except an occasional bunch of clippings that is handed to me by one of my secretaries. But I do positively assert that I am as confident as I am of my own existence that the Minister of Finance had no more to do with the editorial policy of any of these papers in Montreal than any hon. gentleman who is listening to me in this House.

Mr. ROBB: While the Prime Minister is discussing this question, would he have any objection to telling the House and the country who were consulted previous to the appointment of Mr. Nichols? Last week, during the debate, the President of the Privy council (Mr. Rowell), stated that before appointing Mr. Nichols he had consulted the best newspaper men in Canada, and that upon their recommendation he had appointed Mr. Nichols because that gentleman was known as a competent newspaper man. I understand that a great many of the best newspaper men in Canada say they were not consulted. Who were the newspaper men who were consulted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Inasmuch as I was not the person consulting them, I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. friend the information. We were assured by the President of the Privy Council that he had made the necessary inquiry and he was so advised.

Mr. FORTIER: This Bill is to provide for a military expenditure of $500,000,000. I would like to know what portion of the total amount is to cover the expenses in excess of the war appropriation of 1917 and also the amount that is required for the military operations of this year. I understand that with the amount required for this year the Government is taking into consideration additional expenditures to be incurred by the amendments contemplated to the Military Service Act, 1917, which appear in the Government's notice of motion on the Orders of the Day the debate upon which has been adjourned until to-morrow. I maintain that this is not the proper time to discuss in Committee of the House the Bill providing for the appropriation of that large amount. We see by these proposed resolutions that the Government intends to make some amendments to the Military Service Act. It follows that the expenses of the current year will be increased if these resolutions are adopted by Parliament. I hope they will not be adopted by Parliament, but if they are adopted there is no doubt that the appropriation for next year will have to be increased accordingly. I should say that inasmuch as the appropriation of $500,000,000 is for the putting into operation of conscription, I am against it. I have been elected against conscription and I am against all forms of conscription. I would expect that the Government would defer the consideration of this Bill until the proposed amendments to the Military Service Act, now before the House, are taken into consideration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortier) will look at page 601 of unrevised Hansard he will find the estimate upon which this appropriation is based. I gave it a week ago to-day, but as the hon. gentleman has probably not had his attention called to it, I will read it

again. It is based on the total force of 500,000 men from Canada, as follows:

First Draft, Military Service Act.. ..	100,000
Home Defence Force..	10,000
In England	150,000
In France	140,000
Discharged after service at the front Killed, died of wounds, etc	100,000
	500,000

Mr. FORTIER: The right hon. gentleman has not answered the question that I asked. I would like to know from the Government what proportion of the $500,000,000 is to cover the expenses incurred under the War Appropriation of 1917.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will look at the statement that I read in the House, page 597 of unrevised Hansard, he will see that the accounts up to the present time, as far as they can be furnished to us by the Finance Department, show a total of $306,488,814.63 from which it would appear that no portion of this sum will be needed to meet the expenditure of the last fiscal year. If, however, the accounts when they come in should swell the total to more than $500,000,000 this Bill provides that any balance may be paid out of it.

Mr. FORTIER: Is it contemplated to provide out of the $500,000,000 for the additional cost of carrying out the military law as it is supposed to be amended this session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman probably is aware that the Military Service Act provides for raising a total force of one hundred thousand men. The estimate that I have already given takes into account the one hundred thousand men to be raised under the Military Service Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the Government any idea as to how the account of Canada with Great Britain stands to-day? I understand that we are paying for certain things on behalf of the British Government which are being manufactured or produced in and shipped from this country. I understand we are paying in Canada for certain things that ought to be paid by Great Britain. We may not be actually advancing the money because there is a somewhat similar financial process being followed on the other side in our interest. Has any balance been struck between the British Government and the Dominion Government, and does the balance stand to the credit or the debit of the British Government?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Early in the war the British Government made a loan, not a very large loan, to Canada. Upon the accounts as they stand at present I believe the balance is in favour of Canada, but I am not sure of the exact amount. What happens is this: the British Government pays accounts for us in connection with the maintenance of our troops at the front, provides supplies and so forth, which I suppose would run up to something like $200,000,000 a year, or very nearly that. On the other hand, we provide in this country credits for the British Government in payment for munitions, food stuffs, and supplies of various kinds, and those, of course, are charged against the British Government, just as the amounts that they advance are charged against us. Upon the whole, since the beginning of the war, the balance is something in favour of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: I understood from a statement made the other day, that the British Government was paying for our troops in France at the rate of six shillings a day per man, and that that covered munitions, equipment and everything. Is the British Government paying for our troops in England and is there, as in the case of the troops in France, a stated per capita amount which the British Government is advancing on our account?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The arrangement to which I have alluded applies only to the troops in France.

Mr. BUREAU: And the six shillings covers everything?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The six shillings covers everything, but I again remind my hon. friend that the other Dominions of the Empire have agreed to increase that to something over nine shillings, I think. We have not yet given our formal consent, but it is very likely that in all fairness we shall be obliged to do so, because of the tremendous increase in the use of shells and munitions of all kinds which has come about since that arrangement was entered into. I would like also to remind the hon. gentleman that the accounts have not yet been adjusted. When I state my belief that the balance is in favour of Canada, I make that statement subject to the final adjustment of accounts.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like the Prime Minister to take his pencil and make a calculation, because I have some figures that require explanation. I see that the expenditure during the first year of the war, 1914-1915, on account of naval service was

$3,096,125. During the second year, 1915-1916, the expenditure in round figures was $3,274,000, and in the third year, 1916-1917, the expenditure was approximately $3,806,000, whereas last year, up to April the 8th, the expenditure on account of naval service reached a total of over $10,000,000 in round figures. There seems to be quite an increase there, and the committee is entitled to an explanation of why there is such a difference. I am simply speaking of the expenditure on the naval service, I shall have other questions to submit later as to the expenditure under other heads.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman's question is a very reasonable one, and I will give an explanation of it as far as it is possible to do so in the public interest. In the autumn of 1916, I think it was, the Government of Canada was called upon very suddenly by the Admiralty to take certain precautions in connection with the theatened submarine menace against the coasts of this country. We consulted with them, and steps were taken with very great promptness, and in the most effective way possible, by the then Minister of Naval Affairs, Mr. Hazen. Those steps involved a very considerable outlay at once in the provision of trawlers, patrol boats and other armed vessels, in order that the merchant marine of Canada might be protected so far as possible from any attack by submarines near our coasts. I do not know that I can go into the matter more fully at the moment, but I am confident that the minister in charge of the Naval Service will be very glad indeed to give the hon. gentleman privately much fuller information than it would be prudent to publicly disclose in this House. The expenditures of last year are grouped in an account which I shall be glad to send over to the hon. gentleman if he cares to look at it. It is not desirable, I think, that I should do more or give some information the publication of which is undesirable. Altogether, these expenditures amount to $10,662,981.02.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The expenditure in the Department of Indian Affairs in 1914-15, the first year of the war was $81.72; in 1915-16, $5,688.83; in 1916-17, $5,836.93; this year, up to April 8, $50,000. Might I ask the reason for that increase? I have other items to inquire about, but I would like to get the explanations seriatim.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not see the explanation as to the Department of Indian Affairs among my papers. Perhaps my hon. friend will go on with other items.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I take the Department of the Secretary of State. The first year of the war the expenditure was, in round figures, $16,000; in the second year, $21,000; in the third year, $54,000; and the last year, $66,354.32.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The estimate of the amount required for the coming year is $60,000. The expenditure last year was as follows:

Office of the Chief Press Censor for Canada.	
Salaries at Ottawa	$11,937 97
Assistant Censors outside of Ottawa.	1,701 00
Travelling expenses	1,025 75
Printing and stationery	1,601 35
Newspapers and books	169 48
Translations	828 10
Sundries, including postage, telegrams, telephone conversations, cartage, etc.	1,079 40
Total for Branch	$18,343 05
Registrar's Branch—	
Salaries of substitutes for employees on active service	$1,223 86
Extra clerical assistance	1,283 04
Total for Branch	$2,506 90
War Charities Act Branch—	
Salaries	$1,068 77
Printing, stationery, travelling expenses, advertising, other contingencies	2,947 25
Total for Branch	$4,016 02
For the Department generally, the details are—	
Salaries of substitutes other than in the Registrar's Branch, for employees on active service	$2,320 58
Extra clerical assistance	4,228 80
Visit of Marshall Joffre and M. Viviani	8,511 62
Investigations of suspected alien enemy businesses	9,988 49
Printing and stationery	31,355 40
Travelling expenses and sundries	895 19
Total	$57,300 08
Grand total	$82,166 05

The estimates for the coming year is $60,000. Printing and stationery is to be cut down by $29,000, and some of the other items slightly increased.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I find that under the heading of Agriculture, the first year of the war shows an expenditure of nothing; the second year, $5,000 in round figures; the third year, $12,000; and the last fiscal

year to April 8, $21,579.22. Will my right hon. friend explain that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did read all these details a week ago to-day, but I will read them again:

Exemption representatives	$14,415 38
Bacon-Hog campaign.....	25,898 51
Salaries of substitutes.....	16,644 76
Representatives at Leave-of-Absence Boards	6,042 45
Total	$63,001 10

The Estimate for the coming year is considerably larger. The campaign for increased food production will cost $280,000, according to the estimate. It involves certain advances to provincial governments for work that they are to undertake. Salaries for substitutes are set down at $17,000; representatives at Leave-of-Absence Boards, $20,000, making a total of $317,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under the heading Marine, nothing was spent in the first year of the war; in the second year about $1,500; in the third year, $2,000; and last year, $267,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would my hon. friend like to have the explanation of that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not all the details, but my right hon. friend might explain the reason for the swelling of the expenditure to that extent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the expenditure is really more than is given through the Department of Finance at the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is up to April 8.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, but I explained when I presented these statements to the House that they came from the Department of Finance, and that the statement from the department actually concerned might be larger. According to the statement from the Marine Department, which I have in my hand, the expenditure is as follows:

Extra clerks, $2,267.98.

Equipment of lake vessels for overseas trade. Under Order in Council of 1st June, 1917, the expenditure of $405,800 was authorized, of which it is estimated that $300,000 will be spent, $201,632.01 of the above amount having already been invoiced.

Shipbuilding program as per Order in Council of 24th December, 1917, of which $25,000,000 was to be spent during the year 1918, and of which there has already been spent $267,030; making a total expenditure for the fiscal year of $569,297.98.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I find that the Military Hospitals Commission in 1916-17 cost $1,378,000, in round figures, while last year the cost was over $9,000,000. What is the explanation of the increase?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is due to the fact that more soldiers are returning from the front.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many new hospitals are to be built?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Invalided Soldiers' Commission may have to extend its operations to the provision of sanitoria for a certain class of patients, and, on the other hand, the Department of Militia and Defence, which has taken over the hospitals for active treatment, will probably have to provide additional accommodation as the men begin to return in increasing numbers. The Minister of Militia and Defence will be in a position to give full information on that subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that the National Service Commission which cost $111,759.89 in 1916-17 and $117,771.07 last year—was the commission presided over by our late colleague, Mr. R. B. Bennett. Is that commission still in existence, or has it been abolished?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was abolished except so far as taking care of the records is concerned. That is not attended with any expense to the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are there many employees?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are no employees.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under whose management is it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not under any one's management at present; it is not carrying on active operations. About 1,750,000 cards were received. They were tabulated to some extent and certain use was made of them. They were placed at the disposal of the military authorities; they were also made use of for the purpose of finding men for different employments throughout the country as they were required. The work of that commission will be superseded by the registration which we hope to take next summer and which has a very much wider scope. It is proposed to keep the new registration up to date from time to time,

under regulations which will shortly be laid on the Table.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the explanation of the amount of $22,718.30 under the heading: "Immigration and Colonization?"

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is almost entirely in payment of substitutes for those who have gone to the front. There is included an amount required for expenses of officials in connection with the enforcing of Order in Council No. 1433. This amount is used in paying travelling expenses, meals, board, etc., of inspectors on trains, and other sundry expenses. This Order in Council was the one which prohibited men of military age from leaving the country. A further amount of $8,000 is mentioned under the head of printing and stationery—that is, for printing the different permit forms and any stationery required by the officers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is an item of $399,266.89 under the heading: "Railways and Canals, reconstruction of Halifax." Was that for the emergency call when the Halifax disaster took place?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was for reconstruction to repair damage occasioned by the Halifax explosion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Newsprint Commission, $22,003.86. Is that matter settled?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it is not settled. The commissioner has not made his final report as yet.

Mr. ROSS: There has been presented during the war the greatest opportunity the department ever had, in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, to encourage the horse industry in this country. If I am correctly informed, the department has not taken advantage of this opportunity. I believe that horses are being purchased for Great Britain in the United States, and have been going through Canada in thousands. I wish to call attention to the fact that in 1916-17 there was spent by the Militia Department on war account, according to the public accounts, the very large sum of $298,000,000. I put a question on the Order Paper as to what amount of money had been spent in the purchase of remounts for the Militia Department during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, and the answer was $261,042.73. I further inquired what amount was spent in the purchase of remounts elsewhere, and where they were purchased, to which the reply was "nil." In the public accounts for 1917, under the heading of "Details of War Expenditure by Militia Department" from April 1, 1916, to March 31, 1917, I find an item: Purchases of remounts, expenses of purchasers, etc., $3,440,761.64. I should like some explanation of that discrepancy and also some statement of policy.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already given that explanation a good many times, not only in this Parliament, but in the late Parliament. I gave it two years ago for the first time, and I have given it on several occasions since. When I was in England in 1915 it was arranged that all remount purchases for the Canadian Expeditionary Force should be made by the British Government. They had a very competent staff engaged both in Canada and in the United States for that purpose. Further than that, unless we arranged the matter in that way, we would be obliged to keep up remount stations at various points in Great Britain and also at various points in France; whereas, if the remount stations, from which we would get our horses, both in Great Britain and France were under one control, a very great expense would be saved to this country. The British Government agreed that they would put in the horses to us at bare cost. In fact, in their charges against the horses which they supplied to us they did not include what might be called overhead charges, which would necessarily have been included by this country if we had embarked upon a policy of having separate remount stations of our own both in Great Britain and France. Therefore, the expenditure to which my hon. friend calls attention is expenditure which has been made by the British Government for horses purchased in that way by a commission acting for both parties. The other item to which he alluded, namely, $261,042.73 is for horses used in the various camps in Canada and not for horses used overseas. I am informed by the deputy minister that 2,876 horses were purchased for the purpose of those camps.

With respect to the opportunities in Canada for the sale of horses, I have had very frequent correspondence with the British Remount Commission. From time to time since 1915 I have not failed to urge upon them directly and also through the British Government that there were good opportunities for the purchase of horses in this country, and that those opportunities should be taken advantage of by the British Remount Commission, and on every occasion on which I have taken up the matter with

the Remount Commission they have given what semed to me to be a satisfactory explanation when they did not happen to be purchasing in Canada at that time.

Mr. BUREAU: I was asking, when the other questions were put, what arrangement existed as to the balancing of accounts between Great Britain and Canada. I see that the overseas forces which are now in England are paid for by Canada. The Prime Minister, the other day in making an explanation, said that the expenditure overseas was under the supervision of the Auditor General. Has the Auditor General a staff overseas auditing those accounts which are paid by the Overseas Minister of Militia? If so, when is a return made to the Minister of Militia at Ottawa so that he may control the expenditure which is voted for war purposes or for supplying the troops which we have in England—that is, in addition to the balance which we have to strike with Great Britain with reference to the troops that we have in France? The current accounts of the Minister of Overseas Military Forces, I understand, are controlled by the Auditor General. The ultimate control comes to Ottawa, and I suppose that the Minister of Militia, as I said the other day when I was expressing my astonishment at this duplication, is responsible to the House for that. Can we have an explanation of the system that is followed?—how these amounts are controlled overseas, how the return of this expenditure is made, and to whom it is made?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just the same as in any other department. The accounts are audited overseas by the Auditor General. I do not think he has any staff in Great Britain at the present time; that is, for the reason that he does think it necessary. When I spoke to him a few days ago, he said that his officer had returned from England; that his officer was not there during the winter, and he did not consider it necessary to keep him there. That is a matter which we leave to his own judgment. He had an absolutely free hand to have whatever staff was necessary, according to his best judgment, to make a thorough and complete audit of all the expenditures overseas. The statements come forward from that department just the same as from other departments, and I believe, besides that, a monthly statement comes to the Department of Militia and Defence as well as to the Auditor General.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not say this in the way of criticism, except that I cannot get through my head this double Ministry of Militia, particularly in regard to the Overseas Minister. What is the approximate amount that has been handled and expended by the Minister of Overseas Military Forces?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The expenditure overseas from 4th August, 1914, to 31st of March, 1917, amounted to $171,137,853.86. That, of course, did not include the expenditure in France to which I have already alluded and which is made by the British Government on behalf of the Canadian Government.

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps the information about which I am going to inquire has already been given, and if it is in Hansard, I do not wish to have the right hon. gentleman repeat it. I presume this appropriation, which is necessarily a very broad one, included expenditures in connection with the mission at Washington?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be included in this appropriation.

Mr. FIELDING: The mission at Washington is one of the many new things which have been created during the war, and the public would like to have some information concerning it. I would, therefore, suggest that, at a convenient date, not necessarily at the present time, the right hon. gentleman might give us some information as to the number of persons composing the mission, their salaries and the nature of the duties they are called upon to perform. Some part of their duties may have a bearing upon military matters and, of course, the information in regard to that cannot be given. I put my question with that reservation. I am sure the subject would be an interesting one.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon friend perhaps did not observe that some time ago I placed upon the Table an Order in Council which gives the principal part of the information to which he alludes. Mr. Lloyd Harris is the Chairman. There are at the present time only three other gentlemen upon the board, namely, Mr. Rolph, of Toronto, Mr. Macmaster, and Mr. Scott, of Montreal. They are all serving without any salary whatever, though of course they have a clerical staff, and there will be some expense incurred for rent, which unfortunately is very high in Washington at present. The duties are defined in a general way in the Order in Council, a copy of which I shall be very glad to

send to my hon. friend. I shall be very glad after that, to go a little more into detail, as to the particular purposes which this War Mission is carrying out. They have very important duties to perform. Those duties are more directly concerned with communication between the very numerous commissions which have been established in Washington, and which have to do in a very intimate way with the trade relations between this country and the United States as they are affected by the war, the import and export of articles, the restriction of importations to articles of an essential character, the utilization of industries of both countries for purposes that are essential for the war and not for other purposes, and a great many other matters which I shall be glad to explain at some later date.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: When the committee rose at six o'clock the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) had given us a statement with reference to the Director of Public Information, and had discussed among other matters the sending overseas of the lists of the candidates who were running in the recent elections. Now, lest the Prime Minister should deem that his answer was entirely satisfactory in that regard I feel compelled to say a few words. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the list was sent over by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a gentleman whom I have not the honour of being acquainted with, but an officer of the Crown, I suppose. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sent over imperfect information, according to the Prime Minister's own statement; that is, he suppressed the names of a considerable number of the candidates who were then properly in the field for the Dominion election. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the leader of the Opposition and himself had initialled certain candidates who were running in the interests of either one or the other, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery transmitted only the names that had been so initialled.

9 p.m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said I presumed it had occurred in that way. I have not seen the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on this subject, but apparently the names that were telegraphed over in the first instance were of candidates mentioned as having been recognized by either the leader of the Opposition or myself.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If the Prime Minister is not aware of it, I can tell him that there were other names in the list that were initialled neither by the leader of the Opposition nor by himself, and those names appeared in the first list.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not aware of that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But it is correct, because I know that the name of the candidate in my riding who was running against me was on the list. There were three candidates in that riding, and the names of both my opponents appeared in this first official list, as well as my own. This is war time, and I am not disposed to raise any trouble, or give this Government any trouble that can be avoided, but the element of fairness cannot be overlooked even in a war-time election; and I must say that the Prime Minister's explanation so far as those names are concerned, is not satisfactory to me. Other names went over that were not so initialled. I can give the name of one, and I believe there were five or six others. To say that the list was reprinted and sent over two days later does not cover the ground at all. This document, which I understand the President of the Privy Council is responsible for, is the official mouthpiece of the Government for the soldiers at the front. It was sent out containing certain names. We are told it was sent out in the first place on 27th November, and that after the mistakes were pointed out, it was reprinted and another copy sent on 29th November; but we do not know when that copy sent out on the 29th reached the front, or whether it ever reached the front. What we do know is that the soldiers began to vote on or about 1st December, although the election was not until the 17th, and I believe in my heart that there were a lot of soldiers who never knew what candidates were running in that election. I feel that that was the case, and I say it was not necessary for the purposes of Union Government, of which I am a strong friend and backer, even though I make this criticism, that the names of their candidates should be known. The soldier ballot had four divisions in it—one for the Government candidate, one for the opposition candidate, one for labour, and one for an independent candidate.

Mr. PROULX: I think there were five divisions.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: In the fifth space the name of the candidate was to be written,

or else he got no vote at all. So the soldier voted for or against the Government, but where a candidate's name was suppressed the soldier, of course, had no opportunity of knowing that this man was running at all. I do not like to accuse the powers that be of doing anything unfair or unjust, and in war time when we are fighting with our back to the wall and our boys are dying by the thousands at the front it is no time to raise trouble. I want to back the Government for all I am worth in all war-time measures, but I do say that I think they were derelict in their duty. I did not even hear the Prime Minister say this afternoon that he had given the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a crack over the knuckles for omitting the names of these candidates—names which I believe were deliberately omitted by some one. If that is the case it is a serious thing. It is all right for the Government and the Opposition to endorse their candidates, but in a democratic country, where a man is properly nominated and is of sufficient standing in the community to get the nomination, I think no Government and no Opposition has the right to suppress that man's name as a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons. I do not want to go into this matter very fully, and I do not want any of my friends to take any particular notice of it, because a member of my family was one of those concerned, but I do say that this kind of thing would only pass in the strenuous times through which we are passing; that is the only ground on which we can keep quiet about a thing like that. It is the strenuous times in which we live that closes my mouth tonight, but I think it is up to me to let the Prime Minister know—yes, and the President of the Privy Council too, because I believe he was privy to the matter—that I thought at that time before this action was taken that it was going to turn out just about the way it has, that certain men were marked for slaughter, and that is how it did turn out. Whether this was a deal between the gentlemen I am not in a position to say, because I am not in the inner circle, I am only a back-bencher. But I feel it my duty to say to the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council that if it were not that winning the war demands our every exertion, I could not support them on this occasion. The Prime Minister may have other reasons up his sleeve which he did not adduce why these names were omitted. He may tell me as soon as I sit down that I am talking entirely aside from the facts, but I thought it my duty to say that in my judgment his explanation given in regard to the lists of candidates sent overseas was entirely inadequate to the situation, and will not be at all satisfactory to the gentlemen whose names were suppressed from the official lists.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall not follow my hon. friend's advice, however much inclined I might be to do so. I shall merely tell him that I was not in Ottawa at the time. If he supposed that during that election I had nothing else to do but follow around the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and see that all his telegrams were correct, then I can only say he has a very imperfect appreciation of the burdens that were laid on one at the head of public affairs in this country, when he was called upon at the same time to carry on as best he could the work in connection with the greatest war that humanity has ever known and also to carry on an election campaign. If the hon. gentleman intends to suggest—and I do not know whether or not he did intend to suggest—that I was privy to any unfairness towards him, or any member of his family, or any one else, I want to give him the strongest denial that parliamentary usage will permit.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Did the right hon. gentleman write a letter asking a certain gentleman to run and afterwards turn him down?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, I did in this sense, that I suggested to him, at the request of an hon. gentleman, a member of the Senate, just about the time the Union Government was formed, that he might run. That gentleman wrote to me afterwards and said that he would retire if I asked him. I asked him to retire and he did not do it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That gentleman offered to retire in favour of a certain other gentleman, as the Prime Minister very well knows, but not in favour of the one who was crushing him out of the field where he had been properly placed. The Prime Minister, if he wanted that letter read here, would find it very necessary to give me the direct statement that he has given just now. The letter was fairly and squarely written and it contained that statement. Whether the Prime Minister did it unknowingly or whether he did it with the intention of asking him finally to retire, I cannot say, but it seems to me that we have not been

played fair with. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) has just raised another question which involves more or less the same matter. One gentleman who was concerned in this matter has been rewarded with the chairmanship of a commission at Washington. How that comes about I cannot say, but that has been revealed to us.

I have been a friend of the right hon. gentleman all my political life; during all his political life I have supported him in every way; I have supported in every possible way the winning of the war, and I take no back seat, although I am a back bencher, even to the Prime Minister himself in regard to the heartiness in which I have endeavoured to help win this war. The Prime Minister, knowing what my family has done in this matter, should cast no reflection on me in that respect, as I rather think he did. He seemed to say: You think I have nothing to do but help to win elections. I made no such assertion. I say that in my judgment those names were suppressed by somebody—I do not know by whom—and the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, if he were in any way responsible, should have received a crack over the knuckles for sending out an imperfect list. I have not heard the Prime Minister say one word of disapproval, or whether he disapproves of an imperfect list being sent out. He has not the right to read me a lecture, even although I am a back-bencher; I am a pretty old hand in the political game. I was in it before he was. I ran my first campaign over thirty years ago. Although I do not often speak in this House, and although my views may not carry very much weight, even with the Prime Minister—I am aware of that—I still have my views and they are held just as strongly as are those of the Prime Minister. In so far as the winning of the war is concerned, I believe that my heart is in it just as much as his is. Our object is to win the war and that was the object with which we went into the war-time election, but even a war-time election should, in my judgment, be characterized by all the elements of fairness.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was just that suggestion on the part of the hon. gentleman that I did resent because he seemed to imply that there had been some intentional unfairness on my part through which these gentlemen's names were not included in the first telegram. I repeat that I resent as strongly as I can any unfair suggestion from him or any one else in this House. I have told him—he is at liberty to take my statement or not as he sees fit—that I was not in Ottawa at the time and knew nothing until months afterward about any names being omitted from the list. I repeat that I was far too busily engaged at that time to follow up the details of any such matter as this. The task of selecting candidates in the various constituencies of this country who should be recognized by the Government was an invidious and distasteful one. Few hon. gentlemen can realize how invidious and distasteful it would be. I did the best I could with it. I appointed a committee in each of the provinces composed of men who previously had been opposed to each other in political affairs, and I asked them to make the best selections they could. As far as I remember, I followed their judgment in every case; I do not recollect any case in which I departed from it. Whether I might have done better by giving more personal attention to the matter I do not know. I do know that I did what I thought was right and what I thought was best in the interest of the country and without any desire or intention of being unfair to any man, whether he was recognized or not.

Mr. ROWELL: As the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has mentioned my name in connection with this matter, as well as that of the Prime Minister, I wish to state just as clearly and emphatically as the Prime Minister has stated that I had absolutely no knowledge of the matter until weeks after the election. The first I learned of it was from a statement which I saw in the press some time after the election that these names had been omitted from the list. I, like the Prime Minister, had been absent from Ottawa, and I never had any communication of any kind with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. He is not in my department and I had no communication with him. On learning of this report after the election I asked for an explanation from the general returning officer and I got one similar to that which the Prime Minister has given the House this afternoon. I had no knowledge about it in any shape or form, direct or indirect, until long after the election.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does the minister approve or disapprove of the action of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in omitting those names?

Mr. ROWELL: I absolutely disapprove of any names being omitted. I am absolutely sure that they were omitted by mistake although I have no personal knowledge of it. Every one would disapprove of any names being omitted. Every one should have a fair show; the names should all be made public.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I omitted to say the same thing. I regard it as most unfortunate that the names were omitted and if it were owing to any intentional neglect on the part of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery he would be subject to the severest reprimand and probably something more than that.

Mr. MOWAT: I desire to say a few words to the committee in regard to the effect of this omission. I will confine myself to that. It appears that owing to the information telegraphed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certain names were omitted. That was corrected two days afterwards. The two issues of the Record were on the 27th and 29th November. If there was any objection to that action, or if there was any injustice, some complaint would have been made from France or England regarding it by the friends of the candidates whose names were omitted. But was that done? No, it was not. It was not until two months after 27th November that the matter was mentioned at all. And how did it come to be mentioned at all? It was mentioned by a newspaper in Toronto which had taken a very strong stand on behalf of what it called the "soldier candidates." The Prime Minister said this afternoon that he had received some complaints with regard to the matter from the Great War Veterans, but I desire to correct him to some extent in that regard. The Great War Veterans as a body, wisely it seems to me, decided to take no part in party politics; their interests, they thought, required that they should stand neutral; but an ambitious gentleman in Toronto who runs a newspaper had different views. He has always been very distinctly antagonistic and hostile to the Union Government. Holding such views and having no chance with the Opposition he could not satisfy his inordinate ambition to become a political leader unless he had some sort of a party. The only party he could think of to get was the Great War Veterans. Now the resolution of the Great War Veterans to take no part in politics stood as a bar to their becoming followers of any body, himself or any body else. Therefore, the gentleman in question got an employee of his own newspaper, who happens to be the secretary of a local branch of the Great War Veterans, to have the resolution of the main body sitting here in Ottawa rescinded, so that the Toronto branch of the Great War Veterans' Association should be able to engage in party politics in this contest. The Great War Veterans are a fine body of men as a whole. They are men who went to serve their country, and some of them have come back maimed or nervous as a result of shell shock. The trouble is that being nervous and somewhat sentimental they art apt to be misled, and in this case they were misled, it seems to me, not by one of their own number, not by a soldier, but by a person who wished to use them for his own purposes. Perhaps I am a little discursive, but I wish to point out that the effect of this mistake in not publishing these names in the first number of The Record cannot have had any real or practical effect. In the first place, as I say, no attention was called to it for months after 27th November, and furthermore, during the election the same band of civilians who wished to intrude and make a sort of a third party as part of their election campaign, said to the people: "We have sent over cables to the soldiers at the front." They did send many cables and in one election of which I have knowledge they said they spent something over $200 upon cable tolls. "Therefore," they said "don't be troubled by the fact of endorsation by the Union Government, but vote for our candidate and you will find that a vast number of soldiers at the front will join with you and he will be elected." Well, with the expenditure of $200 in the case of one candidate, one would have thought that the soldiers at the front would have been informed of the exact state of affairs. What do we find? According to the election returns, a copy of which we got a few days ago from Mr. O'Connor, in the particular constituency I refer to the endorsee of the Government got 3,300 overseas votes. How many do you suppose were cast for the soldier candidate, to whom not only the particular issue of The Record had reference, but in whose interest there had been an expenditure of $200 in sending cablegrams to soldiers at the front. As against 3,300 votes for the Unionist candidate, the soldier candidate only received 13 votes in the whole of France and in England, so the omission referred to cannot have had much to do with the result.

There is another constituency, represented by my hon. friend the member for

East York (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman was subjected to vicious attack. I make no complaint whatever of any attack made upon me in the election. If my opponents consider such attacks are fair politics, all right. I make no complaint, whatever, especially as I won by a jolly good majority. But in the case of my hon. friend from East York as vitriolic and acidulous an attack was made upon him as was ever known in Canadian politics, and he was deprecated in every form as a miserable civilian running against this nominee of the new party that I have referred to. Well, the result in his case, where antagonistic cablegrams were also sent over to the front, was more extraordinary than in the case of the other constituency I have mentioned; because, while my hon. friend received more than 2,700 votes in England and in France, the soldier candidate who ran against him did not get one single vote. So it was a case of 2,700 votes to nothing. The point of my remarks is this: despite the mistake made—I am sure it was a mistake, because nobody could be a party to actually misleading the electors over there—the actual fact is that the soldiers were not misinformed, they knew who was running, but they deliberately marked their ballots for the Government because they knew that would suit their purpose far better than any other course they could take.

Mr. REDMAN: I cannot but regard it as unfortunate that the hon. member who has just taken his seat should have seized this opportunity to ask for the sympathy of the House in regard to the election which he ran last year. I cannot but resent the statements which he has made in regard to the Great War Veterans, and, as I take it, the soldiers generally. It strikes me that his remarks were in very bad taste. The fact that a soldier ran against him in that election should not give him any reason to come here and single out that soldier, or the Great War Veterans, for comments in this House. He has stated that the soldiers who have returned from overseas are sentimental and nervous. Doubtless the hon. gentleman is an authority on this subject, and when he states that the soldiers returning from overseas are sentimental and nervous, possibly the hon. gentleman knows what he is talking about, and possibly he does not. However, I do resent very much the hon. gentleman making any statements of the kind. It does seem to me that if the Great War Veterans' Association, or any of their members wish to run a candidate in this country, or to exercise their rights as citizens, they are perfectly free to do so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: When this matter first came up a few hours ago the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) was making a statement with regard to the Director of Public Information. I asked him then as to who was responsible for the omission of the names of certain soldier candidates in the last election from the Canadian Daily Records sent to the soldiers, but I little thought at the time that my question was going to create the debate that has taken place. I regret very much, indeed, that the time of the House should be taken up with a matter that now can do no earthly good, because this is war time, and we have men at the front who are making greater sacrifices possibly than any one who have remained in Canada, no matter how hard such persons have laboured.

I intend, therefore, to touch upon one phase of the question that appeals to me, and that is on behalf of a certain soldier candidate in the last election; who was the first man to volunteer in the county of Oxford, who went overseas with the First Contingent, who raised two battalions in the country, was twice wounded, came home, and returned to the front crippled but determined to go. He was nominated as a candidate when he was at home on sick leave, and told the people that, if his election depended upon his returning to Canada while the war was on, he did not want to be elected. Now, for some strange reason, this candidate's name was omitted from the official list sent out by the Government in this official organ which we are asked to support in this vote which is now before the House; and, so far as I am aware, there is no disposition on the part of the Government to fix the responsibility where it properly belongs and to see that the guilty suffer for their misdeeds in this regard; at least, we had no expression of that kind from the Government to my knowledge. Men who are absent at the front fighting for us are not in a position to take up their cause in this House or in the country, or have not shown any disposition, or made any request, that the matter should be brought to the attention of the House, and, so far as I am aware, no complaint has been received from those men with regard to that matter. Now, the President of the Privy Council has just made a further statement that he knew

nothing whatever with regard to this matter, and I accept his word. He says that he was busily engaged at the time, and he does not know anything with regard to the matter. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) brings the War Veterans into this debate, endeavouring to make it appear that they renounced their rights during the last election. The War Veterans in Oxford county called an open convention to nominate a candidate, and I believe there were some six hundred people present to nominate a Unionist candidate. On the other side, his opponent was selected by the executive of the Liberal Party, and endorsed by the Government as the Unionist candidate in opposition to the man who had been nominated in an open convention called for that purpose. There is a feeling abroad in the country among returned soldiers that this Government is not in sympathy with the soldiers, that they are not doing certain things that they ought to do with regard to the returned soldiers. When you find things of this kind happening right under your eyes, I do not feel that it is my duty to sit still and allow statements of that kind to go unchallenged. Further, I believe that there was a deliberate effort on the part of some one to see that certain soldier candidates were not elected, and who ever is guilty—and there is certainly some guilty party—must be punished or else professions of being in sympathy with the soldier and with winning this war will stand for little. The men who are doing these things are entitled to consideration. When the campaign was nearing its close, certain correspondence was published with regard to one of these soldier candidates, in an endeavour to make it appear that he was not endorsed by the Government or as favouring Union Government. But his opponent, who had been selected by the executive of the Liberal party, was endorsed by the Government as the Unionist candidate. What do we find? On the 5th day of November, a letter from the secretary of the President of the Privy Council was published shedding more light on this matter, and making it practically impossible for that candidate to be elected in that constituency. I am going to read the letter; it has been published, and no denial has been made with reference to it to my knowledge. The Prime Minister has told us of his efforts, and of the work that was entailed upon him in endorsing candidates. I have not the slightest doubt of that. I appreciate the tremendous responsibilities that press upon the head of a Government, particularly during war time. It is beyond my comprehension how he could do as much work as he did; consequently, he must have had to delegate a great deal of his work to others. I do not think for one moment he was responsible or that he would do anything of that nature. But I want to point out that the soldier candidate to whom I have referred did not receive a fair deal in the last election, and that a letter was sent to the secretary of the Conservative Association for the North Riding of Oxford, asking that the nominee of that party should be withdrawn. I understand that he was communicated with and offered to withdraw in order that the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) might be elected for that constituency which he represented in the legislature. He offered to stand aside and allow that hon. gentleman to run in that riding. Later on,—he was nominated at this open convention. In the meantime, however, a letter was published in the press which had considerable effect upon his prospects of being elected. Now, I must read the letter, because I am going to read one that was sent out afterwards. This is written from Uxbridge on November 26, 1917:

Dear Mr. West,

I had hoped to speak in North Oxford but the time at my disposal would not permit. Under the circumstances I think it my duty to ask my friends in the North Riding of Oxford to support loyally and effectively Mr. E. W. Nesbitt, the candidate named by the Government under the Military Voters' Act. His support of compulsory military service and of the proposals for a Union Government has been all that could be desired. We are asking Liberals in a great many ridings of Ontario to support Conservative Union candidates. It is equally the duty of Conservatives to support Liberal Union candidates in the ridings for which, under arangement with my Liberal colleagues, a Liberal Union candidate has been selected.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

R. L. BORDEN.

I can quite understand, with the multitudinous duties resting upon his shoulders, how the Prime Minister was anxious to give way in matters of this kind in order to arrive at some mutual arrangement by which the difficulties could be overcome. The party who received the letter did not make it public apparently, although I understand that he acknowledged it. Shortly afterwards, when the campaign was nearing a close, he received from the private secretary of Hon. Mr. Rowell a letter as follows, a copy of which was also sent to the press of the constituency:

Mr. Wesley West,
Secretary, Conservative Association,
Woodstock, Ont.

Dear Sir,—

I am directed by Mr. Rowell, who is in Northern Ontario, to say that before leaving for the Maritime Provinces on Sunday, Sir Robert Borden furnished Mr. Rowell with a copy of his letter to you regarding the North Oxford situation.

Sir Robert's intention was that this letter should be made public by you, and it is Sir Robert's desire that this should be done.

Yours very truly,
MAIN JOHNSON,
Private Secretary.

This letter was sent out by the private secretary of the President of the Council. The private secretary states that the Prime Minister intended that the letter should be made public. Then the private secretary evidently gives it to the press, because it is published in the papers; that is where I first saw it. I think that in view of his connection with this matter the President of the Council should ascertain who was guilty of omitting these names from the published list.

It may be said that this circumstance did not have any effect on the election results, but I contend that it is a remarkable coincidence—the efforts to make it impossible for this soldier at the front to get the votes of those at home who were favourable to Union Government, and also of the soldiers overseas, by omitting his name from the records. You may say that the list was published on the 27th, and that a supplementary list was published on the 29th. But the men overseas would naturally be anxious to know who the candidates were; they would look over the first list, and would not take the trouble to go over the second and see whether any names had been added or omitted. The first would be the one that would receive their attention; we do not know when the second was circulated. I am sorry indeed that I have to refer to these things in this way; it was not my intention to have done so. In the course of half a dozen words I asked a simple question, and I do not consider that I received the answer to which I was entitled. The minister may not have been responsible for the acts of this Director of Public Information at that time, but somebody was certainly responsible, and that is what I want to emphasize. I do not wish to make trouble for the Government, but I must insist upon my rights in this House and upon the right of those who are not here to see that justice is done. I submit that the guilty party in this case should be punished.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. NESBITT: I regret exceedingly that my name has been drawn into this discussion. Above all things I always try not to appear personally in a public way any more than I can possibly help. I have nothing whatever to say against my opponent; he had as much right to run as I had. He was first the candidate of the Conservative party. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) said that I was nominated and brought out by the Liberal executive. It is true that I was nominated some two years ago by the Liberal party in the north riding of Oxford. In the last Parliament I took a certain position with respect to the Military Service Bill, and when the elections were brought on last fall I called the executive of the Liberal Asociation together and made a statement to them of the position that I had taken in that respect. I told them that, on account of the position I had taken, it was absolutely impossible for me to take any other course during the coming campaign than that of endorsing the Union Government. The executive of the Liberal Association were kind enough to say that they thought I had taken the proper course, and that they would endorse it and support me during the coming campaign—an offer which I very gratefully accepted. That was on Saturday. That evening the Conservative Association called a meeting of their so-called executive and pretended to accept the resignation of my opponent as Conservative candidate and to nominate him as Conservative-Unionist candidate. On Sunday afternoon they got hold of the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association—remember, I have nothing to say against the Great War Veterans' Association, or against the great war veterans—. The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) interrupts me. I want to tell him that it is not because he suggested anything that I say this, and we can settle it right now, or outside if he likes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not want any insinuations from him at all. On Sunday afternoon the Conservative clique in Woodstock got hold of the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association—who, by the way, has never been at the front—and got him to call a meeting of his executive that afternoon and nominate my opponent as their candidate. That Sunday night the same Conservative clique in Woodstock called another meeting of their so-called executive, withdrew the resolution they had passed nominating my opponent as the Conserva-

tive-Unionist candidate, and endorsed the Great War Veterans' candidate. It was a little trickery on the part of the Conservative clique in Woodstock, that was all; and it was so recognized by a great many of the Conservatives in the north riding of Oxford. As to the men in France and England not knowing that my opponent was running, let me say that my opponent had been in France, had been wounded and was home. He spent six months at home canvassing against me on the pay of this Government. He was not a cripple any more than I was, or half as much as I was, so far as that is concerned. He went back to England, not to France, and he was in England at the time the election was on. I have no doubt that he was doing the best he could for himself in England, and I do not blame him for that; that is his privilege. But I have letter after letter from men who were in France and England, saying that his name was posted on the bulletins and that they did know that he was running at the time. So I contend that those who voted for the Union Government or for me personally, as the case might be, knew that my opponent was running, and knew that he was a soldier and at that time in England.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Is it a fact that the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) wrote a letter to the German voters in his riding canvassing them in the election, and repudiating Union Government and the War-time Elections Act?

Mr. NESBITT: It is a fact that I wrote letters to some constituents in my riding, but not by any means repudiating the Union Government, I was opposed to the War-time Elections Act, and I was opposed to it during the whole of the last session. I would be absolutely hypocritical if I said that I was not opposed to it, because I did oppose it on the floor of the House as energetically as I could, and everybody knows it. I may tell the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that I voted for the Military Service Act, and he knows it.

Mr. ANDREWS: The daily bulletins sent to the troops in the field from home are very highly appreciated by all ranks, and to discontinue them would be an unnecessary hardship. I suggest that these bulletins should be speeded up, if anything, and that they should be delivered regularly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I disagree with my hon. friend. I will take the case of Sir Allen Aylesworth's son, who is in the trenches. In one issue of that sheet a cable from the President of the Council in Canada is published, with the following heading:

Sir Allen Aylesworth's son. Your Old man Has Gone Back on You.

Mr. ROWELL: May I ask my hon. friend the date of that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The 27th of November.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend knows that I stated in the House this afternoon that the publication of the Record was not transferred to my jurisdiction until January or February of this year. Until that time I had no more to do with it than my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend, this afternoon, assumed the responsibility for the publication of this sheet.

Mr. ROWELL: I did from the time it came under my jurisdiction.

Mr. BUREAU: Somebody was responsible.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened with a great deal of interest to this little family squabble, and I notice that some of my hon. friends are very touchy when their names are not mentioned in that Record. For instance, my hon. friend from Brantford, Mr. Cockshutt, was incensed because his brother's name was not published in the Record, and there is some other squabble in regard to Oxford County. Well, if my hon. friends get angry because their names are not mentioned, what about Sir Allen Aylesworth's son who is in the trenches and who sees his father's name branded as it was in that paper in which it was cabled from Canada?

Sir Allen Aylesworth's son. Your old man has gone back on you.

It tells the fake story that a sergeant said to the audience at a political meeting:

Think of it. Picture Sir Allen's son over there in the midst of it all. See him in the trenches holding a field telephone to his ear—

A nastier way to hear it.

—asking why reinforcements have not come up to him, when he needs them so sorely. Then comes the answer: Aylesworth, your old man has gone back on you.

A ministerial, an official publication, distributed amongst our boys in the trenches!

Mr. MURPHY: To win the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sir Allen Aylesworth, one of Canada's most prominent men, has given his only son to fight in the trenches, and his son has to read that literature.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: And we have to pay for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend from Winnipeg says: Speed up, speed up; it is too bad they do not receive this Record soon enough. I do not wish to be too personal, but I desire to nail a lie published in that sheet during the last election, which was read by my son and forwarded to me:

Fighting officer's nomination. Hon. R. Lemieux's petition for rejection is discussed. Daily Record Cablegram, Quebec, Wednesday.

A despatch from Perce, Gaspe, announces that the petition of the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, for the rejection of the nomination of Major L. P. Gauthier, the Unionist candidate, because he is at the front, was dismissed by Judge Tessier. There will be a straight fight in this constituency between the two principal parties.

That, Mr. Chairman, is nothing but a lie. That article was sent by Canada, paid for by Canada, paid for by your humble servant as well as by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Mr. BUREAU: What is the date?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, just in time, the 29th of November. I said this afternoon that the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who pays just as much as the Prime Minister for the publication of this sheet in England, who contributes his share as a taxpayer, had been slandered and libelled by that sheet during the whole election campaign. What do I read on November 29th?:

A victory for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, therefore, would mean that Canada would have to drop out of the war.

This is a lie. Sir Wilfrid Laurier never appealed to his fellowmen on those lines.

Many of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's supporters have gone so far in opposition to it as to pledge themselves, if elected, to disband 100,000 men who have already been called up under the new scheme. That is to say, they have undertaken to wreck the Canadian Army Corps at the most critical moment of the war.

I am in earnest about this. Let by-gones be by-gones. Are we going to pay in the future for such literature to be distributed amongst our boys at the front? At this critical moment, when the right hon. gentleman is making a supreme appeal to this country to unite to win the war, are we going to be called upon to pay for such literature as this? You will never get united effort, national unity, if you go on with such a publication. This is a deliberate insult to one-half of the people of Canada. The Liberals are represented as traitors, quitters, slackers, as desirous of wrecking the army. I have some confidence in my hon. friend

the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). I have no confidence in this Record, and much confidence as I may have in my hon. friend, I do not believe that he is a recording angel himself.

Mr. CURRIE: Before this very interesting debate is ended, I desire to make a few observations. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) stated to the House that, during the election, he did not repudiate the Union Government. I hold in my hand a letter which my hon. friend issued to his constituents in a certain section of his riding, that is, in Tavistock. I do not think he will deny this letter:

Dear Sir, I am taking the liberty of writing you to say that I would like you to give me your support on election day, Monday the 17th, and get as many others of your neighbours to do as you can. I have, as you know, represented the Riding for the past nine years, and, I hope, satisfactorily to you all. I have been a consistent follower of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and still consider him the foremost statesman in Canada.

Not a word there about the leader of the Union Government.

I have never differed with him except on one question and have been a strong opponent of the new War-time Elections Act—

That is the very Act that helped to elect him. This is the beautiful part of the letter:

—which aimed to disfranchise a certain number of my German friends, and if elected will use my best efforts to have the same repealed, as I look upon them as among our very best citizens.

That is to say, the German element in the West are our best citizens.

I also was a strong opponent of the Canadian Northern Bill, and, if elected, will endeavour also to have that rectified.

We shall doubtless hear from him about that later on.

I hope, therefore, that I can count on you for your hearty support and assistance in any way you can. Hoping to hear from you favourably, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. W. Nesbitt.

That is the letter that was sent to one part of the riding. A very touching appeal was sent by the same hon. gentleman to the men in the trenches. I have not that letter here, but I have a copy of it also and no doubt it told very much in his favour over there, because he said he was in favour of the war, he was against the German element in Canada and all that kind of thing. This

is neither the time nor the place to bring up these questions, but after all is said and done, this Government has won and is in power notwithstanding those who are lukewarm behind it, and who were saying nice things about their German friends. I want to say one word in conclusion in reference to the Great War Veterans. Everybody knows that the Great War Veterans' Associations before the election, were manned largely by officers in the employ of the Government.

Any man who became president of the Great War Veterans' Association was given a job on the Hospitals Commission or something of that kind; however, the association has its heart in the right place and is probably more anxious to win the war than any other organization in this country. The action which that organization took before the election was that it would not as a body support any particular party, but would leave to local organizations perfect liberty to exercise their own judgment in selecting candidates. The Great War Veterans' Association selected candidates in a number of constituencies. They had a candidate in the Toronto riding represented by the hon. gentleman who has spoken this evening, and I might say that that is one of the strongest Tory ridings in Canada. I know, and everybody in that city knows very well, that if that gentleman had not had the endorsation of the Union Government and the support of the Conservative machine behind him he had no more chance of winning than a snowball. The Great War Veterans' Association opposed him simply because there was a man in the field who had served his country in the trenches, and had not gone around in clothes masquerading as a soldier, and they had a perfect right to do that. As far as I am concerned if it is ever my duty to vote for any one in an election I am going to vote for the man who fought in the trenches, regardless of what party label he wears, and that is the right thing for those who have seen service to do in my estimation. If this war meant anything in the last election, it was a call by the Government of the day to the people of this country to support the men in the trenches, and I think the action taken in Ontario in some cases smacked very much of old-time ward machine politics.

10 p.m.

Now, about the Toronto Telegram, the widest-read journal in Ontario. The editor of that paper, a great journal—

The CHAIRMAN: I think I must rule that out of order. What we are discussing is clause 1 of the War Appropriation Bill, and not the journalistic doings in the last election.

Mr. CURRIE: I shall endeavour to confine my remarks to the question before us, but the hon. member for Toronto has attacked the editor of the Toronto Telegram on account of his attitude in the last election, and the connection between that and the subject before us is so close that I did not think I was out of order in discussing the matter. However, I do not wish to go into any lengthy remarks, and will only say that I have noticed that the editor of the Toronto Telegram is quite capable of taking care of himself on every occasion, either on the platform or in the columns of his paper.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to interrupt this entertainment but before this act came on I was doing business with the Prime Minister. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has just read from a publication which is distributed in the trenches and paid for by the people of Canada, and he seemed to charge the President of the Privy Council with responsibility for this publication. The President of the Privy Council denied that he was responsible, and said that the publication in question was issued on 29th November, whereas he only took office as manager of the paper on 1st January. The other evening when the Prime Minister was making a statement about the appropriation for 1918-19 he seemed astonished because I took exception to certain matters in connection with the Overseas Minister of Overseas Military Forces who is three thousand miles away from us, and he invoked solidarity—I think that was the word, whether a minister was in France, India or China, it did not matter, as the ministers were all jointly and severally responsible for everything that happened in any department. Consequently, it seems strange to-night that the President of the Privy Council now he is confronted with the misdeeds of his confreres, should say that he did not become responsible until the 1st January, because only the other day we put through a Bill at the request of the Prime Minister which appointed the President of the Privy Council to his present position in the Government, dating from the month of October last. I mention this just to show how this question of solidarity works.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is in error. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve said that this document emanated from the office of the President of the Council, and I said that was incorrect as the publication had not come under my jurisdiction until a later date.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that the excuse that my hon. friend is making?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I was simply correcting my hon. friend from Maisonneuve on a statement of fact, and was saying he had not correctly stated the matter.

Mr. BUREAU: The statement that my hon. friend now makes is that the responsibility was thrown on him. He says he was not President of the Privy Council at that time.

Mr. ROWELL: I have to correct my hon. friend again. The hon. member for Maisonneuve read a statement which he said emanated from the office of the President of the Council; as a matter of fact, he said it had been sent from that office. That was not correct, as the paper was not under my jurisdiction at that time. It was purely a question of fact I was correcting.

Mr. BUREAU: Under whose jurisdiction was the publication? Who was the assignor when my hon. friend became assignee of this job?

Mr. ROWELL: I explained this afternoon that what is done in Canada is the telegraphing over to the other side of Canadian news. That has been done by an officer who has served overseas, and is now here in Canada in charge of that work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is his name?

Mr. ROWELL: Captain Wallace. He was in the Department of Militia prior to his coming under the Director of Public Information.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In what capacity in the Department of Militia?

Mr. ROWELL: He was looking after the sending over of information; I do not know whether he was directly under the Minister of Militia or not, when he was employed in connection with the Canadian War Records in the Old Country. I do not know the arrangement under which he was operating prior to coming under the Director of Public Information.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not answer my question. The hon. gentleman is in control of this publication now, or at all events, whoever edits the paper is under his jurisdiction.

Mr. ROWELL: No. The Director of Public Information reports to me; he is an official under the charge of the President of the Council. Captain Wallace who transmits the news to this publication to England is now under the Director of Public Information.

Mr. BUREAU: And the Director of Public Information is under the jurisdiction of the President of the Council?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to get this clear in my mind, as I do not want the President of the Council shirking his responsibility.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not want to shirk anything.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to know who handed this Bureau of Information over to him, and by what process it was handed over.

Mr. ROWELL: The Bureau of Information was not handed over. The officer in charge of this publication came from the Department of Militia, but I do not know what position he occupied in that department.

Mr. BUREAU: That is immaterial. The point I was making was that if solidarity should be invoked by the Prime Minister in one case it should apply in every case, and the President of the Council is just as much responsible as any other member of the Government for allowing these statements to go abroad.

Mr. JACOBS: A little more so.

Mr. BUREAU: Perhaps. He is a great inspirer, I am told, and his inspiration may have filtered through to the Department of Militia; however, if this family quarrel is adjourned I will now renew my question to the Prime Minister. Does the Victory Loan of last November and all things in connection with it come under the Department of Finance?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before answering the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) I would like to say one or two words in reply to certain observations made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He seems to make a great deal out of very little. Here is an item of which he quoted only a part in the Canadian Daily Record of November 27. It simply gives an account, which has been published in the Canadian press, of an incident that took

place at a political meeting at Beaverton. That is all there is about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is pleasant news for the son of Sir Allen Aylesworth.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Whether it concerns the son of Sir Allen Aylesworth or any one else, it is an item of public news which is proper to be made known to the men in the trenches as it is proper to be made known to the people of Canada generally. I do not know that telegrams describing what has transpired at public meetings in Canada are to be censored from the standpoint of any individual in the trenches. I would regard that as rather an extraordinary proposal. My hon. friend gave another quotation in regard to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I never saw it; yet I venture to think that nothing more would be found in regard to that than I have found in regard to the item on which he lays so much stress. It has now been placed in my hands and I find it is simply an advertisement in the Canadian Daily Record publishing an article from the London Daily Mail. It is upon these two extracts that my hon. friend would endeavour to build up a case for attacking this newspaper. I have already explained—some hon. gentlemen do not seem to understand it—that the Canadian Government does not pay out anything in connection with the Canadian Daily Record except for the news transmitted at the cost of this country overseas for the information and benefit of the men in the trenches. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House will begrudge the very moderate expenditure of public money for enabling these men to know what is transpiring in the country they have left in order that they may fight for its continued existence.

Let no hon. gentleman imagine from what has transpired here this evening that the candidates who had served this country at the front were overlooked. I have examined the list just now and I find that about twenty men, most of whom, I am glad to say, are sitting in this House and who saw service either at the front or here in Canada or in the United Kingdom, were recognized as candidates on behalf of the Union Government at the last election.

In regard to the question which has been put to me by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), the method of procedure under the War Appropriation Act is this: it is not a vote to any particular department. I have explained this at every session of Parliament since the war began. My hon. friend has overlooked it. I have explained it altogether about fifteen or twenty times from first to last. This is not a vote to any department of the Government; it is a vote to the Government as a whole, and therefore no portion of it can be expended by any department except under Order in Council. When any particular sum of money is appropriated to a department out of the war appropriation, that department has power to utilize those funds to that amount and no more, subject to the audit of the Auditor General and to all the precautions in regard to the expenditure of public moneys that would prevail if that particular sum of money had been voted to the department in question by Parliament in the first instance. That is the only way it can be carried out, and that is the way it is carried out. We have felt that where so large a sum of money is voted to the Government as a whole we should take rather extraordinary precautions to see that we understand the purpose for which it is to be expended, and that the accounts are properly and carefully audited.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Lest there should be some misunderstanding in the minds of hon. gentlemen regarding the Daily Record, I will give the history of it. Early in the war it was found, as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) has told the House, the boys were anxious for news from Canada. Accordingly we arranged to send over, I think it was one hundred words a day. We got a grant for one hundred words daily, and we sent that to the boys of each corps along the whole line. There was no advertising, and it was just in "flimsy." We extended it to three hundred words later, and it was under the charge of the Department of Militia and Defence. We put it under the management of two of the best newspaper men we could get—and they are all good. I may say here that the newspaper men of both political parties have played the game like gentlemen from the drop of the hat during this war, and that they have given us every legitimate assistance that they could give. One of these men was Mr. Grange and the other was Mr. Wallis. They were men who would be satisfactory to every hon. gentleman on either side of this House. We sent this news over continuously day after day,

but it was on flimsy. Later on it was printed. I do not know anything about it since that, but I think it is desirable that it should be continued, because I can back up what the hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews) said as to the great service it is to the boys at the front. They need it badly. I have no doubt it will be kept free, and that no side issues will be allowed to crawl into it.

With regard to the other question spoken of by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), I have no hesitation in saying that I am teetotally opposed to employing any gentleman in the capacity of a sort of newsvendor to the ignorant people of this country, because we have none of the class that can be moved by any such process as that. It is nothing but an insult to the intelligence of the people of Canada for a lot of these fellows to go around preaching to the people, telling them to do this, and to do that, and to read Napoleon. The selection of a man who has shown himself so prejudiced and so unworthy of public confidence as this gentleman who has been selected by the President of the Privy Council, is a mistake of the first magnitude. As to the others in the department, I know nothing concerning them at all. They may be all right or all wrong. But if they belong to the type I have indicated, all I can say is that I have never yet seen men of that type do anything to build up the country. As far as I am concerned, I am totally opposed to the action of the President of the Privy Council in establishing this department at considerable expense to the country. I have no hesitation in saying—and my belief has not been changed in the slightest degree by anything that has been said to-day—that the organization of that department composed of these gentlemen, has not for its object the education of the people along lines connected with the winning of the war, but has for its object the education of the people along the lines that will be convenient for certain gentlemen in case they want to use them politically later on.

Mr. POWER: In regard to the history of this sheet, the Canadian Daily Record, at one time overseas, I received that paper, or rather a collection of typewritten sheets, which I read with considerable pleasure. Because, after all, the home papers arrive, as a rule, two or three weeks late. This sheet, I understand, was instituted at the time that my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) was in charge, and consisted of about one hundred words.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was suggested by the notorious character, Max Aitken, Lord Beaverbrook, who had the interests of the boys at heart then the same as now.

Mr. POWER: I agree with my hon. friend as to the notoriety of his friend. However, whatever one thinks of Max Aitken, or any other of my hon. friend's friends, the news which reached us at the time, amounting from one hundred to two hundred words, consisted mainly of reports of the ball and hockey games. Everybody settled his bets by the comic cuts that we received from Canada, and everybody was pleased to get them. But I imagine that the people of Canada would have no objection to furnishing, besides items of this character, news of political events in Canada to the boys at the front. But what, I imagine, the people of Canada—particularly the one-half who voted for us on this side of the House—object to most sincerely is paying for a paper which seemed to have as its particular object the defeat of those candidates who, in the recent election, endeavoured to put before the Canadian people at home, and before Canadian soldiers at the front, views that they thought were straight and honest. I am not speaking because of any personal grouse, though I have one, but from the standpoint of every man who sits on this side of the House. We have no objection to any one on the other side telling us that we are traitors, because we are here to answer the statement; we have no objection to the newspapers, bought with money that came from God knows where—it did not come from this side—but we do object to your loading the dice and stacking the cards against us with the boys overseas. When I see in a paper issued by the Canadian War Records Office, towards which a certain portion of the war vote of $500,000,000 is devoted, as was ably explained by the President of the Council this afternoon, this question asked of Canadian soldiers, "How Would the Kaiser Vote? Vote for Union Government," then I say, Mr. Chairman, one-half of the people of Canada should be consulted as to how this money should be spent, and should be asked to endorse that expenditure.

There is, Mr. Chairman, one more word. In answer to my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). the Prime Minister stated that these articles—I am not talking now only of the advertisements, because if it were only advertisements I suppose we could not have very great objection—cabled from Canada, mentioned something

of the election. But, Mr. Chairman, every word of the headlines in this paper, if they said anything to the man who thus poisoned the wells for the soldiers, said that he was a good poisoner, that he was surely entitled to a seat in the Cabinet of any Government which did nothing to allow the people of Canada to have a free expression of their views, and to a position in any Cabinet which would impose such a law as the War-time Elections Act. Read in the Canadian Daily Record of December 1, 1917, the reference to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig), under the caption:

Archie was willing, but—
Others refused to let him become M.P. by acclamation.

The paragraph itself reads as follows:

Chatham, Ont., Friday.

Despite the efforts of the sympathizers of the Win-the-War Government, Kent County, Ont., will have an election. This has been brought about by a decision of the Laurierites here. The Unionist candidate, Mr. K. W. Plewes, offered to drop out of the fight and give Mr. A. B. McCoig the election by acclamation if the latter would sign a statement agreeing to support the Union Government.

Mr. McCoig put the matter before his supporters, who scornfully refused to do any such thing.

All true, probably, but the headlines and the way it is put to the soldiers to make them think that my hon. friend from Kent was "one of those traitors, one of those slackers, one of those friends of the Kaiser," that is what we complain of. Every one of the articles here is tainted with the same hand, the hand of the man with a brain equal only to the brains of the poisoners of the middle ages. I am sorry that any attack should be made on this paper, because I am sincerely convinced that nothing could be better for the troops at the front than to get news day by day from their homes and the people in Canada. The only objection there is to it, and it is a serious objection, is that apparently whoever is in charge of the Record, and whichever member of the Government is in charge of the paper, is guilty of debauching the news from Canada in order in this time of stress to win some political advantage for himself and for the Government of which he is a member.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Was not the article which the hon. gentleman first read an advertisement?

Mr. POWER: It was an advertisement and I stated it to be such.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that.

Mr. POWER: We have never had any statement as to whether any moneys have been turned in to the Canadian Government, or to the Canadian War Record Office, for advertisements printed in this paper during the period of the election.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As a matter of fact the Canadian Government does not expend any money upon the publication of the Canadian War Record at all. The only money that it does expend is in sending telegraphic news messages, and, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said as to the character of the paper I am under the impression that he has not made a very careful study of its columns, or he would not have committed himself quite so absolutely as he did. For example on the very page from which my hon. friend, the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) quoted I find this:

Denies all knowledge.

Sir Wilfrid makes reply to Premier on recruiting.

(Daily Record Cablegram.)

Ottawa, Monday.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has issued a statement replying to the Premier's speech at Sydney, when Sir Robert said he had asked the Opposition to co-operate in regard to recruiting.

In his reply, Sir Wilfrid Laurier says he has no knowledge whatever of these invitations.

A correction, according to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's ideas, of a statement I had made at Sydney. I would suppose that any hon. gentleman looking at a page of the paper—

Mr. POWER: Would the Prime Minister like to have a photograph of that paragraph, as well as of the paper, shown to anybody in this House? If a photograph were taken of it it would surely be shown that it was an imputation with respect to the honesty of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I must confess that I can hardly enter into the state of mind which would attribute any such imputation as that to the article that I have just read. I shall not discuss it; hon. gentlemen can see it for themselves, as they have heard it for themselves. According to my limited powers of understanding, I should say it could not by any possibility whatever convey any such imputation as the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. BUREAU: The Prime Minister said just now that we should not begrudge the money we are spending for that publica-

tion. It is the same old game. When we get up, and there has been a family quarrel, I am surprised that they do not yell "Quebec." We on this side of the House do not begrudge any expenditure for the soldiers. If you want to have unity, and have us join hands with you in everything, it is high time that these imputations should stop, and when anybody on the other side is in a hole it is sufficient that he cry out: "Oh, well, you have to cry, because this is an expenditure for war purposes." Nobody on the other side can complain that we have embarrassed the Government in any way since the beginning of the session, even when they brought in bad measures, or measures that would be obnoxious to any man who desired to keep this a democratic country if it was not a time of war. We do not want to have any trouble, and it is for that reason that we object to these imputations that have been made against us for the last year or more. As my hon. friend has said, the Canadian Daily Record has contained some shameful posters and literature, which was published in the Ontario papers, and the title "Union Publication Committee," telephone such a number, and such an address, appeared on the sheet. Now, I have no objection to sending this publication to the trenches. The Prime Minister says it does not cost a cent to send it. I say go on and spend money on it, and let the boys in the trenches know what is going on in this country. It is not the spending of $200 more a week or a month that will cripple this country. The object is to keep them in contact with their people. I suppose its not costing the public anything is the excuse for making it a political sheet to be sent to the trenches. We are onto the game, and we won't stand for it, and are determined that these imputations shall go on no longer. The Prime Minister told me that this amount of $500,000,000 is appropriated to the Government as a whole. That being so, I want to see the report of the whole Government as to that Victory Loan. The reason is this: On page 597 of unrevised Hansard, the Prime Minister made the statement that the war expenditure for the Finance Department for the fiscal year 1914-15 was $149,630.09; in 1915-16, $72,000; in 1916-17, $54,000; in 1917-18, $6,000. Now, before 31st March last, the Victory Loan was floated, and my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) told us the other night that the cost of floating that loan was about three millions of dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Five millions.

Mr. BUREAU: And might increase to five millions. My hon. friend is here to correct me. He said that the cost so far was about three millions, but that when all his friends were satisfied it would amount to five millions. I would like to know from the Prime Minister where this five millions representing the commission paid for the raising of the Victory Loan of $300,000,000 is going to be charged.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the advertising.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought I understood that covered all the expenditure incurred in the raising of the Victory Loan.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: On the occasion to which my hon. friend refers, I gave to the House all the information that was available in connection with the cost of the last Victory Loan. The expenditures in that connection, so far as known, amount to $3,620,395. But I said there were additional expenditures to be accounted for, and I am very sorry they are not yet available. But they will be available in a few days when I shall be able to lay on the table of the House a complete statement of the expenditure. It will approximate nearly five million dollars, but the total cost of the loan will amount to one and one-quarter per cent, which is an exceedingly low rate.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not criticising that; I did not rise in a spirit of criticism. I wanted to find out how it is that, according to the Prime Minister's statement, the expenditure for the Finance Department for the fiscal year 1917-18 is $6,024.02, when we know that the floating of this loan is costing the country over four million dollars.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that has any connection with the loan. I am not very familiar with the administration of the Department of Finance but my impression is that, with respect to all loans floated in this country, the cost is deducted from the proceeds of the loan. Perhaps the Acting Minister of Finance can say if that is the case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That has been the practice, I think, in the past. My hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queens can give the House more information on that point than I can.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not followed the argument just now. Speaking generally, the hon. gentleman's statement of practice is correct.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to afford the information that the hon. gentleman desires, if I can give it to him. I did not understand his question. Would he repeat it?

Mr. BUREAU: The Department of Finance has raised a loan of $500,000,000, if I understand it aright, by means of a Victory Loan from the people. This loan has cost a certain amount to the country. My method of keeping books would be to charge the cost of that loan somewhere. Now, if you are going to pay $5,000,000, you won't get $500,000,000; you will only get $495,000,000. I understand from the Prime Minister that the country will be credited ith only $495,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: $398,000,000 is the proceeds of the loan.

Mr. BUREAU: I am using $500,000,000 for the sake of argument. There is a discrepancy in the amount realized of $5,000,000. There has been realized from the loan $495,000,000 and there have actually been issued bonds or certificates to the amount of $500,000,000. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, but what is wrong about it?

Mr. BUREAU: Nothing is wrong with it. But if the Finance Department have been handling this loan, where is the cost of floating it shown? The Prime Minister says that this is a loan which is made to the Government as a whole. Is it distributed among the various departments? Do I understand that the Militia Department, for instance, get $200,000,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend misunderstood the Prime Minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was talking about the appropriation, not about the loan.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All war appropriations are made on behalf of the Government. Ordinarily our estimates appropriate money to the different departments for different purposes, and each department has control over the money voted. But in the case of war expenditures, the appropriation is made by the Government, and the Government is responsible, not the department actually making the expenditure. I informed the House the other day as fully as I could of the exact cost of the Victory Loan. I am sorry that complete and exact details of the expenditure are not available; I hope, however, that they will be available next week, when I shall lay them on the Table. The Victory Loan was in charge of a committee whose headquarters were at Toronto, and the expenditures were incurred by that committee. We must rely upon them to submit all the details to the Department of Finance. We are promised the particulars this week.

Mr. BUREAU: That will be in the public accounts?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The cost of the loan will be deducted from the proceeds of the sale of the bonds.

Mr. BUREAU: There will be that discrepancy between the two sides of the books.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The books of the department will show the total receipts and the total cost of making the loan.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman said that there was a committee in Toronto. What committee was that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Some members of the committee were from Montreal and other parts of Canada, I believe. I am sorry that I cannot inform my hon. friend as to the membership of the committee.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will my hon. friend get that information?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: In the return which my hon. friend promises to bring down, will he give details of the various items of expenditure under the different headings—newspaper advertising, and so on?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The information I propose to lay on the Table will disclose the exact amount paid for publicity, and the amount paid to each newspaper in Canada.

Mr. PEDLOW: Will it contain the amount paid for publicity through the newspapers as distinguished from publicity through other means?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: I listened with great attention to the statement made by the President of the Council this afternoon with regard to his scheme of propaganda throughout Canada and his explanation of the publication in different books and maga-

zines of the reasons for the war and the aims of the Allies. I was not, however, in any way convinced that this country ought to spend so large an amount as the cost of the scheme proposed by the President of the Council would involve. I submit that if the press, not only of the province of Quebec but of all the other provinces as well, were allowed to state exactly the views of the people of the country the people would be thoroughly acquainted with our aims in this war and the objects which we wish to attain. The President of the Council told us that he had appointed as head of the Bureau of Public Information a gentleman by the name of Nichols. I do not wish to repeat what the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said, but if what he said is true—and it has not been contradicted either by the President of the Council or by any member on the other side—Mr. Nichols certainly is not competent to be placed in such a position as that which has been assigned to him by the minister. Mr. Nichols edited two newspapers in Montreal; what happened to those newspapers? Well, they attacked the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) for what purpose I do not know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know, though.

Mr. CANNON: The ex-Minister of Militia thinks he knows. I hope that after I have finished these few remarks, he will explain why he knows.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did.

Mr. CANNON: While the member was Minister of Militia he was conducting the military affairs of the country as best he could. I do not say that I approved everything he did; as a matter of fact I fought some of his decisions and disapproved of part of his policy. But I wish to say one thing for the ex-Minister of Militia: whatever he did, he did in earnest, and it cannot be said of him, as it can of other people in this country, that he was a hypocrite. He may have been wrong, but whenever he was wrong he never claimed that he was right. Another thing I liked about the hon. member is that whenever he had friends he stuck by them—and that is one thing I cannot say for many members on the other side. The ex-minister mentioned this afternoon two of his friends, the first of whom was Mr. Armand Lavergne. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) attacked Mr. Lavergne. I am no friend of Mr. Lavergne, politically speaking, but I wish that the member for Simcoe had the same love for his country, Canada, as the honourable—I correct myself—as Colonel Armand Lavergne seems to have for his country. He may be wrong; his ideas may be exaggerated or false, but he has convictions, and he sticks to them. He does not alter his principles, and when he does anything or means anything, he says so. Some people in Canada do not do that. We have before us a Government composed of supposed Liberals and supposed Conservatives. Are the supposed Conservatives Liberals, and are the supposed Liberals Conservatives? I do not know. But I know one thing: if we had on the other side the same amount of sincerity, conviction and good faith as exists on this side, things in Canada would be better by far. This afternoon I heard, with great surprise, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) speaking of autonomy as if it meant nothing. It may mean nothing to him. If so, I am sorry for him. I would refer the hon. member for Frontenac to one bright work among the classical works of English writers. I refer to the work entitled the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, by Gibbon. I would refer him to the second volume of that work, and if he is not too busy, he might go through that second volume and find out the true answer to this question: Why did the Roman Empire fall? The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), I see, is laughing. I may say to the Minister of Labour that I put the question for this reason, namely, that the greatest empire which has ever existed in the history of the world since the Roman Empire is the British Empire, and therefore it would be very prudent for statesmen like the Minister of Labour to inquire as to the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, so as to prevent the existence of similar causes in regard to the British Empire. Why did the Roman Empire fall? The Roman Empire fell because Rome thought that she had not to consider the mentality, the aspirations, the hopes, of her dependencies, and whenever the Roman emperors declared war, they would simply call on the provinces of Gaul, or Asia, or Africa, to contribute so many thousand men, and those men had to come into the field and fight for the Roman Empire. How long did that condition last? A very short period of time. We are here to legislate, not so as to shorten the life of the British Empire, but, if possible, to lengthen it, and any measures introduced by the Government of the nature of that which is submitted to us to-night are cer-

tainly not of a character to improve the political relations of the colonies towards the British Empire. The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) told us to-day that when he was our Minister of Militia, when he was at the head of our army, an army which now numbers over 400,000 men, he had practically nothing to do with the conduct of the army. Such a condition of things should not exist.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I correct the hon. member? It was assumed by Canadians, the Canadian High Commissioner and others, that we had nothing to say in the matter. When I laid the matter before the British Government, I did so very clearly, and Viscount Kitchener, Sir Douglas Haig, Sir William Robertson, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law and others recognized our position exactly as I laid it down.

Mr. CANNON: I understand from what the hon. member says that our official representative in England, our High Commissioner at London, was under the impression that we had absolutely nothing to do with the conduct of our army the moment it landed in England?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: Our Minister of Militia at that time maintained the contrary. What was the result? The Commissioner is still there, and the minister is out.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Happy, though.

Mr. CANNON: Happy to be out. Maybe the ex-minister is happy, but if the ex-minister contended for the maintenance of our autonomy, I may say that I am not happy that he is out, because the stand taken by him is the stand that should be taken by every true and sincere Canadian. We are subjects of the British Empire, it is true. I would be the last man to forget that I am a British subject; I would be the last man to preach, in my province or in my constituency any disloyalty towards the British Crown; but on the other hand, I would be the last man to say that I am the slave of England or of Downing street.

Mr. HAY: What about the American forces in England and France at the present time?

Mr. CANNON: The American forces have been placed by their Government at the disposal of General Foch as Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces, but our Government never had anything to do as to our troops once they went overseas. That is the difference.

I was astounded, I was amazed this afternoon when the Minister of Militia declared that he did not even know who was the army commander of the Canadian corps at present. Where do we stand? We are no longer in 1760. We are no longer at the stage when this Canada of ours was merely a small colony which a few thousands of people were trying to open up to colonization and civilization. This Canada is a country and the Canadian people are a nation. We are not a Crown colony. What is our status? When you take a country like Montenegro, which has contributed to the Allied forces in this war a force of about 10,000 men, whenever there is a military conference in Paris or in London the representatives of Montenegro are called in to give their opinion. And at such conferences, where is our Canadian representative? When England decided to declare war on Germany and Austria, was the Prime Minister of this country consulted? Did the Prime Minister of this country receive a cable from the Imperial authorities? If he did, I should like him to let me know. We were not consulted as to the declaration of war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may tell the hon. gentleman that we were in constant communication with the Imperial authorities for days before war broke out.

Mr. CANNON: Constant communication with the Imperial authorities possibly, but if the Prime Minister wants to be sincere he will admit he never was consulted as to whether this Empire should declare war on Germany or not.

Mr. CURRIE: This Parliament did take action.

Mr. CANNON: It was never consulted as to the declaration of war.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. CANNON: I know what I am talking about.

Mr. CURRIE: No, you do not.

Mr. CANNON: I do not wish to carry on a discussion with the hon. member along these lines. Ignorance is no argument, and he can keep his to himself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I think that a great deal of useless discussion would be avoided if the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), who now has the floor, would

bring his remarks a little nearer to the Bill under consideration.

Mr. CANNON: I will ask the Chairman to read the clause now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (reading): "This Act may be cited as The War Appropriation Act, 1918."

Mr. CANNON: The preamble has not been adopted, has it?

The CHAIRMAN: No, it has not. According to the rules of the House, consideration of the preamble has been postponed until the clauses have been considered.

Mr. CANNON: Therefore, all clauses are subject to the preamble, which reads as follows——

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have just stated that the discussion on the preamble has been postponed until the clauses have been considered. If the hon. member does not wish to submit to my ruling he can appeal to the House.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I understand that according to the rules I can state my position.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to inform the hon. gentleman that according to the rules, the hon. member cannot state his opinion after the Chairman has made his ruling, and the only recourse is an appeal to the House without discussion.

Mr. CANNON: What is the Chairman's ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: It is that we are discussing the short title of this Bill, and that the remarks now being made by the hon. member for Dorchester are not in order, as they do not relate to the clause now under discussion.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision, Mr. Chairman. I understand that this is a Bill to grant to the Government $500,000,000 for war purposes. I have listened to the discussion and have heard the hon. member for North Ox-
11 p.m. ford (Mr. Nesbitt) complain as to the choice of candidates, and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) complain of the way his opponent was called back from Europe. I have heard the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) giving his ideas as to the conduct of the war and the many mistakes that have been committed, not by himself evidently, but by other people. I have heard the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) attacking the hon. member for North Oxford, and have heard attacks on the Roman Catholic clergy, and all kinds of other things, and I now wish as briefly as possible to answer these attacks, if they are not irrelevant to the clause under consideration. When the chairman after an interruption by the hon. member for North Simcoe called me to order, I had just stated that Canada had had nothing to do with the declaration of war. Another question I would raise is, have we anything to do with the conduct of the war? A few months ago the newspapers announced that an Allied Council has been established at Versailles, composed of representatives from England, France, Italy and other Allied nations. Was Canada represented at that Council? Has the Government of Canada been consulted as to that Council? I do not know, but judging from the official statement of the Government, I do not think this Government was consulted.

[The Chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order. Once again, and for the last time, I call the hon. gentleman to order. He is now discussing the principle of this Bill—discussion which might more properly have taken place on the second reading. In any event, it certainly is not in order on the clause under consideration,

Mr. CANNON: With all respect for the Chairman of this committee I wish to——

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. CANNON: On the second reading of this Bill it was distinctly understood——

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VIEN: May I ask the Prime Minister if it was not distinctly understood that we could discuss the principle of the Bill in committee just as on the second reading?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not so understand.

Mr. VIEN: There was something of that kind understood.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will look it up and see what it was. I remember that I said I would give a great deal of information in committee which I might otherwise have given on the second reading.

Mr. VIEN: The Bill was given its second reading to rush matters, but on the distinct understanding that we could discuss its principle in committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not aware of that.

Mr. VIEN: That is what we gathered from the Prime Minister's remarks the other day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman will find what I said on page 596 of Hansard. I said that it was not necessary to discuss the principle and therefore I did not propose to discuss it, but would give information on the second reading. The leader of the Opposition said:

> The suggestion of the Prime Minister, in so far as the method of giving information to the House is concerned, is quite acceptable. In order to facilitate business, the information which is usually conveyed to the House in a resolution was postponed until the second reading of the Bill. We on this side of the House shall reserve our right to criticise the main features of the Bill, after the information promised has been received, when the Bill comes up again for discussion.

There was nothing said about discussing the principle.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision. The honourable the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) this afternoon gave us a statement as to the great scheme he had to open up the minds of the people of Canada as to the object of the country in this war. If we are to believe the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and which were not contradicted, if the Government wish to carry on a propaganda of the same character as that which was carried on in England during the election and if the Liberals of Canada are to be represented in these official papers as the Kaiser's friends I do not think it would be fair for any gentleman on the other side of the House, not even for the President of the Privy Council, to ask us to pay for papers that are libelling us all the time. The President of the Privy Council says that his sole object is to unite the population of this country and to increase our strength in fighting Germany. As far as that is concerned, we are always unanimous.

Mr. EDWARDS: In theory.

Mr. CANNON: In theory and in practice.

Mr. EDWARDS: Not to any alarming extent.

Mr. CANNON: We may differ as to means and methods but I think our spirit is the same. I think that our ideas are in common and that on both sides we wish to win the war and to prosecute it with the greatest possible vigour. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that this propaganda that is being carried on has certain dangers. Why should the people of this country who are divided in their political views be called upon to pay the expenses of publications, lectures and meetings when the views expressed in these publications, lectures and meetings may not be in the interest of unity or of the country generally? As far as the President of the Privy Council is concerned, I have not the pleasure or the honour of knowing him personally, but I have known him casually through reports published in the papers and through speeches made in the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CANNON: If any hon. member wishes to interrupt me I would ask him to rise. These publications may be good, but judging by those which have been issued in the past, I do not think it would be fair or just to the people of this country to ask them to pay for them. In England, in France, and among our overseas troops, these publications have been issued absolutely for political purposes. If the Unionist party wishes to promote its aims and to improve its chances of being elected, should not the Unionist party pay its party and election expenses instead of the Government bearing these expenses? It is not fair, just or equitable. I notice in memorandum No. 3, which is being distributed to the members, a statement published on page 60. This statement contains one item to which I wish to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister. It is an item as to the Ross rifles. According to that statement, we have spent $8,360,358.32 for the period covered by the memorandum. What has become of those Ross rifles? The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), I understand, was a firm supporter of the Ross rifle. He was a very convinced believer in the qualities of the Ross rifle as a war weapon. Last year, without any warning, the workers who were employed at the Ross rifle factory in Quebec received notice that their services were no longer required.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman know if there is any truth in the rumour that for the purpose of carrying on the war they are trying to manufacture a cannon in Quebec that will shoot three thousand miles?

Mr. CANNON: I do not know if such a gun is to be manufactured, but if it were I think it would be very useful to the hon. member because he does not fire very far.

Mr. EDWARDS: Will the hon. gentleman undertake to raise a battalion to operate such a gun from his constituency?

Mr. CANNON: The hon. member may think he is very funny. If he is of that opinion I am not going to disabuse his mind of the idea, because when a man wishes to be funny I like him to enjoy his own jokes. But I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that we on this side are not here to make jokes. We are not here to laugh, but to discuss as seriously as we can the problems which are submitted to us, and we are thoroughly in earnest in our resolution to do so. If the hon. member does not agree with me I am very sorry for him. I do not wish to be funny, I desire to be serious and I hope he will adopt the same attitude. I was remarking to the Prime Minister that the Ross rifle factory in Quebec is closed. The closing of that factory was a real calamity, because it deprived thousands of labourers of employment and forced them to leave our city and to go elsewhere to seek for work. I would like the Government to give us an explanation as to why the Ross rifle factory was closed, because the explanations offered by the Government at the time were incomplete and unsatisfactory. The people of Quebec are asking why that factory should have been closed after the Government had made such a large expenditure as they did in connection with the manufacture and purchase of Ross rifles. I will not take up time in unduly discussing this matter, but I sincerely hope that the Government, before this discussion closes, will vouchsafe a satisfactory answer on the subject.

Mr. DAVIDSON: If the hon. gentleman would apply to the former member for Edmonton, Mr. Oliver, he would get all the information possible on that subject.

Mr. CANNON: That is indeed a very bright suggestion on the hon. gentleman's part.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: May I inquire if the military publication known as "Knouts and Lashes" is published by the department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I never heard of it before.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does the Government grant any subvention to that publication?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. VIEN: This afternoon I asked for some information from the Prime Minister as to the management of the Department of Militia Overseas. I did not want at the time to interrupt the trend of the discussion that was immediately afterwards started by other speakers on other subjects, and which served to divert attention from the point which I raised, but I now wish to press for an answer, because the point involved is most important. If we wish to continue to consider ourselves as a nation we must deal with our army as a nation does. The Prime Minister told us that in the direction of military operations the Canadian commander in the field had to receive orders from the Commander in Chief of the Allied Armies. In that arrangement we all concur, but in our expeditionary force there are regiments, brigades, divisions and army corps. We have staffs for the regiments, and also brigade and division and army staffs, and we have the army council advising the Minister of Militia Overseas. But it seems to me, and the same idea occurs to a great many members of this House as well as to a large number of our people, that such being the case, promotions in and appointments to the Canadian Expeditionary Force could be easily followed, could be easily recommended, and easily kept under the control of the Minister of Militia Overseas, who should be required to report these matters to the Canadian Government for the information of the House. If I understood the Prime Minister correctly, he told us that the military operations were under the control of the War Office and the Commander in Chief of the Allied Armies, but he did not advise us as to how the appointments or promotions in the regiments, or on the brigade, division and army corps staffs were made. Neither did he answer the other question I asked, which was whether the commander of our army in the field reports either to the Minister of Militia Overseas, or directly to the Government, how our troops are ordered into action and how they come out. This information I also deem to be of importance. Field Marshall Haig, the commander of the British troops in the field, now acts under the supreme command of General Foch, but that does not prevent the former from sending despatches to his Government as to how the troops go into action and how they come out. I, therefore, wish for information on those points: First, as to the appointment of officers and as to their displacement; secondly, as to the orders given to our troops to go into action or to come out of it, and whether the commander in the field

has any orders to report to the Government by despatches in that respect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already explained, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not grasp my statement, that in so far as appointments and promotions at the front are concerned, they are carried out practically by the military commanders in the brigades, the divisions and the army corps. We do not interfere at all, and I think the public would regard us as practically insane if we did in this instance attempt to do so. In the case of the higher commands word is sent to us, but naturally we feel that those who are in command of the troops understand better the qualifications, the experience and the ability of the men selected for a particular post.

Mr. VIEN: Who appoints the higher commands?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the case of a brigade, there would be a recommendation from the commander which would, I presume, require the approval of the divisional commander and the commander of the corps. In the case of a division, the divisional commander would make his recommendation to the commander of the corps. It all goes in that way. Inasmuch as the commander of the corps is responsible in the last analysis, why, naturally his approval must be secured. And then in the case of important commands—

Sir SAM HUGHES: We cannot hear a word.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was saying that the commander of the corps must approve, as I understand, because he is, in the highest degree, responsible. As to important commands, we have been consulted over here. But we have never attempted to over-ride the recommendations made from the front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: While what the Prime Minister says in practice may be true, surely the Prime Minister does not for a second dispute that he and his Cabinet have the final say in the appointment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Absolutely, we have, and I have said so repeatedly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is quite possible for a gentleman living in Ottawa to know quite as much about the capacity of these officers as a gentleman thirty miles in the rear of the fighting line.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I would like to ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia if French-speaking recruits will be sent to the trenches as a unit; that is, will they be merged into French regiments like the 22nd Battalion? I understand that the 150th Regiment was broken up in England. It was commanded by Colonel Barré, a good officer, who has received the medal of the Legion d'Honneur. I want to impress upon the Minister of Militia that in my judgment it is important that French Canadians should be kept together. Last week the minister said that he regretted very much that owing to the necessities of the situation a certain regiment which came from a certain province had to be disbanded, and that it would have been better for the spirit of the corps if it had remained together. I think that special steps should be taken to see that French Canadians, a great number of whom do not understand English, shall be commanded by officers who can speak French. Sometimes orders may be given of extreme importance, and it would seem to me that these instructions should be given by officers who can give the necessary explanation in their language. I would strongly and energetically urge that French Canadians should not be merged with English regiments, because they will have sufficient hardships to endure without the added difficulty of language.

Mr. MORPHY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I am just finishing; I won't be long. I noticed in a Montreal paper a statement by Colonel Mignault, who has been to the front, and is, I presume, well known to the Militia Department, in which he argues along this line, that the French Canadians should be kept together as a unit.

Major-General MEWBURN: I think I said some days ago in the House that the whole organization is on the territorial principle, that in England they have some regiments linked up with those overseas. Any recruits coming from Military Districts No. 4 and No. 5, taking in Montreal and Quebec, go over and are put into the reserve battalions, and from these they are gradually sent over as reinforcements to the units in the fighting line coming from their home districts. There are several regiments at the front known as Quebec regiments. I won't say that they are filled completely with French Canadians, because, I think, in some instances, that they were unable to keep up their reinforcements. But the 13th, 14th, 22nd, 24th, 5th, and the 87th are all known as Quebec regi-

ments coming from the province of Quebec, and the reserve units in England take care of these men, and they go from there to the line regiments in the front.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: Will the hon. minister promise the House to put himself into communication with the Imperial authorities to see that French Canadians shall be kept together as much as possible? It is not an evasive answer that I wish to have.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Probably the Minister of Militia would allow me to answer the hon. gentleman's question. We all know that the 22nd Battalion, which has covered itself with so much glory at the front, is entirely a French Canadian battalion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not entirely.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think so. As the French Canadians go from Montreal to England and as the Minister of Militia has pointed out, they are put into what is known in England as the 10th Reserve Battalion under Colonel DesRosiers. They are all French Canadians there; I was in that camp and saw them. So I wish to assure my hon. friend that the French Canadians at the front are kept together in the 22nd Battalion and officered by French Canadians.

Mr. VIEN: The right hon. Prime Minister answered the first question. He will perhaps be able to tell me whether the Government received any despatch from the commander of the troops in the field as to how they were ordered into action, and how they came out?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Officer Commanding the corps in the field reports to us through the Minister of the Overseas Service. We receive very frequent reports. As far as ordering them into action or out of action is concerned, of course, the Government sitting here in Ottawa has nothing to do with ordering them into action any more than the people in the War Office have to do with directing General's Haig's movements. These things must be done by the military commanders at the front.

Mr. VIEN: My right hon. friend said a minute ago that before the war broke out the Government was in constant consultation—

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I want to call your attention to the fact that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item under consideration. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite have flagrantly violated that rule this evening.

The CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent of the committee, and also of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia, it was understood that all questions relating to the administration of the forces and all expenditures connected with this Bill should be discussed in committee. I do not think that the hon. member has wandered far enough away from that aspect of the matter under consideration to warrant my calling him to order.

Mr. VIEN: I assure my hon. friend that I do not want to delay the procedure unnecessarily. I simply wish to obtain from the Prime Minister such information as will enable us to appreciate how things are managed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: For about a week, or perhaps more, before the war broke out the Government of the United Kingdom were in constant communication with us. I was away from Ottawa—I left, I think, on 23rd July—and these communications, the purport of which was transmitted to me, were of such a character that on July 30th I came to the conclusion that I should return to Ottawa. I arrived on the morning of August 1st, and went over the communications which had been received. A great many more came during the next three or four days, until war broke out. We were kept constantly advised. On 1st August I took upon myself the responsibility of advising the Government of the United Kingdom that if war did unfortunately break out this country would stand with the Mother Country and the other dominions of the Empire to the end. I further sent them a confidential telegram, which has since been made public, stating that I believed we could send a division over almost immediately. The question whether or not Parliament and the country would stand behind that declaration came up in the first instance at the session of Parliament which opened on 18th August. On that occasion this country, through the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, decided that the course which I had taken was the proper one and they would stand behind it without a dissenting voice.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Prime Minister has left out a very important point—

that Britain did not ask Canada to support her. The action of Canada was purely voluntary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I certainly desired to be so understood. The telegram which I sent on 1st August was not in response to any appeal; it was a voluntary offer which I made on behalf of the people of Canada, and which was afterwards ratified by this Parliament.

Mr. VIEN: I asked for this information because I understood the Prime Minister to inform the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) that for over a week before the war broke out he had been in constant consultation with the Imperial Government. I gather from what the Prime Minister says that the Government was in constant consultation with the Imperial authorities so far as our participation in the war was concerned, but not so far as the declaration of war itself was concerned.

Last year the Ross rifle factory was closed down. I was not in the House at the time, but I understood from a declaration made by the acting Prime Minister of that time, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that the Ross rifle factory had been closed down on account of the rifle having been discarded, and that the Ross rifle factory would be transformed into a factory for the manufacture of Lee-Enfield rifles. What has been done with the Ross rifle factory, and what steps have been taken to convert it into a Lee-Enfield rifle factory?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No arrangements have been made to convert the Ross rifle into Lee-Enfield rifle. Speaking without any expert knowledge, I doubt very much whether that would be possible. The troops were being armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and it was not considered desirable to proceed with the manufacture of more Ross rifles. The best disposition possible was made of those on hand.

Mr. VIEN: What has been done with the machinery that was in the Ross rifle factory?

Major-General MEWBURN: Some parts of the machinery that were not required for the manufacture of rifles have been sold; I could not give the exact quantity. I understand it is not the intention of the Government to continue the manufacture of Ross rifles. Some scraps of machinery and material that were not further required have been sold.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: At what price was the Ross rifle factory appropriated by the Government?

Major-General MEWBURN: An Order in Council fixed a maximum price on the expropriation of $3,000,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is it the intention of the Government to manufacture Lee-Enfield rifles in the Ross rifle factory?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We had a great deal of correspondence with the British Government as to what rifle would eventually be used throughout the Empire. It was recognized at the Imperial War Conference, that it was desirable that all troops of the Empire should be equipped and armed, as far as possible, in the same way. It is still quite uncertain what type of rifle will eventually be used. One thing is certain: that at the end of this war there will be a very much greater stock of rifles on hand than the Empire will require for peace purposes. Under these circumstances it is obvious that we could come to no conclusion as to the manufacture of any particular type of rifle in this country in the immediate future.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there any proposal to turn the Ross rifle factory into a plant for the manufacture of machine guns for a foreign Government?

Major-General MEWBURN: There was a suggestion in that regard, and some negotiations took place, but nothing came of them.

Mr. VIEN: Are the details of expenditure in connection with the expropriation of the Ross rifle factory published officially?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are available in statements that have been made in the House.

Mr. VIEN: I do not think any statement was laid on the Table so far as the expenditure incurred is concerned.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There was in the memorandum alluded to a statement as to the expenditure during that particular year.

Mr. VIEN: I understand the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) told us the other day that he expected the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report to be available in a few days, or, at least, that he could tell us shortly when it would be available. Can the minister tell us now when we may expect the fourth volume which contains a great deal of information and details as to the expenditure? The House will not find our inquiries too ex-

tended or obnoxious, because $500,000,000 was voted last year and have been expended, and as insufficient reports have been laid on the Table of the House, I think our inquiry is justified.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree that the hon. gentleman's demands are proper. I am sorry I cannot give him any further information this evening, but I shall do so to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. JOS. READ: I just want to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the very great danger to which they have been exposing the Empire by not sticking to the truth, especially in those publications. Take for instance, that publication that is still under discussion. In that sheet which my hon. friends had circulating amongst our boys, it was stated that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, won the election, it would mean that Canada intended to quit. Did ever any hon. gentleman opposite think of what moral effect such a statement would produce not only upon our boys at the front, but upon the Imperial forces? Supposing Sir Wilfrid Laurier had won the election, what a state those people would have been in. Hon. members opposite must remember that the morale of an army is of as much importance as its ability to fight, and yet at the risk of lowering the morale of our army, my hon. friends, in order to win the election, go to the extreme method of publishing an absolute falsehood. My hon. friends want to be careful what they do.

Mr. VIEN: I would suggest to the Prime Minister that in view of the fact that we have not the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report, and in view of the fact that the report of the Military Service Council was distributed only to-day, the consideration of the clause under discussion should be postponed until another day, and that the committee should rise and report progress. There is not immediate urgency, and we shall not by any means unfairly delay the discussion of these matters, but it is only fair that, before the title of the Bill is carried, we should be put in possession of the documents and details.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not quite see the relevancy of the report of the Military Service Council to the appropriation under discussion. The report of the Militia Council, I am informed, was laid upon the table of the House about a week ago. Perhaps my hon. friend is confusing the one with the other. There are two distinct reports. One is the report of the Militia Council, which does contain a great deal of information relative to the appropriation that is now being asked for. The other is the report of the Military Service Council, an absolutely different thing, which has to do with the enforcement of the Military Service Act. According to my apprehension, that has very little relation to the appropriation that is now being asked for. I was not aware that the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report was not brought down. If the fourth volume contains his report respecting the Department of Militia and Defence, that, of course, is very relevant to the subject under discussion.

Mr. VIEN: It contains all the expenditure overseas, and especially the latest expenditure. The expenditure made by the Military Service Council comes under the War Appropriation Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know it does, but the report deals with methods, not with expenditures, and therefore, notwithstanding the suggestion of my hon. friend, I venture to impress upon him that it really has very little relation to this appropriation. The other two reports which he has mentioned have very direct relation to the appropriation.

Mr. VIEN: In view of the fact that the fourth volume of the Auditor General's Report, containing important details and information, is not available, I would suggest that the committee rise and report progress.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We had better pass this section. We have been at it for two days, and as it consists of only one line, if we should take as much time for every other line in the Bill, we would get through with this appropriation by next September. I hope we shall get through a little earlier than that. I should like to say further that when my hon. friend suggests there is not some urgency about this matter, he is not thoroughly well advised. Since the 31st day of March, we have not had any money to carry on this war, and while it is perfectly true, I suppose, that bills and accounts have not yet come in to any great extent, we may expect them to come in very soon, and until this measure is passed, there will be no money with which to meet them. Therefore, while I do not desire in any way to restrict discussion, but rather to invite it, I hope hon. gentlemen will not be under the impression that there is no urgency in connection with this measure.

Mr. PARENT: Will the Minister of Militia be good enough to tell the committee what procedure must be taken to enter the Royal Flying Corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: Applications are made to the Officer Commanding the Royal Flying Corps in the Royal Bank Building, Toronto. General Hoare is the Officer Commanding, and when he is travelling between Texas and the Canadian camps, applications may be made to the Officer Commanding the Royal Flying Corps at Toronto, where the headquarters is.

Mr. PARENT: My reason for mentioning this matter to the minister is that I have had occasion to hear of a couple of cases of young men in the city of Quebec who wanted to apply for a commission in that particular corps and who were not able to succeed for one reason or another. The men are fully qualified in the way of education, physical capacity and so on.

Major-General MEWBURN: The Royal Flying Corps is not under our jurisdiction; it is under the Imperial War Department. They have their head office at Toronto. They have several camps in this country; they will be opening up at Camp Borden next month or probably the end of this month. If the hon. member finds any difficulty in getting information, I shall be glad to give him all information possible.

Mr. PARENT: Has the minister nothing to do with the corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: Nothing whatever. The appointments are all made through the officers of the Flying Corps around here.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To my personal knowledge the branch of the Aviation Corps in Montreal is under the charge of Mr. Lightall, and he has done excellent work in Montreal. I have sent many young men to him myself, and after examination at his office, where an Imperial officer is present, these young men are enlisted. I was surprised to see how rapidly it could be done.

Major-General MEWBURN: I presume my hon. friend is referring to young men who want a commission in the Flying Corps. The Flying Corps have offices all over the country—in Montreal, in the West, and in the United States—and applications are received through any of these offices. I was speaking of the headquarters of the Flying Corps in Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest that the minister get some of his officers to ascertain just where these offices are, and have the information published in the newspapers so that these young men would know where to apply.

Major-General MEWBURN: We pass these applications right along.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let the newspapers publish the information so the boys will have the data.

Mr. PARENT: I think the minister said the Government had nothing to do with the Royal Flying Corps, but I find on page 61 of Memorandum No. 3 that the flying officers are paid at the rate of $6—I do not know whether that is per day or not—and an allowance. Apparently this money is paid by the country, so the Government must have something to do with the Royal Flying Corps.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman probably did not hear the explanation which I made. There was some allowance made by this country to officers who went into the Flying Corps and lost pay on that account.

Mr. PARENT: My only object in bringing forward this matter is to facilitate the enlisting of men in the Flying Corps. For some reason at the present time there is a great deal of red tape to be gone through. I think if the minister would look into this matter it would help considerably.

Major-General MEWBURN: I shall do so with pleasure. I know the Flying Corps are only too glad to get recruits, and I am surprised to hear there is any red tape in the matter.

Mr. CANNON: I asked the Prime Minister some time ago to state the reasons why the Ross rifle factory was closed. I do not know whether he forgot about the subject.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I certainly could not have forgotten about it, because I gave the reasons, but perhaps my hon. friend did not hear them. I explained that the Ross rifle was not now used, that the men were armed with another rifle, and therefore it would not be in the public interest to continue manufacturing the Ross rifle.

The CHAIRMAN: Before passing clause 1, I should like to remind the committee that it was on this clause that all these questions concerning expenditure were asked. If any hon. members have any

further questions of that nature to ask, I think it would be a proper time to ask for the information before this clause passes.

Mr. VIEN: I understood from the Prime Minister's statement that further questions could be asked when the full volume of the Auditor General's Report was available.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Let me relieve my hon. friend's anxiety at once. If the Chairman has no objection, I see no reason why we should not continue this discussion, in so far as it is relevant, on any other clause of the Bill. There is no reason why information could not be given on any other clause. But I hope it will not be found necessary to have a discussion of quite so comprehensive a scope on the other clauses. I would suggest that the discussion be a little more relevant, but so far as relevant information is concerned, there will not be the slightest objection to giving it on any clause of the Bill, or even on the preamble, which we have not yet reached.

Mr. VIEN: The Prime Minister will render us this justice: That so far as relevancy is concerned, this side of the House has kept to the point as closely as hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not intending to draw any comparison whatever.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 12 midnight.

Friday, April 19, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Amendments of Defence of Canada Order, 1917.—Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.

Statement issued by the War Cabinet of the United Kingdom, at the request of the Board of Admiralty, showing for the United Kingdom and for the world, for the period August, 1914, to December, 1917: 1. Mercantile losses by enemy action and marine risk. 2. Mercantile shipbuilding output. 3. Enemy vessels captured and brought into service; together with diagrams showing mercantile losses and shipbuilding output for the United Kingdom and for the world for the same period.—Sir Robert Borden.

[The Chairman.]

THE LATE JOHN McMARTIN, M.P.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): It is appropriate to refer to the loss which the House has sustained in the death of one of its members, John McMartin, member for Glengarry. Mr. McMartin had been elected by acclamation and took his seat on the first day of the session, but I had not then the privilege of meeting him. I am sure that the sympathy of all the members of the House will go out to his family and relatives who are called on to mourn his loss. Mr. McMartin had no opportunity of taking part in the proceedings of the House, but we know that he was a man of strong character, of wide business experience and great business ability, and I do not doubt that these qualities would have made him a most valuable and useful member of the House. I am sure that all of us deplore the loss which the membership of the House has sustained in his death.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I associate myself with the expressions which have been uttered by the Prime Minister concerning our late fellow member. Mr. McMartin was an old friend of mine, and I can testify to the high character which he always bore. The fact of his election by acclamation in the county in which he resided was excellent testimony as to his worth. I had the pleasure of meeting him when he was here on the first day of the session, and it was evident then that the hand of death was already upon him. We extend our sympathy to the members of his family.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 64, to amend the Indian Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The main purpose of the Bill is to make less difficult the enfranchisement of Indians, that is to say, it provides for the withdrawal of Indians in special cases from their present condition and their erection into the condition of citizens.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MILITARY SERVICE.

MOTION BY THE PRIME MINISTER ENACTING REGULATIONS BY GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL FOR THE CALLING OF MEN TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that regulations respecting Military Service shall be made and enacted by the Governor in Council in manner and form and in the words and figures following, that is to say:

P. C. 919.

At the Government House at Ottawa.

Present:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Whereas there is an immediate and urgent need of reinforcements for the Canadian Expeditionary Force and the necessity for these reinforcements admits of no delay;

And whereas it is deemed essential that notwithstanding exemptions heretofore granted a substantial number of men should be withdrawn forthwith from the civil life for the purpose of serving in a military capacity;

And whereas, having regard to the number of men immediately required and to the urgency of the demand, time does not permit of examination by exemption tribunals of the value in civil life, or the position, of the individuals called up for duty:

Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, and in virtue of the powers conferred on the Governor in Council by The War Measures Act, 1914, and otherwise, is pleased to make the following regulations which shall come into force as soon as approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament, and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:—

Regulations.

1. In these regulations,—

(a) "Minister" shall mean the Minister of Militia and Defence.

(b) "Act" shall mean the Military Service Act, 1917.

2. Class 1 under the Act shall, in addition to the men included therein as in the said Act mentioned, include all men who,—

(a) Are British subjects; and

(b) Are not within the classes of persons described in the exceptions mentioned in the schedule to the Act; and

(c) Have attained the age of 19 years; but were born on or since 13th October, 1897; and

(d) Are unmarried or widowers without children; and

(e) Are resident in Canada.

3. Class 2 under the Military Service Act, 1917, shall, in addition to the men included therein as in the said Act mentioned, include all men who,—

(a) Are British subjects; and

(b) Are not within the classes of persons described in the exceptions mentioned in the schedule to the said Act; and

(c) Have attained the age of 19 years; but were born on or since 13th October, 1897; and

(d) Are married or widowers with children; and

(e) Are resident in Canada.

4. The words "In any theatre of actual war" in the fifth exception in the schedule to the Act shall not include the high seas or Great Britain or Ireland and the said exception shall be interpreted accordingly.

5. The Governor in Council may direct orders to report for duty to issue to men in any class under the Act of any named age or ages or who were born in named years or any named year or part of a year and any exemption heretofore granted to any man of any such named age or year of birth shall cease from and after noon of the day upon which he is ordered so to report and no claim for exemption by or in respect of any man shall be entertained or considered after the issue to him of such order, provided, however, that the Minister may grant leave of absence without pay to any man by reason of the death, disablement or service of other members of the same family while on active service in any theatre of actual war.

6. The age stated in any claim for exemption made by or on behalf of any man or in any other document signed by the man shall be conclusive evidence as against him of his age and year of birth.

7. The Minister may, from time to time, direct that no orders to report for duty be issued to men who have been examined by military medical boards and placed in such medical categories as are specified in such direction.

8. All men included in Class 1 by virtue of the provisions of these regulations shall report to the Registrar or Deputy Registrar under the Act as required by Proclamation; they shall be subject to military law as in such Proclamation set out and shall, in the event of their failing to report, be liable to the penalties specified in the Act and the regulations thereunder.

9. (a) Any man now unmarried, who at any time hereafter attains the age of 19 years and is then a British subject resident in Canada and not within one of the exceptions in the Schedule to the Act, shall; and

(b) Any man who, having attained the age of 19 years, being then a British subject resident as aforesaid and not within one of the exceptions in the schedule to the Act, becomes a widower without children, shall, if the class within which he then falls has been called out on active service,

Forthwith become subject to military law and shall within ten (10) days thereafter report to the Registrar or Deputy Registrar under the province or the part of a province in which he resides. He shall be placed on active service as provided by the Act, by the regulations thereunder or by these regulations, and shall, until so placed on active service be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

10. Where under or pursuant to any treaty or convention with any foreign Government or any country provision is now or may hereafter be made that the subjects of such Government or the citizens of such country resident in Canada may be made liable by law to military service, such subjects or citizens of such Government or country may be called out by Proclamation and shall report, be liable to military law and be placed on active service as may be specified in said Proclamation or in the Act or the regulations thereunder.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make this motion under circum-

stances of peculiar gravity. Since the 21st of March last a battle has been proceeding on the Western front, in France and in Belgium, which may continue for months yet and may ultimately decide the fate of the world. Up to the present, the attack has been principally made upon the British army, and it is beyond question that the object of the enemy is to destroy that army before any considerable forces from the United States can be brought into the battle line, and thus bring this war to an end under such conditions as will enable Germany and Austria-Hungary to impose their will not only upon the Allied nations, but upon the world.

It might be worth while, I think it is worth while, to impress upon the House and the country the effort which the Central Powers are making in this war. Germany in November, 1916, passed a law which placed all male persons in the country, between the ages of seventeen and sixty, at the disposal of the Government for military service. It is not necessary to go into the details of the Act, it is sufficient to say that it brought under military service no less than 1,700,000 men; and other additions augmented the man-power of Germany for war purposes in the spring of 1917 by no less than 2,100,000 men. To that extent Germany a year ago increased her armies in this war, or at all events created reserves which could be drawn upon in case of need. The annual addition to Germany's man-power each ensuing year by young men reaching military age is about five hundred thousand men. In Austria it is about four hundred thousand, and in France something less than three hundred thousand men. Moreover, Germany, as we know, has practically enslaved tens of thousands of Belgians who are forced to work in that country in order that men of German birth may be brought into military service. She has made drafts upon the population of Poland, and we cannot doubt that in the immediate future she will make corresponding drafts upon that population, numbering about fifty-five millions in all, comprised in the newly acquired territories which she has conquered from Russia.

The defection of Russia in this war, her practical disappearance as a fighting unit, has had otherwise a most important influence upon the power that Germany is able at present to exercise upon the Western frontier.

A statement was made in the British House of Commons on January 14 last by Sir Auckland Geddes, Minister of National Service. Hon. gentlemen who are interested in it can read it in the English Hansard for themselves. It is only necessary for me to state the result at which he arrived by a series of deductions that are to be found in his speech. As a result of Russia's defection, according to his statement which seems to be based upon sound premises, Germany, in the spring and summer of 1918, will be able to throw upon the Western front an additional force of not less than 1,600,000 men. But she will be able to do more than that. She will be able to hold her Eastern frontier with inferior troops; she will be able to send there her new levies in order that they may be trained and hardened for work on the Western front, and she will be able to supply her battalions, brigades and divisions on the Western front from the reserves thus established and trained on her Eastern frontier.

Now, what have the Allied nations done, and what has the British Empire itself done? I need not do more than refer to the effort of France in just a word or two. According to the statement of the British Prime Minister, made not long ago in the British Parliament, France has put into the fighting line one-sixth of her entire population. If Canada did the same it would mean at least 1,500,000 men. I may be pardoned if I quote from the speech of a distinguished American general, who has recently returned from France, giving his estimate of conditions there and of the extent to which the population of that country has been called upon to fight in this war. General Wood says:

> When you think of perhaps twelve million, or even more millions, of men on a single unbroken battle-line, running over three hundred miles in length, and twenty miles or more in depth; every village full of artillery; every house full of soldiers; every road covered with transports, you begin to realize what this war means. If you go a bit beyond in the country to the rear you find great hospitals full of wounded; and if you go into the cities you find every man of proper age in uniform. If he is not in uniform you look at him critically to find out why he is not in uniform, for there men have learned that they owe the country service in war. Half of these that you see are cripples, and yet no one is talking of stopping. They are fighting for something vital to humanity; they are waging a war in which you have long been expected to help, and they are glad that you are now beginning to come. God helps those who help themselves. This is a war against efficiency, a degree of efficiency which the world has never before witnessed. Do not under-estimate the strength of the enemy you are sending your men against; he is skilled in war, trained in arms, wonderfully well led, and also brave and enduring. We may damn his methods, and condemn his

morals, and denounce the object of the war, but do not let us make the mistake of under estimating his value as a fighting machine.

What has our own Empire done? I quote again from the statement of a minister of the British House of Commons, who, on the 14th January last, gave this statement of the forces that had been sent to the front or raised for service in the United Kingdom and in the various Dominions of the Empire: "The actual strength of the forces "to-day obviously only represents a part "of the call that has been made on our "man power. To it must be added our "losses in killed and wounded, missing and "prisoners, and in maimed and invalided "men who have been discharged. Taking "this into consideration, we may say that "the effort which the British nations have "made in the one item of provision of men "in the armed forces of the Crown totals "6,500,000 men, and of that 4,500,000, or 60·4 "per cent have been contributed by Eng-"land; 620,000, or 8·3 per cent have been "contributed by Scotland; 280,000, or 3·7 "per cent, have been contributed by Wales; "170,000, or 2·3 per cent, have been contri-"buted by Ireland; 900,000, or 12 per cent, "have been contributed by the dominions "and the colonies. The remaining 1,000,-"000 men, composed of native fighting "troops, labour corps, and so on, repre-"sent the splendid contribution made by "India and our various African and "other dependencies." I gather from other information that the computation which Sir Auckland Geddes made in that statement, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, covers not only the troops who have actually been raised since this war began, but also the forces that comprised the standing army and the naval forces of Great Britain when war broke out. I am not quite sure that his computation of 900,000 men from the dominions and colonies does full justice to the figures that might be established. I am inclined to think it would be at least 1,000,000 men, but, even so, the figures speak for themselves. A certain force must, of course, be retained for the defence of the United Kingdom against that German attack which has been prophesied ever since the war began, and which may yet be attempted as a last desperate resort on the part of Germany, even if she does sacrifice a considerable portion of her fleet in the attempt. But I venture to assure the House, from information in my possession, that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland has put into the fighting line in France and other theatres of war not less than four million men up to the present. As to the other dominions, I have figures in my possession which I am not permitted to give to the House to-day, as they were imparted to me under the seal of confidence. But it is not too much to say that Australia, in proportion to her population, has put more men into the fighting line than Canada; and that New Zealand, in proportion to her population, has put a far larger number of men in the line than we have done up to the present.

Now, what have we done in this country? It is desirable that I should place upon the pages of Hansard some information which will be available for purpose of reference, and which ought to be communicated to Parliament and to the country. A portion of this information has been given from time to time. It has not been brought up to date, at least; and probably some of it has never yet been placed before Parliament. Up to the 31st March, 1918, we have despatched overseas—and it is the force sent overseas that counts in this war—364,750 men of all ranks, of whom 16,033 were officers and 348,717 were of other ranks. I have the details which are as follows:

Sailings by Arms of Service up to and including March 31st, 1918.

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Totals.
Infantry	9,282	242,957	252,239
Cavalry	629	13,222	13,851
Artillery	964	31,371	32,335
Engineers	508	10,573	11,081
Pioneers	101	3,015	3,116
A. M. C.	3,179	11,937	15,116
A. S. C.	360	9,128	9,488
Cyclists	55	1,489	1,544
Forestry	400	12,769	13,169
Railway and Construction	408	12,156	12,564
Miscellaneous	147	100	247
Totals	16,033	348,717	364,750

By districts our sailings have been as follows:

Military district No. 1, Headquarters at London	25,533
Military district No. 2, Headquarters at Toronto	76,597
Military district No. 3, Headquarters at Kingston	39,393
Military district No. 4, Headquarters at Montreal	32,463
Military district No. 5, Headquarters at Quebec	8,389
Military districts Nos. 6 and 7, comprising the Maritime Provinces	37,205
Military districts Nos. 10 and 12, comprising the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan	75,503
Military district No. 11, British Columbia	36,475
Military district No. 13, Alberta	33,192
Total	364,750

The following is a classification by occupation of the men who went overseas, up to March 31, 1918:

Professional men	13,676
Employers and merchants	6,529
Clerical workers	52,124
Skilled labourers	160,198
Unskilled labourers	67,078
Farmers	51,284
Ranchers	3,210
Students	10,651
Total	364,750

By clerical workers is, of course, understood those engaged in clerical work of various kinds, in banks, mercantile institutions, companies and various similar activities throughout the country.

As to country of birth, the following statement has been furnished to me by the Department of Militia and Defence:

Canada, of British descent	147,505
Canada, of French descent	16,268
England	121,571
Scotland	37,496
Ireland	12,657
Wales	3,574
Other British possessions	3,648
United States	12,000
Other countries	10,031
Total	364,750

It is desirable that the House and the country should know the sacrifice entailed upon our forces in casualties from the beginning of the war up to the 31st March last:

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Totals.
Killed in action	1,235	24,677	25,912
Died of wounds	381	8,290	8,671
Died of disease	101	1,855	1,956
Wounded	4,308	101,877	106,185
Prisoners of war	141	2,595	2,736
Presumed dead	117	3,821	3,938
Missing	35	755	790
	6,318	143,870	150,188

The total of those killed in action, of those who have died of wounds or disease and of those presumed dead is 40,477. If we add to that a reasonable proportion of those who are missing, we find that not less than 41,000 Canadian have given their lives for their country in this war up to the 31st March last.

I am not permitted to state the exact number of the Canadian forces in France at present, nor am I permitted to give the House information as to the portion of the line our troops are holding. It is, however, permissible to say that the Canadian forces at the front were never in greater strength or in more confident spirit than they are at this moment. It is permissible also to say that they are holding a portion of the line which has not yet been forced back, and I venture the opinion that so long as their flanks hold good the Canadian line will never be forced back by any numbers that the Germans can send against it.

Our forces have not been attacked up to the present, as other forces of the British line have been attacked, in overwhelming numbers; but it would be too much to hope that the attack will not come, and we must be prepared for it. What it will mean when it does come, none of us would venture to forecast. We may—we must—realize that in all probability it will be attended with great loss, even if the effort of the enemy is unsuccessful. At the second battle of Ypres the first Canadian division lost about 6,000 men, or some 40 per cent of its combatant strength. It is for a fight like that, on the defensive against great odds and against all the terrible methods of warfare which the Germans have been employing during the past three years that we must prepare.

Canadian casualties in 1917 were 84,347. In April, when our troops took Vimy Ridge, we lost 13,461 men in killed, wounded and missing. In May, in the attack upon Lens, the casualties were 10,134. In August, when we took Hill 70, the casualties numbered 10,080. In November, in the attack on Passchendaele—a most difficult and wonderful task, splendidly accomplished—the Canadian Army Corps lost no less than 24,530 men. Thus, in one month of victorious fighting our forces at the front lost nearly 25,000 men. That will give us some realization of the trial which may immediately lie before our men in meeting the German attack.

I now come to the proposed Order in Council which this House and the Senate are asked to sanction. I shall take it up clause by clause and make apparent the reason why those who are invested with the responsibility of administering public affairs have reached the conclusion that in no other way can the need be met. The proposed Order in Council recites:

> Whereas there is an immediate and urgent need of reinforcements for the Canadian Expeditionary Force and the necessity for these reinforcements admits of no delay;
>
> And whereas it is deemed essential that notwithstanding exemptions heretofore granted a substantial number of men should be withdrawn forthwith from civil life for the purpose of serving in a military capacity;
>
> And whereas, having regard to the number of men immediately required and to the urgency of the demand, time does not permit of examination by exemption tribunals of the value in civil life, or the position, of the individuals called up for duty.

Then it proceeds to enact certain regulations to which I shall come in a moment. Before speaking of them, however, I admit at once, and all members of this House understand, that the Military Service Act of last year was based upon the principle of exemption by tribunals. We established many thousands of tribunals throughout the length and breadth of this country. I cannot at the moment say how many thousands were established. The duty was undertaken by men having had no previous experience in any such task, and naturally and inevitably the result of the decisions of the various tribunals was attended with great inequality and sometimes with marked injustice.

The purpose of the Act was to correct any such result by creating appellate tribunals and, in the end, a central appeal tribunal. In some parts of the country exemptions were granted in astonishing numbers, and it became the duty of the Government to appeal from those exemptions to the extent of, I believe, 80 or 90 per cent. The result of all that has been great delay, and one must admit at once that in that regard the results which have been obtained by the Military Service Act of last year have not been so satisfactory as was anticipated at the time it was passed.

The Order in Council to which we invite the sanction of the House departs from that principle as a corresponding principle has recently been departed from in Great Britain; but departs from it along a line which is not precisely the same as that pursued in Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at present all men between eighteen and fifty years of age in Great Britain are liable to compulsory military service, except in Ireland, to which it is now proposed that compulsory military service shall be applied. More than that, the exemptions in Great Britain have proceeded more along the line of occupational classes than along the line pursued in this country; but Great Britain has recently found it necessary to revise her arrangements, to wipe out some of these occupational exemptions, and to comb the population of that country to the last degree, in order that the British forces at the front may be maintained at full strength.

The proposal embodied in these regulations is somewhat different, because we have never followed the line of occupational classes, which has been pursued in Great Britain, except in so far as in the regulations made under the Military Service Act, direction has been given to pay particular attention to those engaged in the industry of agriculture. The line upon which this Order in Council proceeds is to confer upon the Government power to select men of certain ages and to abolish any exemptions which they have heretofore received or to which they might hereafter be entitled. The Order in Council, therefore, proceeds as follows: The first clause defines the word "minister" and the word "Act." The second clause provides that Class 1 shall include not only unmarried men and widowers without children between the ages of twenty and thirty-four, both inclusive, but all unmarried men and widowers without children who have attained the age of nineteen years and who were born on or since the 13th day of October, 1897. The effect is to bring men of nineteen years of age into Class 1, so that under these regulations, Class 1 will comprise men from 19 to 34 years of age, both inclusive. The third clause of the regulations does the same thing for Class 2. It provides that Class 2 shall include married men and widowers with children who have attained the age of nineteen years and who were born on or since the 13th day of October, 1897.

The fourth clause is designed to bring within the operations of the Military Service Act men who have gone overseas to the United Kingdom, but who have not otherwise entered any theatre of actual war. A number have gone overseas to the United Kingdom and have returned to Canada without entering any war theatre. The purpose of this section is to provide that if those men are within any class that has been called out, and if they are physically fit, they shall be liable to compulsory military service, just as other citizens of this country.

Clause 5 is the most important clause in the regulations and perhaps I should read it. Clause 5 reads:

> The Governor in Council may direct orders to report for duty to issue to men in any class under the Act of any named age or ages or who were born in named years or any named year or part of a year and any exemption theretofore granted to any man of any such named age or year of birth shall cease from and after noon of the day upon which he is ordered so to report and no claim for exemption by or in respect of any man shall be entertained or considered after the issue to him of such order, provided, however, that the minister may grant leave of absence without pay to any man by reason of the death, disablement or service of other members of the same family while on active service in any theatre of actual war.

The power thus conferred upon the Governor in Council is undoubtedly very wide, but it is not, according to our conception, wider than the present need does actually demand. It must, of course, be exercised in a reasonable way. I have

discussed with the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn), and we have both discussed with our colleagues, the proposal which will probably be carried out under this Order in Council if it should receive the sanction of the House. The Minister of Militia and Defence proposes, in the first instance, to call out those from twenty to twenty-two years of age, both inclusive, and later he may be obliged, if the need should demand it, to call out men of nineteen and of twenty-three years of age. It is estimated that from the men available in each year called out, at least 10,000 men physically fit for service for the front might be obtained.

The sixth clause of the regulations provides that the age stated in any claim for exemption shall be conclusive evidence against the man making the claim.

The seventh clause directs that:

> The minister may, from time to time, direct that no orders to report for duty be issued to men who have been examined by military medical boards and placed in such medical categories as are specified in such direction.

Clause 8 provides that all men included in Class 1 shall be subject to military law and must report as in proclamation directed. That is to say, Class 1 has been called out; men have been added to that class, and a proclamation may issue directing that men so added shall report for duty. It will be incumbent on them when that proclamation has been issued and when they have been so ordered to report for duty, to report as if they had been included in that class in the first instance.

Clause 9 provides, in a few words, just this: that men attaining the age of 19 years in the future shall thereupon be included in Class 1 or in Class 2, as they may belong to the one or the other, and they must report if they are included in any such class called out.

Clause 10 provides that when a treaty or convention is arranged with any foreign government under which the subjects of that government resident in Canada may be made liable to compulsory service in this country, then the Military Service Act shall apply to them and they may be called out by proclamation and ordered to report for duty as if they were British subjects. Such a convention was made some weeks ago, and is now receiving consideration in the Senate of the United States, but it cannot come into operation until it receives the approval of the United States Senate. Great Britain has, I believe, such conventions with other nations, France, Italy and Russia, for example, and the Government of this country has asked the Government of the United Kingdom, to have such conventions, if they are in force or now under negotiations, made applicable to the citizens of those countries resident in Canada.

I realize that the proposals which we are placing before Parliament for its approval invite discussion and we shall welcome that discussion. It may be urged that we are abolishing exemptions which were provided for in the Military Service Act, 1917. That is perfectly true, but I do not know of any other means by which the need can be met, and I can assure the members of this House that the need is most urgent and most imperative. It may be said that these regulations will interfere with production. I hope they will not seriously interfere with production, for I realize that production is necessary in order that our troops may be supplied and the civil population fed. But production alone will not suffice. The stern task remains to the allied nations of overcoming the enemy on the field of battle, and what are we to say to our men at the front? They have gone out to fight for their country; they are there overseas; the need is urgent, so urgent that without this Order in Council I do not believe we could provide them with reinforcements after the first day of July next, and if the attack comes, as it may come, within the next two weeks they might be left without any reinforcements after the first of June. I have heard the statement that we should rely on other countries to provide fighting men and further reinforcements. I have seen our soldiers at the front, and I can realize the impression that would be made upon them if the people of Canada should declare: "We will devote all our "future energies to production, and leave "you to shift for yourselves with such rein-"forcements as you may procure from the "British Islands or from United States of "America." For not one moment would the people of this country from Atlantic to Pacific stand for any such policy.

It may be said that the proposed Order in Council will create hardship and inequality. Humanly speaking, it is impossible to avoid these in war. Did these men —three hundred and sixty-four thousand of them—think about inequality and hardship when they went to fight our battles for us? The Government of this country is bound to do everything in its power to prevent inequality and hardship as far as that is

possible, and I shall welcome any suggestion from any hon. gentleman to that end, and so will every one of my colleagues and so will every member of this House. But it is not humanly possible to avoid it. The proposals of the Government will provide in the immediate future adequate fighting forces for the support of our forces, and it is the duty of this Parliament upon its responsibility to the people of this country by whom it was elected, to see that these reinforcements are provided.

Then it is said that it is useless for us to raise more men because the United States of America have more men than can be transported. I may tell hon. members that we have the assurance that all the men that can be raised under these regulations can and will be transported. More than that, if they cannot be transported in the immediate future, they can be trained here in Canada and sent forward when ships can be provided. No one who has not been at the front can realize how our men in the battle line are sustained and supported and nerved for the fight that is before them by the very thought that their countrymen at home are behind them. The present battle, as I have said, will continue for months, and the final issue may depend upon what Canada does now.

I have not endeavoured to elaborate these considerations. I have stated them to the House in the simplest and most direct language at my command, but I hope hon. gentlemen will realize that I am speaking from the most profound conviction and with all the earnestness of which I am capable.

In conclusion, may I point out that, on the one hand, the Government has been subjected to strong reproach upon the allegation that its administration of the Military Service Act in the province of Quebec has been too lax. On the other hand, it has been subjected to equally violent reproach that its administration of that Act in Quebec has been too stern and severe. It is our belief that each of these reproaches is equally undeserved. The purpose of the Government has been in Quebec, as well as in each of the other provinces, to administer the Act impartially, considerately and firmly. In that purpose we shall persevere to the end. The law has been enacted according to the will of the people, and the law must be obeyed.

As to our duty, the first line of defence is held in France and Flanders; the second line of defence is here. Will those in the second line desert and betray the first? If such an outcome were possible, it would be to the everlasting disgrace of the Canadian people. Only those who have been among the men in the fighting line can realize with what faith and confidence the Canadian soldiers rely upon us for that aid and support which are their due; only those who have been among them can realize how intense a bitterness and disappointment would possess their souls if that aid should fail them. I beg you to remember that in this country we are all in one sense in the battle-line; that we must all discharge our duty with the same indomitable spirit as those who are holding back the German onset. May we not estimate that duty in the words of a great Frenchman: "La vie n'est ni un plaisir ni une douleur mais une affaire grave dont nous sommes chargés et qu'il faut conduire et terminer à notre honneur"—"Life was not intended as either a pleasure or a sorrow, but as a great duty committed to our charge and which we are bound to carry on and fulfil by the standards of honour." If that is true of the individual life, is it not equally true of the national life? What we inherit from the past we hold in trust for the future; let us see to it then that Canada's honour is maintained and her escutcheon kept untarnished to the end.

Germany has practically reverted to paganism in this war. The ideals of the old faith of Thor and Odin dominate her people to-day more really than the dictates of Christianity. Otherwise no such reversion to barbarism could have been witnessed as that with which she shocked the world's conscience and brought so many of its nations in arms against her. Confronted with such a menace, we dare not stay our hand. The descendants of our pioneer forefathers have good cause to be proud of their ancestry. They never had greater reason for just pride than to-day, when men of the races from whose loins they sprang are fighting side by side in defence of the freedom of both. Is the cause worth fighting for? Can you not see what rests on the issue? Are your institutions, your ideals and liberties, the honour of your women and the sancity of your fathers' graves worth fighting for? Women of one of those races have been systematically,—not in isolated cases, but systematically,—subjected to nameless outrage and sent in thousands behind the German lines for that purpose. If this cannot, I know not what can, arouse the

fighting spirit in the hearts of all men in whose veins the blood runs red.

We have in this country a population separated by differences of race, or language, of religion. Unfortunately these differences run very largely along the same lines. I for one should resist as strongly as any man a proposal to deny to any portion of our people their constitutional rights in respect of language or otherwise. But we must realize that difference of language does create a profound division, especially when it is accentuated by grouping on the line of race and creed. Lack of understanding through difference of language is not easy to overcome, and it is in lack of understanding that the difficulty chiefly arises. For this very reason an imperative duty rests upon all of us to aid as best we may in removing unfortunate misunderstanding and quieting dangerous controversy. The world has been striving for hundreds of years to learn the lesson of tolerance in matters of religious opinion. The task has been a slow and painful one and the lesson has not yet been fully learned. Let us do the best that is in us to help our people learn that great lesson. No good ever came to mankind out of the bitterness of religious controversy. I especially beg of the press, both English and French, not to indulge in utterances that are calculated to provoke and perpetuate bitterness and discord. If we do not all worship God at the same altar, let us be tolerant and charitable; above all let us respect the sincere convictions and ideals of others. If the press fulfils its full duty, it will not be slow to learn this lesson which might with advantage be studied by members of this House on both sides. Thus and thus only can we create in this country a true national spirit; thus only can our united efforts avail in building up a great nation securely founded upon the heritage which God has given us.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in his concluding remarks observed that it was with a great sense of earnestness and profound conviction that he proposed the resolution which he has laid before the House. Sir, it is with a sense of duty no less profound, and a conviction and earnestness no less sincere that I rise to oppose this motion. My hon. friend will perhaps understand that I, myself, realize even more than he does the truth of the observation of the great Frenchman which he quoted, that life was not intended as either a pleasure or a sorrow. I know the views of those who support the Government; I know they are behind the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister, and it would be more of a pleasure to me were I able to agree with them in the resolution which has been proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister in the performance of what he believes to be a great national duty. I shall endeavour, in what I have to say, to be moderate in the expression of my views, if sometimes I find it impossible not to be severe.

4 p.m.

The resolution which we are called upon to sanction involves a wide departure from the enactment of the Military Service Act. It involves, I am sorry to say, a still wider departure from the principle of constitutional government, of which at one time we were proud, and which we have always considered a safeguard of the people against the encroachment of the Executive power. We pretend that we are fighting, and indeed we are fighting, for the freedom of the world. As to this there is no difference of opinion on either side of the House. We are fighting for the freedom of the world. It is our aim and our hope that we may crush out Prussianism from Europe and from the world. But, Sir, I will ask the House to consider this: Are we not, while we contend that we are fighting for the freedom of the world, introducing more and more into our system of government a wedge which will admit the entrance of the system of Prussian autocracy? Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that last year we passed the Military Service Act. This year, while Parliament has been in session, during the last three weeks or so, the Government undertook to alter the disposition of that Act by Order in Council. Sir, in my humble judgment, and I submit it to those of my hon. friends who differ from me on this question and who still entertain Liberal principles, in that change of the disposition of the Military Service Act, so made, there is certainly a wide and absolute departure from the system of British Government. What authority has the Governor in Council to alter an Act of Parliament? What excuse was there for the Governor in Council to pass such an order when Parliament was in session? If the Parliament had not been in session there might, perhaps, have been some excuse, though they would have no constitutional right to do what they did. But this is what they did: Consequent upon the riots which took place recently at

Quebec, they passed an Order in Council in which this declaration is made:

> Any male person who takes part in any riot, insurrection or civil disturbance, incited, instigated or caused by way of opposition to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, or the regulations thereunder, shall if declared or found guilty of so doing by sentence of a court-martial or of a competent civil court, be deemed to have been called out for military service under the said Act, whether or not he be within any class of persons which has been called out for military service by proclamation, or within any class of persons to which the said Act or regulations apply, or within any of the exceptions of the schedule to the said Act.

What right, I ask again, had the Government to make such an alteration in the Military Service Act—because this provision orders nothing less than that a new class of conscript shall be formed in the community? I repeat that if Parliament had not been sitting there might have been some excuse for passing such an Order in Council, though there would be no right. But Parliament was in session. Parliament might have been consulted, and should have been consulted, and, I ask, is there any possible excuse for not consulting Parliament? Is there any possible excuse why a measure was not brought before the House? What can be the reason? Did the Government fear that the majority behind them would not agree to such a drastic measure, or was it done simply in sheer wantonness of autocratic authority?

To-day we have another Order in Council —or, rather, not an Order in Council, but an embryonic Order in Council, because, as I understand, the Governor General has not appended his signature to the document as yet. At all events, in this matter Parliament has to be consulted, and the Government will have to go one step further than their own executive action if they want to give to the proposals the force and effect of law. Again I repeat: An Act of Parliament cannot be amended, or altered, except by Parliament. If an Act of Parliament has to be amended a Bill has to be introduced, and the procedure with respect to this Bill follows many rigid forms. The Bill, first of all, must be introduced and leave for that must be obtained from the House. Then the Bill has to be read a first time, it has to be read a second time, it has to be examined closely and scanned in Committee of the Whole House, and it has to be read a third time, and even yet its passage is not complete. A final motion has to be made that the Bill pass. Are these vain forms? Are these idle rules? And does it suffice simply to have a resolution of the House to give us a law of such far-reaching importance? These forms are not idle, they all have a profound meaning, and the meaning which they have is that they afford ample opportunity for discussion, for revision of opinion and for improvement in the legislation submitted for enactment. Well, Sir, if it be thought advisable to-day, as proposed by the Government, and just explained by the Prime Minister, that the Act which was passed last session should be amended, and improved or otherwise, why are not the forms prescribed by Parliament observed by the Government, and why is not Parliament consulted?

What reason can be given by the Government that we should dispense with these formalities and these rules, which are the rules observed by the British Parliament, and would not be lightly departed from in that centre of constitutional authority? If the British Parliament would not depart from these rules, why should they not be observed in the Canadian Parliament as well? If the Act is to be changed, notwithstanding all the reasons which have been given by the Prime Minister why the Act should be altered, I submit to the sense of this House that there should be an adherence to the prescribed rules. Otherwise what becomes of constitutional principles? Sir, I submit that this resolution should not be passed as proposed, but that if it is to go into effect that it should be dealt with in the usual way, and the House called upon to dispose of it by a Bill, to become when authorized an Act of this Parliament. What is the reason for this proceeding on the part of the Government? I have heard no reason given. Some time ago I had occasion to challenge the Government for having passed the Order in Council consequent upon the riots in Quebec, but no information and no answer was vouchsafed by them. To-day, Sir, I rise to ask that if we are to fight Prussianism in Europe, it shall not be introduced into this Parliament. This matter is important indeed and I express my sorrow that the customary procedure has not been followed. Having said that, let me proceed at once to the main subject that we have now to discuss.

The Prime Minister states that we must have more soldiers at the front. He proposes, as he has told us, to extend the Act to some classes which were not included last year. He proposes that these new classes should be deprived of all the clauses which they were empowered to

advance when they thought they should be exempted from the Military Service Act. Under the resolution which we have now before us, every young man from the age of nineteen to thirty-four years will be included in the service, but he will not be able to urge any reason why he should not be taken for service, even though he enjoys that privilege under the law as it exists to-day.

Well, Sir, this is only an aggravation of the Act which was introduced last year. When the measure was submitted at that time I thought it was a mistake, but, unfortunately on that question some of my friends, some of my best and dearest friends and myself could not see eye to eye. Either they were in the right or I was in the right. At that time the success of the proposed measure was purely conjectural. Only after a trial of the Act could it be determined whether my friends were in the right or whether I was in the right.

The Act has been in force for some time and we have to-day the admission from the Prime Minister that it has not realized all its expectations. That is exactly what I was afraid of, and I told my right hon. friend and the House at the time, on my responsibility as a Canadian citizen, just as much in earnest as any man could be to win the war and to destroy the infernal power of Germany, that the Act was not calculated to accomplish the end it had in view. And, Sir, the resolution which is introduced to-day is certainly a strong argument for the view which I stated at that time.

We have been asked: what have you to substitute for it? I believed then, and to-day I believe it more than ever, that if we had kept on with the voluntary system we would have had more soldiers to-day at our disposal than we actually have. What are my reasons for speaking as I do? What reasons can I give the House to induce it to believe that, after all, it would have been better, if we wanted to win the war, to continue with the voluntary system? I made certain allusions some time ago upon the floor of the House, and the Prime Minister challenged my evidence upon this point. My evidence for the belief which I entertained is contained in an answer which was given last June by the Minister of Militia of that day. On the 11th June, Sir Edward Kemp, in answer to a question put by this side of the House, gave us the exact figures of enlistments from the month of January, 1916, to the month of May, 1917, as follows:

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

1916.

January	29,212
February	26,658
March	32,819
April	23,289
May	15,090
June	10,796
July	8,675
August	7,267
September	6,357
October	6,035
November	6,548
December	5,803

1917.

January	7,721
February	7,644
March	6,670
April	5,270
May	6,520

It will be observed that commencing in May, June, and July, there was quite a falling off. Up to that time the recruiting each month had run about 23,000 to 29,000. It fell off in May, June, and July from 15,000 to 10,000 and below. What was the cause of this falling off? There must be some cause for such a falling off as that. The question was debated last year, and we heard the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), who had been Minister of Militia in the first months for which I have quoted the record, say in the presence of this House, openly and squarely, that he had been ordered by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance to ease up on recruiting. That statement was made by my hon. friend from Victoria once or twice, certainly once in my hearing, and I have yet to know that the statement was ever denied. So that—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The right hon. gentleman's memory is not very good. I said what I had to say about it at the time. I did deny it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In a qualified way, I admit.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In no qualified way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very well then, let it be so. I leave it between my right hon. friend and the member for Victoria.

But, Sir, take the twelve months which follow the month of May, 1916, and I will again repeat the figures:

1916.

June	10,796
July	8,675
August	7,267
September	6,357
October	6,025
November	6,548
December	5,803

1917.	
January	7,721
February	7,644
March	6,670
April	5,270
May	6,520

After the pronouncement which had been made by the Prime Minister that recruiting had come to a standstill yet in these twelve months more than 85,000 men were recruited voluntarily. Therefore, in the face of those figures I am justified in my opinion that if we had followed along the line I have just indicated we would have had more men at our disposal than we have secured by the enactment of the Military Service law. But we proceeded differently. The Act was passed and was put in force. And then, Sir, what took place? I call attention to this: my right hon. friend has waxed eloquent upon the necessity of enforcing the conscription of every man in the land. He gave us the examples of the United Kingdom and of France, and the example of Germany herself. Well, the hon. gentleman passed an Act that every man should be conscripted, but sometime in the month of December last the Government passed an Order in Council, which I quoted on a former occasion and which will bear quoting again, in which a large class of the community was practically told that they should not be conscripted at all.

On December 3 last the Government passed an Order in Council giving power to the Minister of Militia to exempt farmers. Let me call attention to this Order in Council:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, the Prime Minister and under and in virtue of the provisions of The Military Service Act, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that in any case where a person engaged in agriculture has applied for exemption and such exemption has been refused, the Minister of Militia and Defence, if he is of the opinion that the services of such person are essential for promoting agricultural production may, by order under his hand, discharge such person from military service.

The Prime Minister has emphasized today that the contest which we have on our hands is such that there should be no departure from universal military service, and that every man should be called to the colours; yet on December 3, one whole class of the community was told that they might claim their exemption.

An hon. MEMBER: That was before the election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That was during the election, not before. Shortly after the election, the Minister of Militia gave to the press a most significant interview. On January 4 last, the press of Ottawa contained this interview, which had been given to the whole miiisterial press, by the Minister of Militia:

> "The Minister stated during the election campaign that, notwithstanding the machinery of the Military Service Act, if bona fide farmers effectively engaged in the production of foodstuffs, failed to secure exemption and were called up for military service, he would consider it his duty to relieve such men from military service, in order that they might return to their work on the farms and increase the production of foodstuffs.
>
> "It is pointed out that it was not intended, nor was it within the power of the Minister of Militia, to abrogate the provisions of the Military Service Act, and the executive action above referred to could not in any case be taken except when men were actually called up under the Act.
>
> "It follows, therefore, that farmers who failed to secure exemption at the hands of the local tribunals should prosecute their appeals in the usual manner, as provided in the Military Service Act. Applications for leave to appeal should be addressed in all cases to the Registrar of the district concerned.
>
> "If a farmer who has actually joined up still considers that he has grounds for exemption he should state his case to his commanding officer, who will take necessary action on his behalf.
>
> "Farmers claiming exemption should take advantage of the advice and assistance of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, who were appointed under Order-in-Council in each county. These representatives will take cases up with the district military representative, and will prosecute appeals on behalf of farmers wherever they think it necessary to do so.

Let me call the attention of the House again to these words:

> Farmers claiming exemption should take advantage of the advice and assistance of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, who were appointed under Order in Council in each county. These representatives will take cases up with the military representative and will prosecute appeals on behalf of farmers wherever they think it necessary to do so.

So we have the spectacle of the Minister of Militia trying to obtain recruits and the Minister of Agriculture trying to obtain exemptions for them. The Government is a House divided against itself; the Minister of Militia, on the one hand, wanting to get soldiers, and the Minister of Agriculture, on the other hand, wanting to get farmers. There is not a man in this House who does not know that the last election was carried on the implied, if not the distinct, pledge that farmers would not be amenable to the Military Service Act. I could point to more than one-half—three-quarters—of the gentlemen sitting before me who were elected upon the direct or the

indirect pledge that the farmers in their constituencies would not be amenable to military service. What are we to conclude from that? We are to conclude that it was the intention of the Government at the time of the election—I do not want to make any captious objection; I will go further and say that they were sincere—that farmers should be exempted. They did not proclaim it as publicly as I should have liked, but still they did it. What is the position to-day? Conditions have changed, and the Prime Minister says that the circumstances in which our army finds itself are such that no exemptions should be allowed and that all classes, farmers and everybody else, should be made amenable to the Military Service Act. Well, we are in this position. Last week we had an appeal from the Prime Minister of England to send all the men we could, and also an appeal from Lord Rhondda, the Food Controller in England, to send all the food that we could. What are we to do, Sir? What counsel should we follow; what advice shall we accept? Let us examine the situation as it is. England requires more men; England requires more food. How can we best help England in this matter? This is the 19th day of April; we are at the beginning of the seeding season. If we pass this resolution to-morrow, all men between the ages of 19 and 34 will be liable to conscription. You may derive from this class 30,000, 40,000 or 50,000 men; when will they be able to give assistance to the British Army? Will they be of any assistance in the battle that is now going on? Will they be of assistance within the next week, or the week after, the next month or the month after? I appeal to every man's sense of honesty and fair play when I submit that, do what you may, these men cannot be in England and in a position to fight within four months from to-day. Moreover, if you take these men from activities connected with food production, what is the result? You take from the active work of food production 30,00, 40,000 or 50,000 men. What is it best to do? Shall we take these men from civil life and make them soldiers, although they cannot do any fighting for at least four or five months; or shall we leave them in civil life, where they can at once engage in the production of food for the Allies? Under the circumstances there are no two ways of looking at the question. If you want to help England in the present emergency, leave these men to produce the food of which she stands so greatly in need. That is the way I approach this question, and that is the way I think we should approach it.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Last year the Prime Minister appointed a National Service Board, the object of which was to prevent men who would be of service in the production of food from going to the front, even if they were desirous of enlisting. Well, the position has not changed. I repeat that I am as anxious as any man in this House to help in the great fight in which we are engaged. But exercising my judgment, and appealing without prejudice to gentlemen in office and those behind them, I submit that we can best discharge the duty we owe to our own selves, to the Mother Country and to the cause of civilization, if we approach this question not under the influence of emotion, but simply in the face of the facts as they are and do our best according to the conditions that prevail.

The last words of the Prime Minister brought the real kernel of this question to the attention of the House. He paid a great deal of attention to the province of Quebec. Well, Sir, I have no objection to that; I rather welcome a discussion of the position of Quebec in this war. It has never been my habit to run away from a difficulty; I rather court a difficulty. I know in what manner the election was fought last autumn. It is within the record of history that the election was carried on chiefly by the successful party on this ground: "You must not allow Quebec to rule Canada." Sir, Quebec does not want to rule Canada; Quebec does not want to rule anybody, or to be ruled by anybody. Quebec wants to take its place in this fight as a member of the Canadian Confederation. We have been in the Confederation for fifty years, and we shall remain in it. There is nothing to separate us from the other members of the Confederation. The great point of difference to-day is that which exists between Quebec and Ontario, but Quebec and Ontario, though racially separated, are geographically united. We cannot be severed; we must go on in the Confederation as we are, and as God has made this land.

I know that there is a great deal of prejudice in Ontario against Quebec, and a great deal of prejudice in Quebec against Ontario, but I am impressed by the conviction that the time will come when Ontario will do justice to Quebec and when Quebec will do justice to Ontario.

It is along national lines that we must approach this question. Let me go one step further. I have not seen this so much in the press, but it has been whispered

from ear to ear: We must make Quebec fight. That has been going around in all parts of Canada. We must make Quebec fight! Sir, the men of Quebec who are to-day at the front, who have enlisted and who have been called upon to do their share of the duty which they owe to their country, have shown that they can fight. They can fight and they will fight when they are appealed to in the proper manner. If a different method of approaching them had been employed, better results would have been obtained. But many will ask: How is it that men who pride themselves on belonging to such a brave race have not done more for the cause than they have done? I have myself, and many before me and many after me, have represented the peculiar conditions of the French Canadian. The French Canadians have no relation at all with France. Of the English-speaking members of this House, I presume three-fourths can count near relatives in England, but there is scarcely a man here from Quebec who has any relatives in France to-day. That has created a condition of things which—I am sorry to say it, but so it is—makes the people of Quebec not appreciate the reality of this war as our friends of British origin do.

Further than that, the men who are to-day on the Treasury benches cannot forget that they have a load of responsibility for the attitude of Quebec. They cannot get away from the elections of 1911, when they made an alliance with the Nationalists who taught and preached that, under no circumstances, should Canada ever participate in a war of Great Britain. The election was fought upon the Naval Bill of that day, and, as a consequence of the attitude they took, that under no circumstances should Canada take any share in any war of Great Britain, they also used the Naval Bill to preach the doctrine that there should be no conscription. They stated that the naval policy of the Laurier Government led to conscription. We, of the Liberal party, then in office, said that we did not want conscription, and were not in favour of it. Therefore, the two parties in Quebec preached the same doctrine that there should be no conscription in Canada. You cannot undo, in a single hour or a single day, or even in many hours and many days and many months and, perhaps, many years, the mentality which has been formed under such circumstances.

There is, however, another way of approaching Quebec, and that is to appeal to our sense of right, to our imagination, to our hearts, and to our reason as well, because there is no saner people than the French Canadians. May I, Sir, give you an example which has just come before my notice? It is upon the question of prohibiting the traffic in liquor. Quebec and Ontario and other English-speaking provinces have been at variance on the question of prohibtion, but the question was approached by way of education, by way of enlightenment, and what is the consequence to-day? The cause of prohibition has made such progress that, whilst upon many occasions the people of Quebec refused to listen to the cause of prohibition, still to-day Quebec is in line with the rest of the provinces and has a law of her own to enforce prohibition. The French Canadian people upon that question have given evidence that they are always amenable to reason, and it is in that way that I, for my part, want this other question settled. Let me say to my right hon. friend; let me say to those new members who sit in this House of Commons: We cannot be separated; we must be united; and let me ask: how shall we bring unity about? Shall we do it by compulsion, or shall we not rather do it my the method of conciliation, and of appeal from man to man? If you want to have soldiers from Quebec, the thing is easy enough. Appeal to them; appeal to their imagination; appeal to their racial feeling; give them good officers and they will follow those officers into the very jaws of the German hell. They will not hesitate to do their share. This, Sir, is the method in which I approach this question. I am sorry to say that upon this matter, which is of such importance, I have to take the position which I do; but if I do so, it is from the same profound sense and earnest conviction, as that in which the Prime Minister spoke in his concluding remarks, the conviction that we can conserve the country better; that we can help to win the war better by methods of conciliation and by appealing to the best sentiments of all the citizens of this country than by doing what we are doing now.

There is in this resolution something which does not appeal to me at all. Apart from the ground which I have taken, I do not understand what is meant by this power which, under the resolution, is given to the Minister of Militia. If the principle that judges are to be the arbitrators is to be departed from, by all means let us have no power at all; let everybody be treated alike; but do not put it in the power of any man to give exemption to this one and to refuse it to the other one.

If you do that, you cannot avoid having difficulties and bickerings, and all the evil results that follow bickerings.

In regard to this matter, I have said all that I have to say, but I shall add one word more. In this matter, as in all matters, I have always, since I have had a seat in this House, even before I occupied the official position which I now occupy, approached every question which has come under discussion, never from the point of view of my native province, but always in the broad view which could appeal to all Canadians whatever their race or their origin. Upon this occasion I shall speak for the province of Quebec since it has been brought into the discussion, more than I have ever done before. I shall say this to the Government and to the country. The people of Quebec, while they are opposed to this law, will make their objections and their protests as behooves the free men that they are. But when the verdict has been pronounced, they will, as behooves the free men that they are, loyally accept it and carry it out, because if it is the right of every citizen worthy of British freedom, to combat any measure which he believes ill-advised and ill-timed as this measure is, it is his duty, loyally to respect and to abide by the law, and to take to himself the consequences whatever they may be, however much he may disapprove of the law. It is with that feeling that I appeal to the House on the present occasion, if it is not yet too late, not to go further with this measure, but to consider it carefully, and weigh it by all the methods provided by the British system of Government which we enjoy. Then let Parliament make its decision.

Hon. NEWTON WESLEY ROWELL (President of the Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution moved by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. In answer to the request of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that a further reason should be given for the presentation of this resolution to the House at the present time, I say that the answer is contained in a much better form than I could give it in the order of the day issued in the midst of the present great conflict by Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Currie to the Canadian forces at the front, and bearing date the 27th day of March, 1918. I shall read that order:

> In an endeavour to reach an immediate decision the enemy has gathered all his forces and struck a mighty blow at the British Army. Overwhelmed by sheer weight of numbers the British divisions in the line between the Scarpe and the Oise have fallen back fighting hard, steady and undismayed. Measures have been taken successfully to meet the German onslaught. The French have gathered a powerful army commanded by a most able and trusted leader and this army is now moving swiftly to our help. Fresh British divisions are being thrown in. The Canadians are soon to be engaged. Our Motor-Machine-Gun brigade has already played a most gallant part and once again covered itself with glory.
>
> Looking back with pride on the unbroken record of your glorious achievements, asking you to realize that to-day the fate of the British Empire hangs in the balance, I place my trust in the Canadian Corps, knowing that where Canadians are engaged, there can be no giving way. Under the orders of your devoted officers in the coming battle, you will advance or fall where you stand facing the enemy.
>
> To those who fall I say: "You will not die but step into immortality. Your mothers will not lament your fate but will be proud to have borne such sons. Your names will be revered forever by your grateful country and God will take you unto Himself."
>
> Canadians, in this fateful hour, I command you and I trust you to fight as you have ever fought, with all your strength, with all your determination, with all your tranquil courage. On many a hard-fought field of battle you have overcome this enemy and with God's help you shall achieve victory once more.

When our Canadian troops under the inspiration of that noble appeal of their commander are on the battle line holding back the Prussian invaders, the responsibility rests upon the Government of Canada to ensure that our brave soldiers are adequately reinforced and supported. If the leader of the Opposition wishes to know the reasons for the introduction of this resolution to the House, the answer is: This Government is pledged to the House and to the country to maintain our divisions at the front with adequate reinforcements to repel the onslaughts of the Teuton hordes.

We cannot consider the issue before the House and the country to-day in the light of the situation that existed a year ago. We cannot consider it in the light of the conditions that existed even when this Parliament opened one month ago. The whole world situation has changed within the last thirty days. We must be alive to the present conditions and face the situation as it exists, and, as honest men, meet the situation by measures adequate to the need. This, Mr. Speaker, is the reason, and I submit, the all-sufficient reason, for the resolution now before the House. We must consider it, as I have said, in the light of the present war situation. The Prime Minister has pointed out the effect of Russia's withdrawal from the war; that it has resulted in an addition to the Germanic

forces on the western front of possibly not less than 1,600,000 men. But that is not all. When the attack of the Teutonic forces upon the Italian army in the latter part of last year broke the Italian line, and the heel of the conqueror stood upon the soil of northern Italy, Britain and France, with their reserves already not too adequate to meet the situation on the western front, had to send forces to Italy to help strengthen the Italian resistance, and to break the attack of the Austrian and German armies. Every one who has followed the course of events knows that the expeditionary forces sent by France and Britain to Italy greatly stiffened the Italian resistance, and enabled our valiant Allies to regain some of the ground that had been lost. But the effect of sending those forces to Italy was to weaken the reserves of the Allies on the western front at the very moment when Germany was strengthening her forces there by hundreds of thousands of men. We must recognize in the success which has so far attended the German arms the real effect of that great augmentation of German forces on the one hand, and of the diminution to some extent of the forces of the Allies on the other. The war can only be won and the cause of civilization saved if the forces of the Allies on the western front are sufficiently strengthened to enable them to stem the German tide until our troops can be augmented sufficiently to achieve final victory. It is in the light of these events that we must view the present situation.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has spoken of the constitutional aspect of the resolution. He has said that the passing of the earlier Order in Council bearing on the Military Service Act, and now the submission of this Order in Council to the House, is a wide departure from constitutional government. Just one word as to that. Under the War Measures Act, passed to give the Government power to deal with an emergency, the Government exercised the power given it to pass the first Order in Council to which my right hon. friend has referred. All will concede that if time was not of the very essence of the emergency the ordinary parliamentary procedure would be to introduce an amending Act in the ordinary way. But under the conditions that existed when that Order in Council was passed; in view of the critical situation which had developed owing to the Quebec riots, time was of the essence of the situation, and to prevent further bloodshed and to deter further outbreaks the Government exercised its power under the War Measures Act to pass that Order in Council, and so far as we can see the result has been beneficial.

Coming to the present Order in Council my right hon. friend says that the proper course is to introduce a Bill. Again I say, that under ordinary conditions that would undoubtedly be the procedure but here again time is all important. My right hon. friend says you cannot get the men before a certain date. The very fact that it will take possibly three or four months to give these men the necessary training, and to get them organized, transported and trained to go into the battle line, makes it of the utmost urgent importance that there should not be a single day's delay. That, I say to my right hon. friend, is the reason for presenting a resolution to the House, which can be disposed of in a day, rather than to consume possibly weeks of time by the ordinary parliamentary procedure of putting a Bill through both Houses of Parliament. In this case Parliament has all the liberty of action it would have in the consideration of a Bill. Parliament has the proposal submitted to it, and if it sees fit, it can amend that proposal. The resolution is before the House and the country, and the House is called on to pass judgment upon it.

The power which the passage of this resolution will give to the Governor in Council is no larger than the power which the Governor in Council now enjoys under the Militia Act of Canada. Under that Act the Governor in Council is empowered to call out compulsorily all the men in Canada between the ages of 18 and 60, put them on military service, and send them out of the country for the defence of Canada. Under the Militia Act it is not necessary to submit even a resolution to this House, or ask for the approval of Parliament. The only condition is that if Parliament is not in session it must be called within fifteen days. And, Sir, the Militia Act has been on the statute book for years.

Mr. MORPHY: When was it placed on the statute book?

Mr. ROWELL: I am coming to that. I desire to point out—and this is one of the reasons why I have never been able to understand why in some quarters there should be such strong objection to compulsory military service,—that we have had under the Militia Act, ever since its enactment, compulsory military service in Cana-

da with respect to men between 18 and 60 years, whenever the Government of the day saw fit to call them out for service for the defence of Canada. That Act

5 p.m.

was introduced in the House by a distinguished French-Canadian, Sir George E. Cartier. It was enacted by the Canadian Parliament in 1868, just fifty years ago. In the year 1904 it was revised and amended under the administration of another great French Canadian leader, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), himself. The fundamental principle of that Act is the obligation on every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 60 years to serve his country in a military capacity when the Government of the day calls upon him. This resolution embodies no new principle. It is simply calling upon the young men of Canada to perform the duty which they owe their country. There is not a young man, of military age, in any province of Canada, who was not born under a law which requires him to give his life, if need be, in the defence of his country.

We must consider these resolutions, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the law of our country, and of the serious situation which we are facing to-day in the life of the nation. My right hon. friend may say that the Militia Act only authorizes calling men out for the defence of Canada. To prevent any misunderstanding, let me quote from the remarks of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, then Minister of Justice, in the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. In 1904, speaking on the Militia Act and the power of the Governor in Council under it, at column 8083 of Hansard, he said:

> The hon. member for Kings did not want the Governor in Council to have the power to send troops beyond Canada even for the defence of Canada. That was his position. What is ours? It is that we are prepared to give the Governor in Council a blank power of attorney extending over fifteen days. The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time, when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India to send our militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in defence of Canada.

That, Sir, is the power of the Governor in Council under the Militia Act, as defined by the then Minister of Justice. He proceeds:

> But we do not think it advisable that that power should be absolutely and unrestrictedly in the hands of the Governor in Council. We think it advisable that the period during which they may exercise that power should be restricted, and that Parliament should be called together and be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Parliament must be summoned in fifteen days, and then the whole matter will be in the hands of the people's representatives.

The Government, had it been deemed expedient, need not have come to Parliament at all with this resolution. It could have exercised its power under the Militia Act and called out Class 1, trained them and sent them for service across the sea. By the Bill put through the House in 1904 by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with the full consent of Parliament, representing all the provinces of Canada, that power was placed in the hands of the executive in Canada. Under that Act provision is made for calling the men out in classes and it might be argued that if we called them out we would have to call all of Class 1—that is those between the ages of 18 and 30—and then ballot for the number we require of the class. The Government deems it wiser in the public interest, rather than attempt to do that, to operate, as far as possible, under the Military Service Act, and call out only the men of certain ages, those whom they believe can be best spared, with the least inconvenience to the necessary industries of the country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while one would ordinarily agree with the view presented by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that the constitutional procedure would be to introduce a Bill and put it through the House, I submit that in the present emergency, in order to get men as speedily as possible, the Government is adopting not only a wise, but a thoroughly sound and constitutional course, and that the proposal of my right hon. friend does not aid or help in any way to meet the situation.

After listening to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, for whose character and ability I have the greatest admiration and respect, the difficulty I see is that he proposes no solution of the present situation. Suppose that all my right hon. friend said about the past were true, how would that help our gallant men at the front, and how would it help to stop the advancing German forces? How would his suggestion help to protect the homes of Canada and the people of Canada, if the German forces broke through, compelled Britain to conclude a peace, destroyed her navy, and crossed the ocean to invade our country? We must face the danger as it is and, Sir, it is a real danger. We must face the situ-

ation as it exists now in this year of grace, 1918, and at this very hour.

I wish to emphasize, for a moment, another matter which we must keep in mind. It is sometimes said that Canada has done enough, or that Canada should not send further help, or that we should let the United States help us now. I desire to present, clearly to the House and to the country my view as to that, and I believe that my view is the view of the great majority of the members of this House. Sir, I say that this is Canada's war just as much as it is Britain's war, or the war of France, or the war of Belgium. We have sent our men across the seas with the unanimous consent of the Parliament of Canada, to join in defending our civilization against the most powerful military autocracy the world has ever known. And the moment we sent men across the seas to defend ourselves against Prussian aggression we constituted ourselves one of the belligerent powers, and we must accept all the consequences and all the responsibilities of a belligerent nation. There is no duty resting on Britain, on France, on Belgium, that does not rest equally upon the Canadian people in this great conflict.

If we had not been part of the British Empire, what would have happened? It is said that we have gone into this conflict because we are part of the British Empire. This is true; we were glad to take our place side by side with Britain, in the struggle, but I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that had we been an independent nation on this half of the North American continent, we would still have been compelled to take up arms to defend our liberties, and to protect the lives and the property of our citizens. We would have been forced into this war just as the United States has been forced into it. As honest men, loving liberty and loving free democratic institutions, we would have gone into the fight, and I believe we would have gone into it at perhaps an earlier stage than our neighbours to the south. Perhaps not, but at all events, we would have gone in side by side with the United States to help preserve liberty, democracy and civilization. The Hon. Mr. Lane, one of the members of President Wilson's Cabinet, clearly stated the issue when he declared this was a war between autocracy and democracy, between freedom and the forces of Prussian tyranny, and it must be fought out on either one side of the Atlantic or the other. Would we rather fight it out and achieve victory on the plains of Europe where the war is far away from our own homes or would we prefer fighting it out and settling the issue here. I believe, Sir, that the judgment of the people of this continent is that they prefer fighting it out, and settling the issue in Europe rather than that war's horrors should desolate this peaceful land. For this further reason Canada must be in this war to the end.

My right hon. friend has suggested that it is for us to send food rather than men, and that Canadians should be left to agricultural pursuits rather than bear arms on the field of battle. I am unable to agree with my right hon. friend and for this reason: Our duty is not to send food "or" men, our duty is to send food "and" men.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: And I venture to think that Canadians would wholly mistake the seriousness of the world struggle in which we are engaged if they should think they had done their duty by limiting themselves to either the one or the other. Every nation involved in this struggle has had to gather together all its energies and resources, and throw them into the scale to help achieve victory. Our duty in Canada is to send men, food, ships, munitions and money. Canada's duty is to do everything that she can do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: We entered the struggle and we pledged our future on the issue. Canada has staked her liberty and all her resources on the outcome of this war, and it is our duty and our glorious privilege to throw all our energies into it to help restore peace and security to this war-cursed world. My right hon. friend has said, that the people of Canada were promised that the farmers would not be taken. I can speak for myself, and I think in this respect I can speak for my colleagues: If there was one clear pledge the Government made to the country; if there was one clear mandate the Government received from the country, it was that Canada should maintain our divisions up to strength and provide adequate reinforcements.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: We do not wish to take men from the farms. The Government did not decide on the form of this Order in Council without considering the food situation in all its aspects, without considering its possible effect upon agriculture. The Government did not decide on this Order in Council until they became convinced, that our gallant men could not be reinforced nor the cause of liberty made safe, without this Order. In view of that

paramount necessity, individual preferences and every other consideration must be laid aside to provide the necessary men. Every hon. member of this House knows that many men in his own riding will be affected by this legislation. I represent an agricultural constituency in the province of Ontario, and I recognize that many of my own electors will be called out for service under this Order in Council. I know it will not be popular, I know it will cause distress and sorrow in many a home; I know sacrifices must be made, but, if, in a great national crisis, the Government entrusted with the responsibility of guiding the destinies of Canada were to be swayed from the path of duty because a measure may be unpopular, or because there may be individual sorrow in a home, when the sanctity of every home in the land is imperilled, and were to neglect the sacred duty they owe to their country, that Government would be unworthy of the confidence of the Canadian people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: I say, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, that while I recognize that this proposition will cause inconvenience, and in many cases real hardship, I do not believe that on the whole, if the people of this country receive it in the right spirit, it will seriously diminish our agricultural production this year. Let us look at the situation and test it by what other nations have done; and I make these comparisons, not with a view of minimizing our effort, which has been magnificent, but rather to encourage our people by a knowledge of what other countries at war have been able to achieve.

Take first the situation in Great Britain. The Prime Minister has given figures of the number of men called to the colours up to January of this year, for both the army and the navy in the different portions of the United Kingdom. Those figures give a total of 5,600,000 men which the United Kingdom has contributed up to the month of January last. Under the new Man Power Bill they are raising five hundred thousand more men, and they also passed another Bill in January last under which a substantial number have been called to the colours. But even if we take the figures at five million six hundred thousand, it means that the Old Land has put into the battle line, or called up for service in the army or navy over twelve per cent of her entire population. If the same standard were applied to Canada it would mean that we would send almost a million men. Britain has called out that large force of men, and at the same time she has increased her agricultural production. She has organized and developed a gigantic munitions industry, and has millions of men and women engaged in producing munitions; she has increased her shipbuilding, and while doing all these things, she has increased her agricultural production. How has she been able to achieve this remarkable result? By organizing the man-power and the woman-power of the nation and by throwing her whole strength into the struggle; I believe, Sir, that Canada will show the same spirit, that the broad-minded and patriotic men and women of Canada will rise to meet this emergency.

If there is one thing which the people of Canada are determined to do; if there is one thing they proclaimed last election in tones that could not be misunderstood, it is that Canada will never desert the gallant men who to-day in the trenches of Flanders are fighting for her liberty.

Now, let us look at what Canada's war effort has been in the past, so that we may consider what the resources of Canada are to meet the demands of the present and the future. The Prime Minister has pointed out that we had sent overseas up to the 31st March, of the present year, 364,000 men. We have been in the habit in the past of discussing Canada's contribution to the war on the basis of our total enlistments. That is interesting and valuable as indicating the spirit of the Canadian people, but it does not help us to measure our real war effort or to determine the force withdrawn from civilian life for that effort. Our real military contribution is measured by the men we send overseas, plus the number we have available to be sent overseas. And, measured in that way —and I am now speaking of our splendid force—Canada's war effort is something fewer than 400,000 men, approximately about 5 per cent of our population, if you reckon our population at about eight millions. Many men who enlisted have been discharged in Canada for various causes, physically unfit, too old, or because they have been too young, and some have deserted. These have all found their way back into civil life, and they are all part of the whole producing army, and not to be counted as part of Canada's Military effort. Compared with Canada's 5 per cent of her population Great Britain's effort is over 12 per cent of her population and she is now calling for 500,000 more men. I quite recognize

the fact that a very much larger percentage of the people of Canada is engaged in agriculture than in Great Britain, and that if we drew upon Canadians to the same extent that they have drawn upon the people of Great Britain, we would seriously cripple agriculture. But no one is proposing to draw upon the people of Canada to the extent that the people of Great Britain have been drawn upon. No one is proposing to increase our forces by 600,000 men. What I submit to the House and the country is that we can send the additional men necessary to reinforce our men at the front, and, at the same time, by utilizing our forces at home, the man-power and the woman-power, we can maintain agricultural production and all other essential industries.

Let me give some figures with respect to the other portions of the Empire. As the Prime Minister has intimated, the recent confidential information the Government has received as to the contributions of the other portions of the Empire cannot now be given to this House or to the country. I have taken a very deep interest ever since the war began in the military contributions of the different portions of the Empire. I have endeavoured to keep in touch with the number of men raised in each dominion, and almost a year ago I obtained from the Australian High Commissioner in London, and from the High Commissioner of New Zealand, approximate figures of their contributions in men and in money up to that date. About the same time I obtained information from South Africa in reference to its contribution. While I cannot speak of the situation to-day, I can tell you of the situation as it existed a year ago, and then I will make one or two comments with reference to it. If you compare the number of men actually sent overseas up to one year ago, it would have been necessary for Canada to have sent overseas up to that date two hundred thousand more men than we had sent in order that our contribution should have equalled that of Australia. I think the relative situation of Canada has improved since that time; the discrepancy is not so great to-day. One of the reasons is that Australia has not been able to keep up her monthly reinforcements on the scale she contemplated, because compulsory service was rejected in Australia. Consequently the situation to-day is that Canada is steadily gaining on Australia, and the difference is not so great as it was a year ago. But taking the situation as it exists to-day, from information gathered, not from confidential sources, but from statements in Australian papers and by Australian public men, if we sent across the seas 100,000 more men, even more than 100,000 more men, our contribution in men in proportion to our population would not then exceed Australia's contribution up to the present time.

New Zealand with a population of about 1,100,000, has maintained one division at the front since ever the outbreak of the war. On the basis of population, that would make at least seven divisions for us, and we would have to send overseas between two and three hundred thousand more men to make our contribution equal to that of New Zealand in proportion to our population.

If we take into consideration the men that South Africa put into the war in German Southwest Africa and German Southeast Africa, as well as the men she has sent over the seas, we would have to make a still larger contribution in order to be on a par with South Africa.

What I want to say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the members of the House is this: if the Motherland—Great Britain, Ireland, Scotland—if the great Commonwealth of Australia, if New Zealand, and if South Africa, the youngest member of our commonwealth, composed of men of divers races which, until recent years, were warring against each other, could send into the fighting line for the defence of the flag and of liberty these great numbers of men, should the largest, oldest and wealthiest of all the dominions of the Empire hesitate in this hour of the Empire's crisis?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: And, Mr. Speaker, I would be false to the situation as I believe it to be at the front, I would be false to gallant men I saw overseas a year and a half ago, I would be false to what I believe to be my duty to Canada and to the cause of liberty, if I did not, with all the energy of my being, urge this legislation upon the House. I said Britain had met the situation by mobilizing woman power and resources. How many women do hon. gentlemen think are employed in war services in Great Britain? There are 2,852,200 enrolled in war service in Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: They have in banking and finance, 63,700 women; in the Civil Service, 163,000; in commerce, 820,000; in munitions, 700,000; in national factories, in the metal and chemical trades, 819,000; in shipbuilding in July

1917, 16,500; in agriculture, 270,000. They have also organized their women to serve behind the lines in France and to help the soldiers at the front. In February, 1917, they organized the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps. Within less than a year recruits for this service were being enlisted at the rate of 10,000 a month. The "Waacs," as they are familiarly called, are part and parcel of the British army, working under military rules and regulations. They are in service both in France and in England, and engaged in these occupations: cooks and waitresses in military camps; clerical work; signalling; drivers in motor transport service; salvage—the conversion into useful material of the debris of the battlefield; postal service; the care of soldiers' graves. Then they have the Women's Royal Naval Service, familiarly called the "Wrens," who are performing similar service for the navy. The women of Britain know what the women of Belgium and Northern France have suffered. They know that their homes and liberty are in peril. They know that their husbands and brothers laid down their lives in their defence, and whether it be on the farms or at home, or behind the battle lines, the women of Great Britain are with the men of Great Britain to see this war through to a victorious conclusion.

Sir, the women of Canada wish only the same opportunity. When our gallant men went overseas, with the first, second, third and fourth contingents and subsequent units—the hearts of the women of Canada went with the soldier boys to the front, and to-day the hearts of many of the mothers of Canada lie buried with their boys in the graves of France and Flanders. We have only to speak the word and the mothers and sisters of our soldiers will undertake any work that this nation calls them to undertake, in order that the boys may be reinforced and victory achieved. The women have said to the Government: "Give us the chance to serve." The Women's Conference held some weeks ago with the War Committee of the Cabinet submitted a list of occupations upon which the women of Canada would be glad to enter if the nation wished them to serve. I say that we can reinforce our men at the front; we can send all the men that are needed; we can send more than we can get by calling up the class mentioned, and yet have sufficient labour at home for maintaining all the essential industries of Canada.

What I said of Great Britain is equally, if not more, true of France. One who has had the opportunity of visiting France during the war cannot but be moved by the service which is being rendered by the women of France. The women of Europe do more work on the soil than do the women of Canada or the United States, but in France women who had not previously been engaged in farm work were working on the farms early and late. The French Minister of Agriculture a month after the war broke out, when he thought the struggle would be over in a few months, called upon the women of France to gather the harvest and prepare the soil for the coming spring, so that when their husbands and brothers and sons returned from the war they would find the soil ready for the sowing. But the husbands, brothers and sons have not returned. The women of France sowed the grain in the spring of 1915 and gathered the harvest of that year. They prepared the soil in the autumn of 1915; they sowed the grain in the spring of 1916, and when I was there in the summer of 1916 they were gathering the harvest. I did not see an able-bodied young man in all the fields of France; the harvests were being gathered by the women, the boys and the old men. I went into a great munition plant in Paris, where I found thousands of women employed in making munitions. I said to the director: "Where did these women come from? Who are they?" He said: "They are mostly the wives and sisters of soldiers at the front." These women were making shells in order that their sons and husbands and brothers might have the means of defeating and driving back the foe, and might thereby the sooner return to their loved ones at home. Do you mean to tell me that the women of Canada will not do for their country what the women of Britain and France are doing for theirs? In Britain and France the less essential industries have been cut out. When it is suggested that we cut out less essential industries in Canada, the question is at once asked: "What will your workmen do? You should not stop an industry until you know whether there is work for the men." I submit that, without detriment to any vital interests, we could close up many of the non-essential industries of Canada and relieve the men therein engaged for war work. Canada has not yet got down to this war as the nations of Europe have, and the time has come when we must realize the urgency of the situation and be prepared to deal with it.

France, as the Prime Minister has said, has given one in six of her entire popula-

tion to this struggle. She has poured out her life-blood like water in order that she may defend the homes and liberties of her people. When I was in France they had just received word of the Lille deportations, to which the Prime Minister referred, when the wives and daughters of the French people in the conquered territory were forced from their homes and sent behind the German lines. Do you wonder that there was no talk of peace in France? Do you wonder that every man you met said: "There is only one thing for France, death or victory." The gallant men of France have been inspired by that spirit. I would that in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we should all be imbued with the spirit of France, and that, with her, we might cry, "Until death or victory."

The leader of the Opposition has spoken of the splendid fighting qualities of the French Canadians at the front. With every word that my hon. friend says in that respect I am in cordial agreement. No men ever fought better at the front than the men who have gone from the province of Quebec. Shortly after the Somme battle I received a letter from a Toronto officer who had been engaged in that fight. In the capture of Courcelette the battalion that held the apex of the advance was the gallant 22nd from the province of Quebec. A Toronto company went in to relieve them in the midst of the battle, and this officer, who was himself wounded a few days afterwards, wrote me this letter from a hospital:

> I would like to tell you about the French Canadians at Courcelette. The official eye witness story is nothing compared to the facts. My company relieved the 22nd on the 17th September, and I saw their work and know what they did. No troops, not even the Guards, could have done better. Even if Quebec has been slow in recruiting, the courage and heroism of Colonel Tremblay and his men in that fight atones for a lot. When I relieved him, he had only two officers besides himself and eighty men left out of his battalion, and they were fighting like devils still.

When this officer returned to Canada for a period of convalescence he related this further incident in connection with that battle. On the 17th of September, or the morning of the 18th, just as the relief was being made, the Germans started to come over the trenches again. Colonel Tremblay, with but two officers and eighty men left, came to this Toronto officer, after they had been fighting for days there without relief, and asked, if they could not stay with him to see it through again? That is the spirit of the gallant French Canadian soldiers who have gone across the sea.

We have heard this afternoon of the unity of Canada. I believe Canadian unity is possible, and I ask: How can we achieve Canadian unity? We can achieve it just as our English and French Canadians achieve it at the front—by marching together to a great objective, seeking to serve and to sacrifice together, and if, under this resolution, the sons of Ontario and Quebec go forth to fight for the homes and liberties of Canada, and if they fight and die together on the fields of France and Flanders and mingle their blood in a common grave, the men who return to Canada will put an end to racial strife in this country; they will stand together for a united Canada. We cannot unite by arguing; we can unite by working together for a great objective in which we all believe. I believe that with the cheerful acceptance of this proposal, with the going forth of the men of Ontario and Quebec, you have started on the course of real and lasting unity; you have started on a course which will bind together the conflicting interests, the different races and the different creeds in this country.

Canada stands at the parting of the ways. The situation at the front is, as the Prime Minister has said, grave beyond description. Our boys have fought with a courage and a heroism unsurpassed in history. The generals of the Allied armies on the western front agree that there is no finer fighting corps on the whole western front than the Canadians. Some go further and say that it is the best. Our Canadian soldiers are giving their lives for us. What are we going to do for them? They went overseas with the pledge and promise of the people of Canada that we would stand by them; that we would back them up; that we would send them reinforcements, that we would not desert them. Are we going to keep our pledge to those gallant men? That is the question you and I must answer at this hour. From the Atlantic to the Pacific throughout the Dominion of Canada there is but one answer in the hearts of the people, and that is: Canada must and will stand by her men to the limit of Canada's power and resources.

The issue may determine our future, our liberties, the cause of humanity, civilization. Each of us has the great privilege, in this critical hour of human history, to make a contribution to the future welfare, not only of Canada, but of the human race. Shall we do it? Shall we do it as men? Shall we do it as our fathers did over a century ago? The German must be defeated.

Right must triumph. The cause of liberty must prevail. Canada will not stain her glorious record; Canada will add a new and glorious chapter to her history; Canada will fight to the last for the sacred cause of liberty, for British freedom, for civilization.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will bear with me for the short time I intend to occupy, as a plain and unassuming member of this House, in order to put in a few simple words my position regarding the resolution now before the House. As one who comes from an agricultural constituency in the Far West, and in the face of the methods that were used by my opponent in the last election and by those who supported him on the very question that we have before us to-day, I fail to understand this sudden right about face on the part of the Government. It appears to me that this is a breach of faith on the part of the Government because men throughout the length and breadth of the land were led to understand that those of our countrymen who followed agricultural pursuits, if they supported the Government, would be exempted and would be allowed to pursue the even tenor of their ways. That statement was made in my county from door to door, and I am sure the same course was pursued in every county in this Dominion. The people of western Canada accepted the word of the Government; they accepted the word of the Minister of Militia, and I, as a Canadian, knew what the Minister of Militia meant, when coming in from one of the outlying districts I was handed a copy of the Free Press in which the minister was reported as stating that those connected with agriculture would be exempted; that the Government would see to it that they were exempted. The word went out throughout the length and breadth of the land that those men would be allowed to remain at home. On the strength of that statement, what did the people at home do? Farmers, in Manitoba and in other parts of western Canada, and, I am sure, in eastern Canada as well, mortgaged their very future on the appeal that was made to them as true and patriotic citizens of this country, I want to say here that every man and woman whom I know in this country is a true and patriotic citizen. Those who could not go to the front, including those who had sent their sons overseas, said: We shall do something for the war. As this Government and as the whole country knows, they prepared to increase production. What has this Government and every member of it said to the people? Increase production. What did we hear within the last two or three days? We are facing a world famine. There was written by an able citizen, Mr. Ewart, an article which was entitled "The World Famine." We know for a fact that, the world over, there is a shortage of food. Practical farmers in western Canada are going to sow the crop, but what are we going to reap? No one knows. But we shall endeavour to reap a crop. What is the first move this Government is making? The people to-day are seeding wheat which is the first grain sown in western Canada. I would refer every member of this Government to an article in an organ that supported them through thick and thin in the last election. The article is dated April 16, and it gives a summary of conditions regarding seeding in western Canada. What does it say regarding the labour situation in the province of Manitoba?

> Labour supply seems fairly satisfactory; twenty-four points report "sufficient"; six report supply "fair," "adequate" or "good"; five points report help very short and remainder "barely enough" or "normal."

What is the report from the province of Saskatchewan?

> In regard to labour supply for the land, 35 points reports "sufficient"; 12 report "short" or "scarce"; only three points state labour plentiful.

What does the province of Alberta say in regard to the labour situation?

> Farm labour is given as "sufficient" at eight points, "scarce" at four, and "good" at one.

Every farmer from western Canada will bear me out when I say that we are paying a higher rate of wages than we ever paid before. We all admit that and we are willing to put up with it, because we know that labour is getting scarce. It is also reported on the same page as the article from which I have been reading that although labour is fairly sufficient for seeding there is no provision for the harvest. We all hope the harvest will be an abundant one in the interest of the Allies and of this country. The more bountiful the harvest will be, the greater will be the burden upon the people of this country to harvest it and ship it to the Old Country when that time arrives. I say it is a mistake for the Government to take the boys of nineteen to twenty-three years of age from the farm, particularly at this time of the year. Western Canada has done its share pretty well so far as this war is concerned, not only

in the matter of production but in the number of men they have sent to the front, and some of their best will never come back. I say it is taking the people of the country by the throat at this particular time. After all the turmoil of the last election, the thing was simmering down pretty well; it was simmering down in my county at all events, and I said to the people of the county of Provencher: "Abide by the law," as every true citizen would have done. After the promises held out by the Government before the last election I say it is a deception to conscript the farmers now. It is not in the interest of the Canadian people to put these regulations into force and rob the farmers of the help which is now all too scarce. What are we going to do in the fall if we take away the experienced Canadian boy who can hook up and drive six horses at any kind of work, or the farmer's son who can take hold of the tractor or his father's threshing machine and run it as good as any man? I repeat this is a mistake. There are able men in the Government but I say to them in all common sense they are making a big mistake in pursuing the policy they now propose to carry out. Who else considers it a mistake? A member of the Government; the Minister of Agriculture in the plainest words in the English language says it is a mistake. I have known him a long time and have great respect for him. Let me quote from an interview with the Minister of Agriculture which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of April 17th. It is well worth reading, but I will quote only the last paragraph:

> Despite the difficulties, we must produce more food than we have ever done before. Set apart all your land fit for growing crops, and plant as much wheat as you can. Let me add one word about next year.

He was thinking not only about this year but next year too, which he had a perfect right to do. He goes on:

> Plan to bring as much new land on your farm under cultivation for another crop as possible and thus increase your acreage for next year. It will be needed then just as much as now.

It will be needed more than now There are other authorities in western Canada besides the Minister of Agriculture, with all due deference to him. In the same issue of the Ottawa Citizen there is a statement by Roderick Mackenzie, secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and a candidate for Parliament for the constituency of Brandon in the last election but later withdrawing in favour of the Union Government candidate. He says:

> The farm labour situation will be affected and production will be interfered with by the new Military Service regulation. He would not go so far as to say that the new measure would be opposed. He believed it was in the interest of the country that those farmers between the ages of twenty and twenty-three who had previously been granted exemption should be permitted to remain on the land. It had been shown, he declared, that increased production was now a vital factor from the point of view of winning the war. To take these producers from the land would consequently interfere with the policy outlined.

Were the young men to be taken from the land, what would be the situation in this House to-day? Gentlemen on this side of the House would be on that side, and gentlemen on that side would be on this side, and nobody knows that better than the practical men from western Canada who are now in the Government. I have lived in the county of Provencher for forty-one years and have had a little experience mixing with the people, and I know a man in this House—I caught his eye only a moment ago—who said to me during the heat of the last election contest. "The people will not vote for conscription; the farmers are all against it." The farmers were all against it, and now the Government is doing what I said they would do at that time. The farmers were led away by the Government's promises. For my part, so long as I live I will never be led away by the promise of any politician. What arguments did the Government use in the last election? They would go to a man who had two sons at the front and say: You vote for Union Government and your boy will come home. Then they would go to the other man who had nobody at the front and say: You are a farmer; you vote for Union Government and your boy will stay at home. That was the situation. I have never done anything, nor will I do anything, to interfere with this Government in carrying on the war; I am in this war heart and soul, just as much as any other man, and how could it be otherwise? I say the present policy of the Government is a mistake; there is no occasion for it at the present time. Everybody knows that the situation is desperate, but the Government would do better to follow along the lines laid down by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. The present policy of the Government is simply deceiving—that is the only word to describe it—the people who loyally supported them in the last election. It is tightening the screws on con-

scription more and more, now that they have a big majority. I want to support the boys at the front and I am going to support the war; I have always supported the war. But I say to the Government, in the name of everything that is good try and do something; and I believe there are men in the Government big enough to do something. For God's sake stop dividing the people as you are doing from day to day. A man is now to be branded as a traitor who might have his heart and soul in the war simply for expressing an opinion. I do not question one word in the statement of my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council. I made the same appeal as he did last November to people to help win the war, and I am willing to do that now. I had hoped this thing had gone by for the time being, and that I could come here and give this Government honest, straightforward and independent support on everything in connection with the war, but it seems that they want to load it on and load it on from day to day. I disagree with them and I am going to move the following amendment seconded by the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Read):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The House regrets that the proposed Order in Council departs entirely from the principle of the Order in Council of December 3, 1917, allowing the exemption of those whose services are essential for promoting agricultural production; and the House therefore declares that the proposed Order in Council should be amended so that it shall provide for the exemption of those who are now actually and effectively engaged and so urgently needed in the production of foodstuffs upon the farms of Canada.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, on rising to address the House this evening on what I consider the most momentous question which has ever been discussed in a Canadian parliament, I shall try to confine my few remarks to what I consider the very gist of the question, and in doing so I wish not to hurt the feelings of any person, and yet I must declare the principles which, in my judgment, have actuated the Government in passing this Order in Council and proposing it to Parliament; and when that is done I consider I have performed my duty. I have listened to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the very reasonable criticism which he offered to this proposal this afternoon, and I listened also to the argument of my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy) who has moved the amendment to the proposed resolution. My right hon. friend claimed, in the first place, that the Government was departing from all the well-recognized principles of constitutional government in Canada in passing an Order in Council of such tremendous importance as the present one when Parliament was in session. With that statement I have not the faintest quarrel in the world. I realize that such a course has never been adopted in Canada before. I realize that, were this proposal made in peace time, no government would be justified in adopting it. But I could not help thinking all the time my right hon. friend was discussing this matter that he was forgetting the real situation and the real reason why this Order in Council has been passed. He was forgetting the fact that the civilization of the world is trembling in the balance, and there is nothing in this world which will save the situation in France and Flanders except men. My right hon. friend talks about the Prussian militarism of the Government in passing a law to provide—because that is what it amounts to—for the immediate and effective reinforcement of our troops at the front. I am not going into any long dissertation as to the necessity for the reinforcement of the troops. The Prime Minister has given figures which I think ought to convince any one that there is a real necessity for reinforcing Canadian divisions—not so much perhaps for reinforcing them at present, but a necessity which may arise at any time. That necessity may be arising to-night. Mr. Speaker, we have no idea what is going on in that horrible battlefield now; the whole Canadian army corps may be wrapped in a life and death struggle with the Huns; it may be that thousands of our men have been slain to-day, or will be slain to-morrow. But if the Canadian army corps is not in this condition to-night, and will not be in this condition next week, we know the British army has been under the most terrible strain under which any army has ever been in this world. We know the conditions are so serious that a portion of the French army had to be withdrawn from other spheres of activity and sent to the relief of the British, and we know that was not done without the very strongest reasons imaginable. I do not have to argue with this House, or with any intelligent man or

woman in Canada, as to the necessity for men in this titanic struggle. But without labouring the question, I would like to ask my right hon friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other gentlemen opposite if there is any difference in the principle between taking the opinion of the House of Commons and the Senate on a resolution, and taking the opinion of the same bodies by the ordinary circuitous method of passing a Bill? The only difference I can see is that if the principle of this proposed Order in Council be adopted it will become law to-morrow. If you introduced a Bill in this House it might become law in four weeks from to-morrow. That is all I can say. I cannot see any difference between the House of Commons voting upon a principle of this kind once, and voting on it four or five or six times. That is all it means. Under the ordinary methods of procedure as outlined by my right hon. friend this afternoon, a Bill gets its first reading, its second reading, goes into committee and comes back for third reading. It then goes to the Senate and goes through the same procedure there, and we know that, even if we apply closure at every step we take, which the rules of Parliament provide for, it is doubtful if the Bill could become law in three weeks, and it might take four weeks. In the meantime the Canadian army corps may be cut to pieces. "But," they say, "you cannot get the men there for four months." If you lose one month it will be five months before you get them there. Therefore, as a member of the House of some years standing, as a man who, I think, knows something of constitutional rights and privileges, and one who holds them as dear as any man in Canada, I make no apology, and I have every justification for the course we are pursuing in taking the opinion of the Parliament of Canada at the earliest possible moment, and getting the men to the front as soon as we can. Therefore, I do not wish to discuss this any longer. I lay down the principle that the first and only duty of this Government and Parliament is to stand by the men at the front and to see that they are reinforced and supported in every possible way.

Now we come to the real question at issue, and that is whether or not we are justified in forcibly taking men from the ordinary avocations of life and putting them in the army. We fought out this question a year ago. We spent over two months in this Parliament discussing it, and the Parliament as then constituted declared by a very substantial majority in favour of the principle, and the people of Canada by an overwhelming majority declared in favour of the same principle when the question was submitted to them a few months later. Therefore, I say that constitutionally this Government has all the justification and all the authority which any Government requires to go ahead and produce the necessary recruits in the most effective and expeditious manner. But my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy) comes in with an amendment, the substance of which is that instead of passing this Order in Council, we should amend it so as to provide that exemption be granted to practically every person who belongs to the agricultural part of Canada. I represent perhaps one of the most complete agricultural districts in the Dominion of Canada. Probably three-quarters of my constituents—I do not know but nine-tenths—are of the farming population. I realize that this Order in Council is going to take many men whose labours will be lost to the farm and whose labours are needed on the farm. What is true of my constituency is true, I suppose, of three-quarters of the constituencies in Canada. I do not doubt for a moment that there will be some dislocation of agricultural labour in Canada. It may be possible that a few farms will not produce as much, on account of this resolution, as they would have produced if the resolution had not been passed. Do not think for a moment that the Government has not canvassed this matter from every possible standpoint. Do not think for a moment we did not realize that there might be some dislocations. But every time we discussed it we have been brought back to one proposition—which is required most in the battlefield to-day, men or wheat? If I believed we could not raise wheat if we sent these men, then I would hesitate very, very seriously before I would vote for this resolution; but I want to tell hon. members that the labour possibilities of Canada are not nearly exhausted, and I want to tell the hon. member for Provencher that if we adopted his amendment we would be right back to the condition of affairs which existed in Canada since the month of October last. We started out last October to get 100,000 men by the combing out process, by allowing exemption to very many different classes of people, by allowing people to come forward and say: It is necessary I should remain on the farm, and it is necessary for business reasons, for family reasons, and for one reason or another, that I should be exempted.

The result is that these exemption tribunals have gone on, the appeal tribunals have followed them, and in four months we have not succeeded in getting more than thirty thousand men by the circuitous, cumbersome machinery that was enacted last year. If we go on under the present conditions for four months longer we would not probably get thirty thousand more. Now it comes down to the hard question of expediency. Are we going on with the present method and allow our sons, brothers and friends to be slaughtered at the front, and possibly allow the war to be lost, or are we going to act as sane and courageous men ought to act? If it be necessary to sweep away some of the safeguards of the constitution, then sweep them away and get the men; there is no other course to pursue. I take it, Sir, that the man who has not the ability, the man who has not the will, to meet a situation of this kind and meet it with a hand of iron is not fit to hold a position in any government in any country in times of war. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) talked about voluntary recruiting, and gave figures for 1917 and part of 1916 to show what had been accomplished by that method. Up to the month of July or August last there was no more warm advocate of the voluntary recruiting system in Canada than I was. I have stated in Parliament, and I repeat now, that, perhaps, there is not a man in Canada to whom the word "conscription" is more repulsive than it is to myself. I wanted to exhaust the recruiting system to the very limit before I decided to differ with my old leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), whom I have always loved and have not yet ceased to love. It was one of the most serious situations of my lifetime, and one which comes to few, I am glad to say, in the political life of Canada. Yet, Sir, looking the matter over, realizing that in the whole of 1917 out of some seventy-five thousand volunteers, less than twenty-five thousand of those were volunteers for the infantry, one could appreciate the seriousness of the situation. You cannot wage this war, or any war, without infantry. We did not get as many infantry as we lost in the month of November last in the way of casualties. We found that voluntary enlistment had absolutely fallen down as a means of securing the troops we need. Consequently, there is no other way in the world to get men except by the method we are now adopting.

No man regrets to a greater degree than I do the fact that it is necessary to call upon farmers' sons and take them away from the farms; no man realizes more clearly than I do what that means to the fathers and mothers of these young men; no man, I believe, realizes more clearly than I do, the necessity of having men upon the farms. But I want to tell my hon. friends that if we do not adopt this resolution we would simply be going over and over again along the circuitous route, which has proved such a dismal failure as a means of bringing in men. It has been said by some person, the remark is not original with me, that the Military Service Act as it is now enforced is a splendid exemption Act, but a very poor conscription Act; it has produced something like two hundred thousand exemptions and about thirty thousand soldiers. I want to ask my hon. friends opposite, can we go on and win the war under these conditions? That is all there is to it. Is it better that we leave these young men on the farms, and not only on the farms but in the workshops, and all the different avocations of life in Canada, than do as we propose to do?

My hon. friends are talking about exempting farmers. That only touches a certain percentage, not a very large percentage either, of the men who will be taken under this Act; and the moment you adopt your system of exemptions in order to exempt the farming class, you will have practically the same results as we have had in the past. But, Sir, I am not as pessimistic over the agricultural situation in Canada as my hon. friends opposite seem to be. It has been pointed out this afternoon, and it is within the knowledge of every member this evening, that in France, in England, in all the European countries, people are working upon the farms and producing foodstuffs who never thought of doing such a thing until this war broke out. There is an enormous quantity of labour available for the farmers that has never been touched heretofore. I am not very well acquainted with the conditions in western Canada, and therefore I am not in a position to personally gainsay the statement made by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy), but I know something about the conditions in eastern Canada; and I tell my hon. friend that there are hundreds and thousands of men in eastern Canada who can be impressed for work upon the farms if this Government has only enough courage to go on and do it. We have made a start,—and I am speaking now with some sense of responsibility. We have passed an Order

in Council which makes it a criminal offence, under certain conditions, for men to be unemployed. But the Order in Council hardly goes as far as I would like to see it go. Still, I am always thankful for small favours, and once we have adopted the principle it will not be very hard to extend it. You can go round the city of Ottawa, or the city of Montreal, in fact any city in Canada, and you will find young men attending the moving picture shows in the afternoon, you will find them loafing in the parks, you will find them standing on the street corners, you will find them in all conditions and avocations in life, men who may be taken and impressed for farm service. We are taking a registration of the man and woman power of Canada, and we hope to complete it by the middle of June. Up to the present time we have not decided, we have not gone so far as to say these men shall be conscripted to work. We think they ought to be at work. I think, Mr. Speaker, if this Parliament adopts the principle of taking a certain class of men without exemption and putting them into the army to fight, there cannot be very much difficulty in getting the people of Canada and the Parliament of Canada to stand behind us and say that men shall work where they ought to work. I am not laying that down as a settled policy of the Government, I am only giving my own views; but it follows as logically as night follows day. Why, Sir, if a man had said to me four years ago that I would be standing up here to-night advocating the conscription of men to go into the army I would have said he was an arrant fool, and I think that is practically true of every man in this House. But four years of war have produced a wonderful change in the sentiments of members of this House, and a wonderful change in the sentiments of the people of Canada. The people of Canada to-day are prepared to stand for things which they would not have dreamed of standing for four years ago, and they will stand for still more drastic measures inside of four months if the necessity arises. Therefore, I want to give notice here, so far as I am concerned at least—and I think I am pretty well voicing the sentiments of my colleagues and of the supporters of the Government, and, I believe, of the people of Canada—that if it becomes necessary to impress for service on the farm certain people who have not been farmers heretofore, the people will stand by us and the Government will not hesitate to do its duty in order to see that production is increased to the requisite extent. I am not going to advocate to-night that women should labour on the farm, although women can do so. Women can run machinery and can do many things on the farm that they have not hitherto done. The boys who are attending college can be taken away from those colleges and put on the farms. Young men who are loafing on city streets can be taken and put on the farms; and with all the resources in eastern Canada at least, and with the powers of the Government and the will of the people exercised as they should be, I have no doubt whatever as to what will take place so far as farming is concerned. Therefore, I have no hesitation in voting against this amendment. I realize that in doing this I am not going to please a great body of my constituents, but I think that my friends around me who are ready to vote for this resolution, feel the same as I do. The time has gone by when any man has any right to consider what may be popular or unpopular. The one great question which every man in this Parliament should ask himself to-night is this: What is necessary in the interests of this country at large; what is necessary in order to see that Canada does her full duty with a view of bringing this war to a successful termination?

There are certain duties cast upon a Government in any country in times of stress such as these are; and in addition to that there are certain duties cast upon every good citizen of a country in such times as we are passing through now. I realize that up to the beginning of this war we had so much freedom in Canada that the ordinary man and woman could not understand or realize what it meant when any of this freedom was taken away from him. We had never been taught war in Canada; we never believed it would be necessary to teach our people their duty in time of war. And, when it became necessary to teach them, I can quite understand that it was hard for them to realize—it is hard for people in Canada to-day to realize—that the first duty of every citizen in a time of stress and danger is to stand up for his State. They have been taught differently from that in European countries, and while we all abhor the necessity of it, yet we realize that in Europe for decades they have been taught that when a nation is at war the first duty of every man is to respond to the call of the army. As I said before, I realize that it has taken a good deal of education to beat these things into the heads of the people of Canada, but our people have risen to the occasion, I think, in a manner which calls

for the commendation of every man who gives it serious consideration. When you realize, Sir, that over four hundred thousand men have voluntarily given up their homes and all that is near and dear to them, and have gone into the army ready to make the supreme sacrifice, it proves that there is a splendid public sentiment in Canada, a public sentiment above and beyond what any of us imagined.

But there is no use in trying to hide it. Practically all the men in Canada who were willing to volunteer and take their chances have been recruited. If you want evidence of that, all you have to do is to look around and see what has been done by the remaining people of Canada to evade military service under the conscription law. And I want to say here, as publicly and as forcibly as I can, that the attempts to evade the conscription law are not entirely confined to the province of Quebec. A great deal has been said in this House during the last four weeks about that province. From the figures given here by the Prime Minister this afternoon, we must all realize that the number of French-speaking Canadians who have enlisted is not very great. I am not here to find fault or to criticise; I have not a word of condemnation to say to them. It is a bald fact that stares everybody in the face. But there are thousands and tens of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands, of people in the rest of Canada who have tried as assiduously as they could to evade military service. Among the farming classes, every device has been resorted to which the ingenuity of man could think of. Men by the score have been practically adopted by their neighbours on the ground that it was necessary to work their farms, and through that have obtained exemption; and the next day these young men have gone away from that farm as if it were a pest house, with no intention of ever returning to it. This thing has gone on in English Canada to my knowledge. I do not believe there is one section where it has not gone on. Therefore I think I ought to say that it is just as necessary that we have some method of securing these men in the English portions of Canada as it is in the province of Quebec. It may not gather in as many men—possibly not; but the principle is the same, and the same law that applies to the one will apply to the others.

There are duties cast upon a Government in times like these which no member can refuse to look in the face, and the man who is not willing to look them in the face and grapple with them had better get out of the Government and hand the duties of government over to some man who has the courage to perform them. We have known this situation since last January. We could see at that time that the Military Service Act was not producing the men required. We have tried to speed it up, have tried to enforce its provisions; we have tried to get men, and have failed to a very great extent. I dare say that, if we went on with all the appeals now pending before the central appeal judge, we might get more men; but we would never get 100,000 men or anything like it. Therefore it became the duty of this Government either to face the situation, or hand it over to men who would face it. We decided to face it. After careful consideration we have brought down this measure. We have placed it before you and we ask you to adopt it. We know there will be criticism in the country; thousands will not like it, there is no question about that. We know it will be as displeasing to many of our followers as it is to many of our opponents. Nevertheless, it is a stern necessity staring us in the face, and we are not going to flinch from it. I have no doubt whatever but that it will be carried by an overwhelming majority; I wish it could be made unanimous, I had hoped that it would be carried unanimously. But I will go further, and say that if this measure did not pass in this House, I would not give up the fight. There are other ways. I would not give in until everything had been done that possibly could be done. Notwithstanding that this measure will not be popular in the country, I would not hesitate to go to the people and ask them to pass judgment upon it, and I have every faith in the world that the verdict would be as favourable as it was in December last.

Now, sir, I do not think that I should argue the necessity for getting these men. We are all reading the papers every day. There cannot be a man or woman in Canada who is not aware of what has taken place in Europe during the last four weeks. On the 21st of March the enemy, after concentrating all the forces which he could possibly draw from the eastern front after the collapse of Russia, after withdrawing all the men possible from the Italian and every other front, made up his mind that he simply had to break through the British line or throw up his hands. And the result is that the British army in France and

Flanders has been subjected to the most terrible ordeal which any body of troops has ever been subjected to in history. The most terrible onslaught which human ingenuity could devise has been hurled upon that army. While they have gone back, they have not broken. But it is no use for any man to hug himself and say: "Oh, the British army has always won, and, somehow or other, they will win." They have accomplished wonders, and no man is prouder of his country and nation than I am of mine to-night. There is no man who realizes the perilous situation to a greater extent than I do. If every man in this House and in Canada realized the situation in France as I do to-night, we would not be standing here and arguing as to how we shall get men. When I think of the horrible consequences which would follow if Germany should win, when I realize what would have followed had they succeeded in carrying out their object, and how nearly they did succeed in breaking through, I almost tremble. Do hon. gentlemen realize what would have happened if they had broken through, or if the British and French armies had been separated? The British army would have been forced to capitulate. When the Germans had reached the channel ports and the means of communications between Great Britain and France had been cut off, France would have been forced to surrender also. Do people want German guns in the St. Lawrence river, or German guns along our Atlantic coast, to wake them up to a sense of their duty? That is what will happen if they break through our line. Nothing on this earth can stop them from breaking through that line except men, more men, and still more men. I hope that no one will think that I am drawing upon my imagination in this respect, and trying to make the picture darker than it should be, because I am endeavouring to present my view as it impresses itself upon me. I do not think that my conclusions are unreasonable; I do not think it is unreasonable to assume that if the Germans do break through, the things may happen which I have suggested to you. And should that be the case, what would be the use of your farms? What would be the use of your property? What in the world matters if that happens? Does any man here want his family and his female relatives subjected to the degradation which has been heaped upon the people of France and Belgium? All these things might happen, and probably would happen, in such an eventuality as I have mentioned.

I know that I shall be called an alarmist; people will say that I have tried to scare the public into accepting this measure. I am not doing that; I am simply giving my honest opinion, which I have arrived at after very careful reasoning; and I think that hundreds of people in Canada, if they speak out their minds, will tell you that they have come to a similar conclusion. I have never been a pessimist. I have always believed that we shall win this war, and I believe so still. But I have always tried to look this matter in the face and to realize what might happen in case we did not do our duty and this war should be lost.

I took the trouble this afternoon to look up a few of the remarks I made in this House on the 27th day of June last, on the second reading of the Military Service Bill. The question under consideration at that time was whether this matter should be referred to the people of Canada by means of a referendum, or whether the Bill providing for compulsory military service should be adopted by the House. When I voted with the then Government and against my own leader and many of my friends, I reasoned the matter out just as I am trying to reason it out to you to-night. I want to read simply one paragraph from my remarks, which will show you that my mind was travelling along the same channel nine months ago as it is to-night. I said:

> Sir, I am not the keeper of my brother's conscience; I am the last man in the world to force any other man to vote with me who does not wish to vote with me. I hope I am big enough to give any man who differs from me the credit of being just as honest in his convictions as I am honest in mine. And I have just as much respect for the honesty of the man who declares he will vote for the referendum as I have for my own. But I cannot help asking: Should the referendum be defeated, what then? That is a question I cannot get around. I do not say it will be defeated. I do not say that Parliament ought to pass a law if it is sure that in doing so it is going against the will of the people. But again I come back to my first proposition: This country is at war and must have men; this country must go on doing its duty. Again I say: Suppose the referendum is defeated, what then? And, not being the keeper of any other man's conscience, I have no fault to find with the man who says he is willing to take this chance. But so far as I am concerned, I can only say, it is not good enough for me.

These were my considered views nine months ago; they have since then been substantiated, strengthened, and modified to some extent. I say now that the question is not whether the majority of the people

are in favour of a referendum or of conscription, but, what is the duty of the Government and Parliament in view of the conditions which exist in Europe to-night? I am willing to brush aside all my preconceived ideas of constitutional rights in times of peace, and to say frankly and openly that, no matter whether it be popular or unpopular,—I would go so far as to say, no matter whether the majority of the people are behind it or not—it is our duty to go on and get every man we possibly can get without crippling the ordinary affairs of the country. Entertaining these views, my duty is clear, and I hope that I shall be able to convince every man who listens to me to-night that his duty lies along the same path as mine.

A splendid sentiment has been exhibited by the people of Canada. I said a while ago that over 400,000 men had voluntarily answered the call of duty, had gone to the front, and had faced conditions of which no man can have a proper conception unless he has been there to become familiar with them. I regret to say, however, that something else is required in the sentiment of Canada to-day to make it what I should like to see it. Everything is not as lovely as the sentiment expressed by the action of the 400,000 men who voluntarily offered their lives, if necessary, for their country. I am very sorry to say that there is a sentiment throughout the country which does not measure up to that high standard. There are people who have used the war as a means of getting rich to an extent which they had never dreamed of. There are men who come to the Government—"patriots" who want to help win the war, but to win it in some way by which they can make themselves rich—and want everything in the world one possibly can imagine. There are men who come to the Government and want things for which they have no right to ask. There are men who come to the Government without asking for a moment where the money which their proposals involve is to come from. There are men who never consider for a moment what the revenues of the country are or what is the extent of the debt which is being piled up. "Patriots" come to the Government every day who want to build everything from a ship down to the smallest article of commerce, and who want the Government not only to furnish the money to do it with, but the money which will make them rich for the rest of their lives.

While I am on this subject, there is a class of men to whom I want to address my respects to-night, and that is the labouring men of Canada. I know that what I am going to say may not be very popular. I do not wonder that the labouring men of Canada are making a demand for increased wages every day in the week, when their employers are getting rich beyond the dreams of avarice. But I want to say here to-night—I give this not as the opinion of the Government, but as my own private opinion—that no man in Canada is justified in laying down his tools and saying: I will not work at any necessary industry in this country. No man is justified in saying: I will not mine coal; I will not produce steel; I will not run a railroad; I will not do other things necessary in the ordinary affairs of the country. They may have grievances, and those grievances could be remedied; but they should never quit work, nor should the employer ever cause the conditions to be such that they can quit work. I know that this is beyond the question under consideration, but as I am speaking of the sentiment of Canada, I cannot resist the temptation of making these statements. They may not please many people, but they are not made for the purpose of pleasing. They are made with a view to causing a few more people in Canada to think who have not thought in the past. I am sorry to say that thousands of men in Canada to-day have looked upon this war as a God-given opportunity of getting rich beyond their former dreams. I may be saying something which is unpleasant to myself and unpleasant to them, but in doing so it is possible that I may cause some people to think of things to which they have not given consideration before. I hope that the people will rise to the occasion and realize that this is not a time to get rich; that this is not a time to quibble over small things; it is a time when every man, and every woman, and every child almost, should say: What can I best do to play my part in putting Canada in a position to do her full part in winning this war?

I do not wish to say more than I ought to say, nor do I desire to leave anything unsaid which it is in my heart to say to-night. I am sorry that my hon. friend has moved this resolution and that he proposes, as I imagine, to divide the House upon it. If this amendment be carried, we shall simply have the old question of exemptions tried over again and the whole purpose of the resolution will be defeated.

I hope my friend the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not think me rude if I say to him that I

was disappointed this afternoon at the concluding part of his remarks. It is true he did what I, knowing him as long as I have, realized he would do. He said to the people of his province that they must obey this law. I would have been very much surprised if he had said anything else, but I wish he had gone further and said to his people: Not only is it your duty to obey this law, but it is your duty to come forward without this law. I wish every one of my hon. friends opposite, every one of my hon. friends on this side of the House, and, in fact, every hon. member, would say to the people of his constituency, no matter who they may be: We are living in the greatest crisis this world has ever known; we are living in a time when nothing but the strong arm and the blood of the men of Canada can save the situation; it is not a question of obeying the law when the minions of the law come and take the men, but it is a question of saying to the young men: Turn out like men; do your duty like men; assume the responsibility of citizenship without being compelled to do it; take your share, play the part which the 400,000 men who have gone before have played in this gigantic conflict. I am not given to poetry; perhaps there is less poetry in me than in any other man who has ever lived, but I wish to put on Hansard for the third time a few lines which were written by a soldier at the front, and which were quoted in this House on two former occasions:

> Take up our quarrel with the foe,
> To you from falling hands we throw
> The torch,—be yours to hold it high;
> If ye break faith with us who die,
> We shall not sleep though poppies grow
> In Flanders' fields.

I can only say in conclusion: God help the man on whom is cast the responsibility of playing any part in carrying on the Government of this country who breaks faith with the 40,000 men who have given up their lives on Flanders fields, and the 100,000 men who have been wounded and who have gone through pangs which no man can conceive unless he has had a like experience. The responsibility is a terrible one. I have sufficient faith in the people of this country to believe that they will hold the torch on high; that they will not break faith with those men, and I have sufficient faith in them to believe that they will pass this law; that they will nobly and sincerely uphold the Government in enforcing the law. Those men who are enlisted under it will go to the front and add more lustre to the name of Canada. They will make Canada a country upon which every man and all our children and children's children will be proud to look back and say: When the terrible stress came, the people of Canada did not break faith with the men who fought and died for them, but they stood up like brave men and fought, and, if necessary, died themselves in order that civilization might live upon the earth.

The House divided upon the proposed amendment of Mr. Molloy:

Yeas.

Messieurs:

Archambault,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Boivin,	Lapointe (St. James),
Bourassa,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Boyer,	Lavigueur,
Brouillard,	Leduc,
Bureau,	Leger,
Cahill,	Lesage,
Cannon,	McCoig,
Cardin,	McCrea,
Casgrain,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Chisholm,	McKenzie,
d'Anjou,	McMaster,
Déchêne,	Marcile (Bagot),
Delisle,	Mayrand,
Demers,	Michaud,
Denis,	Molloy,
Desaulniers,	Murphy,
Deslauriers,	Pacaud,
Devlin,	Papineau,
DuTremblay,	Parent,
Ethier,	Pedlow,
Euler,	Pelletier,
Fafard,	Power,
Fontaine,	Prevost,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Fournier,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Gauthier,	Robb,
Gauvreau,	Ross,
Gervais,	Savard,
Gladu,	Seguin,
Jacobs,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Kay,	Tobin,
Kennedy,	Trahan,
Lafortune,	Turgeon,
Lanctôt,	Vien.—70.

Nays.

Messieurs:

Anderson,	Hocken,
Andrews,	Hughes (Sir Sam),
Argue,	Johnston,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Keefer,
Arthurs,	Lang,
Ballantyne,	Loggie,
Ball,	Long,
Blair,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Blake,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Bolton,	Maclean (Halifax),
Bonnell,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Borden (Sir Robert),	McGregor,
Bowman,	McIntosh,
Boyce,	McIsaac,
Boys,	McLean (Royal),
Bristol,	McQuarrie,
Buchanan,	Maharg,
Burnham,	Manion,
Burrell,	Martin,
Butts.	Meighen,
Calder,	Merner,

Campbell,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chabot,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Green,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Paul,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart,
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Wallace,
Whidden,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon).—118.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was paired with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. JAMES M. DOUGLAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Hunt). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McCURDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOY: I voted by mistake, as I was paired with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements). I voted, of course, for the amendment.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James, Montreal): As I was opposed last session to conscription of all kinds, and as I was re-elected as an opponent of conscription, the members of this new Parliament will not expect me to vote for an extension of the law which I opposed last session. This resolution goes further than the previous law and sets aside all the exemption rights that men have acquired by judgment or otherwise, often at big legal expenses, and extends the age to bring within the law young men of nineteen. To be consistent, and true to my electors, I now beg to move, seconded by Mr. Deslauriers (St. Mary):

That this resolution be not now adopted, but that the consideration thereof take place this day six months.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an error in the announcement of the vote which has been taken. The figures are: Yeas, 70; nays, 118. The 70 yeas include the vote of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), who desires his vote not to be counted, but the rule is that a vote once recorded cannot be withdrawn.

The question is now on the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from St. James (Mr. L. A. Lapointe).

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. L. A. Lapointe:

Yeas.

Messieurs.

Archambault,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Jacobs,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (St. James),
Laurier (sir Wilfrid),
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lesage,
McCrea,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Robb,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Tobin,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Vien—62.

Nays.

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bonnell,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lang,
Loggie,
Long,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,

Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chabot,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Green,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Paul,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Ross,
Rowell,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart,
Sutherland,
Thompson (Wayburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tolmie,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Wallace,
Whidden,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon—117.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was paired with the hon. gentleman from East York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KEEFER: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TREMAIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

The House divided on the motion by Sir Robert Borden, that the resolution be agreed to:

Yeas.

Messieurs:

Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bonnell,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Butts,
Calder,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chabot,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Rich.),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Green,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lang,
Loggie,
Long,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (Royal),
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Myers,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Paul,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Ross,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart,
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Turriff,
Tweedie,
Wallace,
Whidden,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon).—114.

Nays.

Messieurs:

Archambault,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chisholm,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
DuTremblay,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (St. James),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Leger,
Lesage,
McCrea,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,

Ethier,	Power,
Euler,	Prevost,
Fafard,	Proulx,
Fontaine,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fortier,	Robb,
Fournier,	Savard,
Gauthier,	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sinclair
Gervais,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Gladu,	Tobin,
Jacobs,	Trahan,
Kay,	Turgeon,
Lafortune,	Vien.—65.
Lanctôt,	

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was paired with the hon. member for East York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). Had I voted, I would have voted against the resolution.

GOLD AND SILVER MARKING ACT (1913) AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) Bill No. 50, to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Assay Office certificate prima facie evidence of ingredients, etc., in article.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move to amend the section by adding after the word " by " on the fourth line the words " the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint or by ".

The CHAIRMAN: The section as amended will now read:

An official certificate by the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint, or by any Dominion Government Assay Office in Canada that any article to which this Act applies has been assayed by such office shall be prima facie evidence that the ingredients and quantities stated by the certificate to be contained in the article are contained therein, and in all legal proceedings had in pursuance of this Act shall be receivable as evidence of the facts set forth in the certificate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The change that is made is this: The section as it at present exists in the Act provides that in cases of analyses of ingredients the evidence shall be the assay at the Branch of the Royal mint at Ottawa. The amendment is designed to add to that branch the Assay Office of the Royal mint in British Columbia, so that the assay of that branch shall be evidence as to the ingredients the same as is the assay of the branch of the Royal mint here.

Mr. MURPHY: How many of these assay offices are there?

[Mr. Tremain.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is the branch of the Royal mint here, and the one in British Columbia.

Mr. BUREAU: When any of these ingredients are assayed does the print of the office appear?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Would it not be well to enumerate in the Act, if the analysis is going to be treated as prima facie evidence, the assay offices that exist in the Dominion? It may be stated, for instance, that it was an assay of the Vancouver assay office, but that would not be evidence before a court that there was an assay office in Vancouver unless we prove it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We say any assay office.

Mr. BUREAU: There is the trouble, the offices ought to be enumerated in the statute to facilitate matters. You should enumerate your offices whether in Vancouver, Montreal or Ottawa, so that the court would know that there is an assay office there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that is necessary. The parliamentary counsel has made the amendments, and, of course, he understands the legal significance of the provision.

Mr. FIELDING: Would it be better to say the certificate of the Ottawa mint, or the certificate of the officer in charge of the mint? I am thinking of the person as distinct from the office. I imagine that in the general law respecting the mint that is provided for, but the point is worth a moment's thought as to whether this provision should be equally specific.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not the person in charge, but the branch that is mentioned in the original Act.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought the point worth calling my hon. friend's attention to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have never experienced any difficulty in that regard.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is the Royal mint of Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Royal mint is in London, but there is a branch of it in Ottawa.

Mr. BUREAU: Then it is not a Canadian institution?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, and no.

Mr. BUREAU: How do you explain that the office in Ottawa is only a branch of the Royal mint in London?

Mr. FIELDING: For good reasons, explained at the time, it was thought expedient that it should be.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a branch of the Royal mint at London, and at the time it was thought expedient that it should be so. It is in one sense a Canadian institution entirely. It has been put up by Canada, the gain or loss is Canada's, but it is under the management—and I am glad it is—of the experts of the Royal mint of England.

Mr. BUREAU: Will my hon. friend say if it makes any difference whether the assay office is designated in the statute or not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the certificate is there, that is quite sufficient.

Mr. BUREAU: Does it bear the stamp of the assay office?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose so.

Mr. BUREAU: The assay offices are enumerated in some other statute, I suppose, or are they created by Order in Council?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think they are created by Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the point I want to come to. If I produce something in court as evidence, and it is not in the statute, how am I going to prove that this assay office is really the genuine thing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no doubt that my hon. friend as a lawyer will be ingenious enough to do that.

Mr. BUREAU: I may lack the genius. I would sooner have it specified in the statute.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I prefer to take the amendment as framed by the law officer.

Mr. BUREAU: We have had things like this before in this committee, and the Prime Minister, who is a lawyer himself, has seen fit to change them. With all due respect to these law officers, most of whom are excellent men, there may be some things that escape their attention when they have a rush of work. It is no reason for throwing aside a reasonable suggestion that a law officer has framed an amendment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will not throw it aside as unreasonable, but I think it is sufficient as it is. If it is not, I will advise with the Department of Justice and it can be fixed in the Upper House.

Mr. BUREAU: We have not much confidence in any fixing being done by the Upper House.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Bill No. 63, to amend the Fisheries Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister explain what effect this will have on those who are in the business?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At present the practise is for Americans and Canadians as well to fish outside of territorial waters for lobsters during the close season.

Mr. FIELDING: Outside of the territorial waters?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Outside of the territorial limits. Representations were made to the American Government regarding this and on March 15 last a Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives to prohibit the importation of, and the bringing into or landing in the United States, of lobsters taken in waters outside the territorial waters during the close season. When legislation is passed by the American Congress and the Canadian Parliament neither Canadians nor Americans will be allowed to fish for lobsters outside of territorial waters during the close season.

Mr. FIELDING: Apart from this question of the fishing outside of territorial limits, the Bill does not deal with the lobster question at all. The hon. gentleman's department, as the public know, is contemplating some change in the lobster regulations, but that matter will be dealt with, I suppose, in the form of regulations, and not in this Bill?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As the House still seems to be very fresh, we might take up some Supply.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If there is any decided protest, and if hon. gentlemen feel

overworked, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MURPHY: Monday is private members' day?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.39 p.m.

Monday, April 22, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Volume IV of the Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1917.—Sir Robert Borden.

Certain information in connection with Bill No. 53, relating to the Civil Service.—Sir Robert Borden.

Copy of Orders in Council in reference to appointment of Colonel Langton as Paymaster General in Militia Department.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Return showing what bluebooks have been printed during the years 1916 and 1917.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 65, to amend the Companies Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The amendment is to one of the sections of the Companies Act. That section requires that the original instruments creating mortgages and charges upon properties of the different companies concerned should be deposited with the Secretary of State. Several lawyers practising in the province of Quebec have called my attention to the fact that, inasmuch as in that province large numbers of these classes of deeds require for their validity to be executed notarially, it is not possible to comply with the provision of the statute as it now stands, the originals of the instruments, having, as is well known, to remain with the notary. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that in cases of that kind a notarially-certified copy of an authentic instrument of that nature may be deposited with the Secretary of State, and shall avail as the original for the purpose of the deposit.

There is also another amendment, to insert the word "hypothec." The section as it now stands provides for deeds of mortgage, etc. As in Quebec, many of these charges are by hypothec, which is a different thing to a mortgage, it has been thought wise to insert the word "hypothec" also.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

NATURALIZATION ACT, 1914.

(Correction of clerical error in French version.)

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 66 to correct a clerical error in the French version of the Naturalization Act, 1914.

He said: The purpose of the Bill is to correct what upon its face is a manifest error in the translation. The section sought to be amended is one which provides that, where a person who is a British subject ceases by declaration of alienage or otherwise to be such British subject, any minor children of his, who by reason of his being a British subject are also British subjects, shall likewise cease to be British subjects. The English version makes an exception to that for the case where the minor child, by the ceasing of its parent to be a British subject, does not become under the law of any other country a citizen of that other country. In that event, where that consequence does not follow, the child would remain a British subject. The English version itself is, perhaps, not very felicitously expressed, and it is probably in view of the form in which it is so expressed not to be wondered at that the error was made in the translation. The translation as it now reads makes a child cease to be a British subject, not unless he does not, but unless he does by the operation of the law of some other country in consequence of his parents ceasing to be British subjects, become a citizen of that country. It is, however, precisely the other case that is desired to be excepted.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as the Bill is intended to correct a clerical error in the French wording of this Naturalization Act, would my honourable friend be kind enough to explain the proposed change in my mother tongue?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (Translation): I have not here the statute in question, but I think that in comparing the clause as it now reads with the proposed amendment, the reason of this change will become more apparent; it will also be realized that this amendment is absolutely necessary in order

that the French version be in accordance with the provisions contained in the English bill. The law we have passed here is exactly the same as the one voted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and the error I have mentioned has slipped into the French translation. To the general rule that, whenever the parent ceases to be a British subject, any minor children of his shall also cease to be British subjects, the Bill, as worded in English, makes exception in cases where the minor child, though its parent has ceased to be a British subject, has not become under the law of any other country a citizen of that other country, while the French text, as it is now in the statute book excepts the very case where the child becomes a citizen of another country.

The purpose of that section is to conserve British citizenship to every child whose father ceased to be a British subject whenever, under the laws of the country to which his father has emigrated, the said child has not become a citizen of that other country, and who, unless an exception were made in his behalf would lose thereby all citizenship. The proposed amendment reads as follows:

12. "Lorsqu'une personne, étant sujet britannique, cesse de l'être par une déclaration d'extranéité ou autrement, tout enfant mineur de cette personne cesse en même temps d'être sujet britannique, sauf dans le cas où tel enfant ne devient pas, en vertu de la loi d'un autre pays, par le fait que telle personne a cessé d'être sujet britannique,, naturalisé dans cet autre pays."

I admit, Sir, that the translation is not of the nicest, but as the English wording is not itself very elegant, it was not possible for me to give a translation of it both correct and beautiful.

Mr. BUREAU (Translation): The reference here is, no doubt, to countries that do not recognize the naturalization of minors?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: Exactly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENSORSHIP REGULATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not observed that the new regulations with regard to the censorship of the press have been laid on the Table. If not, may I ask when they will be brought down?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understood that they had been brought down.

Mr. DOHERTY: I laid them on the Table on Friday, I think.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Canadian Indemnity Company.—Mr. Allan.

Bill No. 23, to incorporate Merchants Casualty Company.—Mr. Andrews.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 10, to enable the Western Power Company of Canada, Limited, to own and operate the railway of the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Stacey.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 58, respecting certain patents of The Dynamic Balancing Machine Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 59, to incorporate the Gospel Workers' Church in Canada.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 60, to incorporate Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Denis.

Bill No. 61, respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks].

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. MacNUTT:

1. What is the total number of "draftees" under the "Military Service Act," up to 1st of February, 1918?
2. How many were exempted for farm work?
3. How many were declared "medically unfit?"
4. What disposition has been made of the "medically unfit?"

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: Some little time ago I asked if the hon. gentleman would be good enough to make somewhat clearer what he contemplated by the word "draftee." Does he mean those who have passed through the Military Service Act and who have been ordered to report, or does he mean men actually taken into the force, because his conception of the meaning of the word makes a difference both as to the answers that ought to be given

and as to the department that ought to answer the question?

Question stands.

TORONTO CENTRAL POLICE BUREAU.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware of the fact that on or about the 29th of March, 1918, in the City of Toronto (Trinity Street), detectives of the Central Police Bureau searched and found a large consignment of firearms, revolvers, and swords?

2. Has the Government taken any steps towards investigating this matter?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The Government has no information. Inquiry is being made.

HARBOUR EXPENDITURES.

Mr. CROWE:

1. What has been the cost, respectively, of (a) dredging, (b) construction of wharves, (c) breakwaters, and (d) repairs, in connection with the Harbours of Halifax, N.S., St. John, N.B., Victoria, B.C., and Vancouver, B.C., since October, 1911, to the present date?

2. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the construction and repairs of dry docks in the harbours of Halifax, N.S., and St. John, N.B.?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: This question has been referred to my department, and it has, so far as my department is concerned, been answered, but certain expenditures by the Department of Marine and Fisheries have to be added to the answer.

Question stands.

MOTOR-BOATS FOR SALMON FISHING.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to pass legislation to compel motor-boats used for salmon fishing to be equipped with mufflers?

2. Is the Government aware that motor-boats, as actually used, prevent salmon from getting in rivers to spawn?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Under consideration.

2. No.

CLAIMS AGAINST CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

Have any claims been preferred against the Government in connection with the C.N.R. that were not specified at the rate of purchase; if so, what is the gross amount of such claims?

Hon. Mr. REID: No.

MAJOR J. W. MARJESON.

Mr. POWER:

1. What position does Major J. W. Marjeson hold in the Department of Militia and Defence?

2. What is his salary?

3. Is any separation allowance drawn by any person on his account?

[Mr. Doherty.]

4. What amounts were paid him during the months of November and December, 1917?

5. What qualifications does he possess to justify him holding his present rank?

6. What qualifying course has he followed in order to obtain that rank?

7. By whom was he recommended for his present position?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. President, Separation Allowance Board; Chairman, Refund Adjustment Board.

2. Major in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and is paid, in addition to pay and allowances of his rank, $1 per day extra duty pay and 80 cents per day subsistence allowance.

3. Yes, separation allowance is paid to his wife at Major's rate.

4. Answered by No. 2. (He was on leave from November 20 to December 20).

5. He was a Lieutenant in the 75th Regiment, having taken a course at Aldershot in 1910. He was appointed Paymaster 25th Battalion, C.E.F., with the rank of Captain, and, after 18 months' service overseas and in Canada, was given the rank of Major. Under P. C. 447 constituting the Separation Allowance Board, the President must be a returned soldier, a Field Officer and a person having legal knowledge.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. By the then Accountant and Paymaster-General.

JAS. STARRATT MARSHALL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has there been since August, 1914, a person named Jas. Starratt Marshall, of Spa Springs, Annapolis county, in the Active Militia of Canada?

2. If not, when did he leave the service?

3. If so, when did he join the service, and what has been his occupation?

4. What amount has he received during the period in which he was employed?

5. Has the Government any information as to whether or not whilst in the service he carried on the work of laundryman either in his public or private capacity?

6. If in the former capacity, what extra pay did he receive?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: When the hon. gentleman asked this question the other day, the minister suggested that if the hon. gentleman would give further information, he might be able to answer the question. The hon. gentleman has not yet given any further information.

Question stands.

EAST CACOUNA WHARF.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Does the Minister of Public Works know that the wharf, which was constructed at East Cacouna in spite of much local opposition, is

an obstruction to light-craft navigation and is of no public usefulness whatever?

2. If not, is it the Minister's intention to investigate the matter with a view to avoiding needless expense in connection with said wharf in the future?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: No, and nothing in the departmental records show that there was opposition to the construction of the work. The District Engineer states wharf is not an obstruction to light-craft navigation, but is of public usefulness by providing a landing at high tide for small craft crossing from upper end of Notre Dame des Sept Douleurs.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY SHARES.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

Has the Government acquired the five-sixths of all the shares of the Canadian Northern Railway as authorized by chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1917? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, as of October 1, 1917.

ORPINGTON MILITARY HOSPITAL.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Does the Government contribute to the maintenance of the Ontario Military Hospital at Orpington?

2. If so, to what extent?

3. Is there any agreement or contract to that effect? If so, what is it?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for Major-General Mewburn):

1. Yes.

2. The Province of Ontario contributes £30,000 sterling annually towards maintenance; the balance, if any, is chargeable to Canadian Funds. This latter information is being obtained by letter from the Overseas Ministry.

3. Yes. The Ontario Government provided and equipped the hospital, to be under the administration of Canadian Army Medical Services during the period of the war; after which the premises and equipment are to be handed over to the Ontario Government, and the Canadian Government assume no further liability.

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, LONDON.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

At page ZZ-227 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1916, we find that the sum of $367,443.39 was advanced by the High Commissioner's Office to the Chief Paymaster, London, and that said sum is a balance of advances unaccounted for.

1. Has an account of said advances been rendered since the Report of the Auditor General was tabled?

2. If not, has the Government endeavoured to obtain such an account justifying or explaining the disposition of said amount?

3. Who was in charge of the High Commissioner's Office, at London, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1916?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL (for Major-General Mewburn):

1. Yes; accounting will appear in the Auditor General's Report, year ending March 31, 1917, which is now in hands of the printer.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Sir George Perley, acting High Commissioner for Canada. Mr. W. L. Griffiths, secretary.

SICKNESS OF SOLDIERS ON LEAVE.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. What steps have been taken to establish a safe routine for dealing with the numerous cases of sickness of soldiers while on leave?

2. Has the Government in contemplation the extending of any compensation to the families that have suffered by the lack of such a system?

Hon. Mr. REID (for Major-General Mewburn):

1. In the General Instructions concerning hospitals immediately to be issued, the following appears:

"No Officer, N.C.O. or man will be treated at his own home, but will be transferred under the direction and supervision of a Medical Officer to a Military Hospital, except when, in the opinion of his medical attendant, it will be unwise to move him."

2. No, but individual cases receive consideration as they arise.

FOOD CONTROL DEPARTMENT EXPENSES.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

What was the cost of operating the Department of Food Control, including salaries, temporary employment, travelling expenses, services of all kinds, equipment, rent, etc., from the date on which the Branch was organized up to December 31, 1917?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: $105,159.17.

ANNUAL REPORTS IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH.

*Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What is the custom of the public departments with regard to the preparation of annual reports? Are they principally written in English and later translated into French, or vice versa?

2. What is the proportion of reports that reach the Editorial Committee in (a) English, and (b) French?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. The custom of the public departments since Confederation seems to have been to prepare all annual reports in English.

From the printed English version, the French translation is made.

2. All the original reports with which the editorial committee has had to deal during the six months of its existence have been in the English language.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Who composed the Editorial Committee respecting the Printing of Public Documents?
2. How many persons form this Committee, and of what nationality are they?
3. What are the duties and salary of each person?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Fred. Cook, assistant King's Printer; F. C. T. O'Hara, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce; F. C. C. Lynch, Superintendent, Natural Resources Intelligence Branch, Department of the Interior.

2. Answered by No. 1. Mr. Cook, English-born, but has been a resident of Canada for thirty-six years; Mr. O'Hara, Canadian-born; Mr. Lynch, Canadian-born.

3. The duties of the aforementioned, in addition to the duties of their respective offices, are to consider all reports and publications of various kinds submitted by the various Government departments to the King's Printer, with a view to eliminating as far as possible the publication of what is considered unnecessary from the standpoint of economy both as regards the cost of printing and distribution of public documents. In general, to carry out the wishes of Parliament as expressed in the report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament, presented on September 12, 1917.

The members of the Editorial Committee have not been paid any remuneration for their services as members of such committee.

Their salaries for their regular duties are as follows: Mr. Cook, $4,000; Mr. O'Hara, $5,000; Mr. Lynch, $2,700.

*Mr. CURRIE:

According to an Order in Council recently submitted to the House, provision is made for the appointment of an Editorial Committee, which works under a Sub-committee of Council of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce is Chairman, such a Committee having been recommended by the Joint Committee on Printing last Session. Has the Right Honourable Minister any report to submit to the House on the operation of this Editorial Committee?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The report is now being prepared and will be laid on the Table in the future.

[Mr. Burrell.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CURRIE:

1. What are the names of all persons employed in connection with the work of preparing the Votes and Proceedings, the Order Paper and the Journals of the House, (a) in English, and (b) in French, and the salary and other remuneration paid to each?
2. What number of each of these documents are printed, (a) in English, and (b) in French, and the cost of printing and binding the same for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1918?

Mr. CURRIE:

1. What are the names of all persons employed in connection with the work of reporting and translating in the House?
2. How long has each been so employed?
3. What is the rate of remuneration paid to each during the past year, with the total amount paid to each class of persons?
4. What number of copies of the Debates of the House have been printed during the past year, (a) in English, and (b) in French, specifying the number of the unrevised and of the revised editions, respectively?
5. What is the cost of printing and binding the same for each year since 1900, inclusive?
6. What are the amounts paid in addition to the above, in each year since 1900, inclusive, for (a) reporting, (b) translating, (c) typewriting, and (d) printing proceedings before Parliamentary Committees?

Mr. McMASTER:

What amounts have been paid by the Government for printing or advertising to the Globe, Toronto, and the Devoir, Montreal, during each of the fiscal years ending March 31, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918.

FEDERAL ELECTION DOCUMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Mr. Archambault) moved:

For a copy of envelopes Nos. 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 39, 53, 56, 59, and 99, polling booth No. 9, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last and placed in Military bag No. 446 of the North American Continent Military Votes. Also, a copy of the envelopes Numbers 65 and 70, polling booth No. 4, Barracks of St. Johns, Quebec, used in the Federal Election of 17th December last, and placed in Military bag Number 451 of the North American Continent Military Votes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might we have some explanation why this motion is allowed to stand?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): My colleague asked that this motion be allowed to stand, because it will be necessary to look into the effect of it. I do not want to say at the present moment that the papers cannot be brought down, but I would point out this: In order to

produce the copies which the hon. member is asking for, it will be necessary to withdraw the documents referred to from the sealed packages in which they are contained in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Now, all the provisions which are contained in the statute with regard to these documents convey the idea that these seals are not to be broken except upon an order for a recount, when they would be broken by the judge or in his presence, and after he has done with the papers he would be bound to seal them up again. There is also provision for the production of documents of this kind upon the order of a court when there is some proceeding pending before that court in which these documents are necessary evidence, or when there is a petition in contestation of an election pending before such court. In these cases, provision is made for an order of the court for the production of these documents, which involves, of course, the breaking of the seals, and that is done in the presence of the court. The law prescribes that in such cases the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall obey such an order of the court, but it specifically orders him, when he receives these election documents, which are under seal, to retain them for a period of one year and then destroy them, unless within that period there has been contestation of an election, in which event he is to retain them for a year subsequent to the decision of the contestation.

There is also a specific provision in the Dominion Elections Act—it is true, it mentions ballot papers only, because then there was no question of envelopes of this kind—that none of these ballot papers are to be inspected by anybody while they are in the possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. So, as I read the statute, the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is to keep those sealed packages sealed, subject to their production upon an order of a competent court, which order is to be made only when there is some proceeding before that court in which these documents may be necessary. For the moment, I do not think it is necessary to go into the question whether Parliament might be included as being a court in a proper case, but I would point out that there is absolutely no proceeding pending before Parliament in which it is made to appear that these documents are required. The motion is simply to procure copies of these documents—I have no doubt for some proper purpose—and it seems to me we should look more closely into the effect of the motion before passing it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will ask the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) to read the minister's explanation.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR:

For a return giving an abstract of all claims, with the names of the claimants and the amount of each claim filed against the Department of Railways and Canals, on account of the freezing of shipments of potatoes on the Prince Edward Island Railway or on the docks at Charlottetown, Pictou, Summerside and Point du Chene, during the year 1916. Also a return giving the same information for the year 1917, including the above-named railway and docks, the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway and the dock at Port Borden.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR:

For a return giving an abstract of all claims, with the names of the claimants and the amount of each claim, made against the Department of Railways and Canals for breakage and pilferage on the Prince Edward Island Railway in 1917.

ALIEN LABOUR IN CANADA.

MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER BY MR. CLEMENTS, MR. W. F. MACLEAN, AND MR. G. B. NICHOLSON DISCUSSED JOINTLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first resolution on the Order Paper is one by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) dealing with alien labour in Canada. Before putting the motion, I may say that to prevent unnecessary overlapping, it has been deemed advisable to join the discussion on resolutions Nos. 4 (Mr. Clements); 18, Mr. W. F. Maclean (South York), and 20, Mr. Nicholson (East Algoma). While they are not exactly similar, there is sufficient similarity between them to enable discussion to take place on the one resolution, which I believe meets with the approval of the movers of the respective motions.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (Comox and Alberni) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, all the regulations and Orders in Council respecting Alien labour in Canada should be consolidated into one uniform law but that in framing such legislation due regard should be had to the local conditions and needs of the different parts of the Dominion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose the resolution which stands in my name, I think I need offer no apology for taking up the time of the House unnecessarily. I am not a new member and I should regret at

any time bringing to the attention of the House a question which I did not deem to be of paramount interest to the country at large. Unfortunately, a good many members do take up time unnecessarily in the discussion of subjects which do not fall within that category. The question which I am going to bring forward, as the resolution itself indicates, deals with the alien situation in Canada. I think that question is a most important one and that it merits every consideration possible from the Government, especially from a strong Union Government, who should deal with the situation with an iron hand.

Shortly after the elections in December last I drew the attention of the minister representing the province of British Columbia, and of my fellow-members from that province to the alien situation as regards western Canada, and more especially the province of British Columbia, which I have the honour to represent, a very large territory, and in each and every case I received in reply a very sympathetic letter practically agreeing to the programme which I proposed. Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am personally concerned, I desire something more than personal sympathy, I want action taken as regards the alien situation in this country, and especially in western Canada. I might say at the outset that the Order in Council brought down a few days ago by the Prime Minister, dealing with idleness in the Dominion, to some extent meets the object of my resolution, but I must frankly state that that Order in Council will not be worth the paper it is written on unless it is carried out with a strong iron hand, not by any commission, but by the best police authority that can possibly be obtained. To my mind to entrust its enforcement to a commission would not meet the situation at all; there have been too many useless commissions appointed in the past. I believe that one good business man, in a good many cases, would have given better service and accomplished far more than some of these commissions have done. The main purpose of my resolution, and the advice I wish to offer to the Government and to the country, is, that whether you take a census of the man-power of Canada or not, and I believe that is very essential, it is imperative that an absolute census should be taken of every alien in Canada, regardless of their sex and regardless of their nationality or their holdings in Canada. If that were done it would show, in my opinion, that there are in this country very disturbing elements, a fact which this Government does not adequately realize, but which calls for strong and prompt action on the part of the present Union Government. If such action were taken by the Government it would show that they mean business, and it would inspire the alien element to which I refer with greater respect for Canadian citizenship, greater respect for the institutions of the country, and a greater appreciation of the magnificent means of livelihood which they can command at any time in the Dominion. In the second place, it would be of the very greatest advantage to the present Government, or to subsequent incoming administration in this respect: They would be in a position to know what kind of immigration should be admitted into this country in the future; for I am bound to say that in the past the Federal Government has been by far too lax with respect to this subject. Greater precautions, in my humble judgment, should be adopted in the Dominion with respect to the admission of immigrants, and if a census is taken such as I am now proposing it will be very advantageous not only at the present time, but in the future, as regards immigration. I must say that I appreciate the difficulties, not only of an international nature but otherwise, of conscripting the many thousands of aliens who are within the borders of Canada to-day. I listened with a great deal of attention to the Prime Minister's remarks last week when he referred to the thousands of Belgians who have been conscripted by Germany in the interest of that country and the maintenance of her industries. Personally, I see no reason why every alien enemy in the Dominion should not be conscripted and placed at work doing something for the State, instead of being allowed to run at large as disloyal aliens and pro-Germans are now doing to the disadvantage of Canada. I would not go so far as to say that any aliens should be conscripted and placed in the firing line, or conscripted at $1.10 a day for labour purposes. I think that due regard should be had at all times to labour conditions and to the views of the labour organizations of this country. I believe in the organization of labour just as much as I believe in the organization of capital, but I also hold that both of them should be reasonable in their demands. I believe the enemy aliens in Canada should be conscripted and put to work and given a fair wage for the sustenance of themselves

and families, and that the balance of their wages, due regard being paid to the value of their labour, should be taken and applied for the benefit of the State, or for some fund to be devoted towards ameliorating the conditions of our gallant soldiers who have returned incapacitated from the front. That is my view so far as alien labour is concerned.

I have heard many people make the argument, including several sound business men, in connection with what may be termed the shortage of labour in this country, that the importation of fifty thousand or one hundred thousand coolie labourers from China should be permitted. I am absolutely opposed to any such idea, and I see no reason for it. So far as the development of our national industries, or the acceleration of the production of food stuffs is concerned, if the present strong Union Government take hold of the situation, as I think they ought to do, and properly distribute the available labour, whether it be male or female, and put the new Military Act into proper effect, I believe that ample labour will be found to take care of our industries and to meet all our requirements in the way of increased food production.

There is a very large element in this Dominion who, up to the present time, have apparently not realized the seriousness of this war or the obligations of their citizenship. I refer now, not to aliens, but to our own red-blooded citizens, to those who are loyal Britishers, but who do not appear to realize the gravity of the situation. Possibly born with silver spoons in their mouths and possessing bank accounts, they have shown little, if any, appreciation of the duty which devolves upon them of doing something in the interest of the country and of the allied cause. Because they have a bank account, or are otherwise favoured by fortune, that is no reason why they should go Scot free. I believe that every man from the age of twenty to sixty, including the class that I refer to, if he is not already in service should be conscripted and made, if necessary, to don a pair of overalls and cotton shirt and drive a binder or a plough on the prairies in order to bring about greater production. That is what I would recommend in so far as that particular class is concerned.

With reference to the conscription of labour, there is no doubt that in British Columbia the lumber and other interests have made very serious complaints about the labour situation. There would be no serious shortage of lumber in British Columbia but for the activities of alien enemy, pro-German, agitators who are creating disturbances in the different camps and at the different mills. Their propaganda is assisted by the fact that the mill owners have been endeavouring to keep the country a white man's country and not to employ Asiatic labour. A mill owner will get a crew together and at great expense will transport that crew from Vancouver or Prince Albert to a mill 100 or 300 miles distant. Shortly after the men have reached their destination one of these enemy alien agitators will appear on the scene and make demands upon the employer that cannot be granted. The result is that the mill is closed down. If time permitted I could give the House absolute evidence of instances in which agitators have appeared and, when questioned about their nationality, claimed to be Russians or Italians, when as a matter of fact they were Austrians. This element, and there are only a few hundreds of thousands of them in this country, ought to receive the attention of this Government. They ought
4 p.m. to be compelled to assume the duties of citizens of this country whose protection and liberty they enjoy. I want to be absolutely fair in my remarks in regard to these people. I am speaking with particular reference to the situation in Northern British Columbia, because I know the conditions there better than I know them as they exist in the prairie provinces, but I assume that the situation I am discussing is somewhat similar all over the Dominion. There are thousands of Austrians in Northern British Columbia who are working in the large plants there, who realize their position as aliens and who are absolutely peaceful and harmless. They are not doing any harm, but they are doing their best to develop our natural resources and to promote the Allied cause. Therefore, I have nothing to say against that peaceful element in this country. But, if this Government are not strong enough to deal with the element to which I have particularly referred, who are agitators, German sympathizers, and, in fact, just as much pro-German as the Kaiser is, then it is not worthy of the support that it got from the people of this country. I care not whether the reason advanced for not dealing with these people be international law or not; I say that the time has arrived, in the great stress of this war, when international law might very well be forgotten, and when even the Act of Confederation might be over-

looked, if necessary, to meet the situation. The situation is not what it has been in the past and changed circumstances call for extraordinary remedies.

As far as the distribution of labour is concerned, there are in British Columbia large Austrian, Italian and other elements who are naturally railroad builders and who could be very well conscripted and brought to the prairie provinces, or any other provinces, of this Dominion to repair the roadbeds which are so necessary to meet the transportation needs of the country and to help in winning the war.

I regret to have to refer to the province of Quebec. I would like to say personally that I was brought up with French Canadians and I have always had the highest regard for many of them, although I must confess that because of the recent attitude of Quebec I have not had the same regard for them as I had in the past. We heard the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other day pleading the cause of Quebec and telling us why the men of Quebec had not enlisted as we had expected they would do. I see no reason why 20,000—yes—75,000 French Canadians, with their narrow farms, 100 yards wide in some instances, should not be conscripted, taken to British Columbia and placed in their natural element, the lumber woods. Whether this be done under the Military Service Act or not, I mean to suggest that their work should be done under military supervision and that they should be employed in the production of spruce lumber particularly, which is so important from the aeroplane point of view and therefore important to the allied cause. If 75,000 French Canadians in the province of Quebec were conscripted, taken into the province of British Columbia and kept there for six months or a year, I believe that when they returned to Quebec they would be better citizens and would educate the balance of that province.

At every meeting I had the honour of addressing throughout that great country that I have the honour of representing, two paramount questions were put to me. There was represented in those meetings the red blood of both the former political parties, and they united in supporting me as the candidate of the Union Government. One point these people insisted on was that this Government should deal with a strong hand with the alien enemies I have referred to. The second was that each province, in so far as the enforcement of the Military Service Act was concerned, should be standardized and should give its quota according to its population. I am here to advocate that and to do my utmost to carry it out regardless of whether the Government of the day sees fit to do it or not.

Speaking for the northern part of British Columbia, I desire to say that the red blood of that country responded to the country's call irrespective of the Military Service Act. Every available man coming within that category enlisted voluntarily and, I regret to say, in many cases, made the supreme sacrifice. They came forward without any hesitation and offered themselves for their country's cause and the cause of civilization. If time permitted, I could point to dozens and dozens of men fifty-five and sixty years of age who gave a wrong age so that they might get to the front and do their duty.

But I say it is galling indeed to the fathers, mothers and daughters of those who so gallantly responded to the colours, to see these seditious elements surrounding them at every point on that coast, watching and waiting like a hawk watches a bird, to take advantage of the positions that these gallant men filled before they left for the front, waiting to swoop down upon every fishing or other privilege that they enjoyed. On several occasions I have brought these matters to the attention of the officers of the Government, and have referred to these seditious elements who are always skating as close as possible to the thin ice so as to avoid arrest. Finally, some one would plead that he was a naturalized Canadian, it may be an Austrian living in our country as a naturalized citizen. The officials have told me that, under those conditions, it was impossible to deal with such individuals owing to their being naturalized. Well, Sir, if we have not the machinery to deal with them, it is high time that the Government instituted some machinery. There are thousands upon thousands in this country who should be dealt with with an iron hand.

Now, that is about all I have to say upon the subject. I hope that the few moments I have occupied this afternoon, in my feeble way, will give a great deal of food for thought to this Government in their efforts to deal with this very grave situation. The leader of the Opposition the other day invited the solution of the problem of unison in this Dominion. He was referring at that time to the difficulties between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It is all right to carry out an obligation, whether it be a private note or an international pledge, but, as I men-

tioned in my opening remarks, these are not times of peace, these are strenuous times for the Empire and the Dominion. While I am not speaking for the Government, I will say in conclusion, that if I had the power placed in my hands by the Almighty this afternoon, I would give my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition the solution for unison in this Dominion, which will be for the best interests of Canada in the future whether in one province or another. If I had it in my power from the Almighty this afternoon, I would say this, Mr. Speaker: Before the clock tolled twelve to-night, I would institute in this country one flag, one school and one language.

Mr. R. C. COOPER (South Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, as a new member of this House I rise with due humility to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements). If there was an apology necessary, it is absolutely done away with by a date to be found on that calendar behind your back. On that date, three years ago, our men made history for Canada at Ypres. To-day, I find an attempt, supported from Halifax to Vancouver by every branch of the Great War Veterans' Association, by many manufacturers, by many other associations, and by many independent men and women, to bring the enemy alien under some control. On this subject I wrote on the 11th April to the right hon. leader of the Government, asking if he would give me an expression of the intention of the Government on this matter. I have not yet received an answer. On March 26th, a petition was handed to the Prime Minister and the Government by the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada. I propose to read this to the House, and it will show what these men ask for.

March 26, 1918.

To the Right Honourable
Sir Robert L. Borden, P.C., K.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister, Ottawa.

Sir,—

May it please you to hear and give consideration to the humble petition of this gathering of representatives of the Great War Veterans' Association of Canada, which follows:

Whereas there are in Canada a great number of people of alien origin.

Therefore be it resolved that it is our opinion that the aliens of enemy origin in our midst should be employed in work of National importance or in industries essential to the winning of the War, under proper surveillance, and their employer for the time being made responsible for them; and that their earnings over and above an amount equal to the pay and allowances of a Canadian soldier be taken by the Government for War purposes: or, failing their being employed that such alien enemies be interned.

Further that measures be taken at once to make the Military Service Act applicable to all allied aliens in the same manner and to the same extent as to the citizens of Canada, either by negotiating the necessary treaties or conventions with the remaining Allied countries, upon similar lines or the same as those provided for in the conventions recently adopted between the United States of America and Great Britain, or, failing the obtaining of such treaties or conventions, that such allied aliens be forthwith given the option of enlisting voluntarily in the Canadian Forces, or being deported to their country of origin as is being done by the Government of the United States under the Alien Slacker Bill just passed by an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives at Washington.

Further that no steps should be taken to call out the second or other class under the Military Service Act, or to return to France married men of the First Contingent, C.E.F., until the question of the disposition of the aliens has been settled in a manner satisfactory to the citizens of Canada, and that we urge the Government to take up and deal with these questions without further delay.

I would say, Sir, that the Government failed to take any notice of these representations. In my own province of British Columbia, there have been large mass meetings held for the purpose of making the Government at least look into this matter, if it does nothing else. To-day, in British Columbia alone, we have a matter of more than 60,000 enemy aliens, who are practically allowed their liberty, who can do as they like, and over whom there is no control. I ask you to-day, with our young men going overseas to defend our shores in France, what is our position going to be if these aliens are left in practically uncontrolled freedom? It is not possible that we may have a repetition of the scenes enacted in Northern France, in Flanders, in Serbia, in Montenegro and in Northern Italy? It is possible. It may not be likely, but I commend it to the attention of the Government. What has been done to handle this question? I noticed in a paper the other day that it was proposed to form a garrison battalion. Presumably that is the only way they could be handled. Some of our industries in British Columbia, notably the railways and the mines, are practically controlled by enemy aliens of Austrian or German origin.

These men have absolute liberty, and they earn anywhere from $4 to $10 or $12 a day. What do they contribute to the country? How do they help the country to carry on this war, which was saddled upon us by their own people? Absolutely nothing. In a few cases they have been persuaded, I believe, to subscribe to war loan, but war

loan is a good investment. If these men, particularly those in the coal mines, feel it incumbent upon them to work and earn a nice, daily wage, they do so. On the other hand, if they want to play baseball or go out into the woods on a sunny day, they do so. They care nothing about the fact that the people of Eastern Canada and the prairies are waiting for coal to keep them from freezing.

The Government has an anti-loafer law. What penalty does it provide? One hundred dollars and costs, or in default, six months' imprisonment with hard labour. Such a penalty may be all right for men of British birth, but it is not all right for the type of men who work in the mines and on the railways in British Columbia. These men have been taught from their earliest infancy that only by force can they get what they want, and I submit that they should be controlled by force. If six months is the penalty for offences against the anti-loafer law, then I think that in order to deal with the enemy aliens we must have a much more severe penalty than that. What is the penalty in Germany? It does not start at a minimum and work up to a maximum; it starts at a maximum and works down to a minimum. But the maximum penalty in Germany with our prisoners, is death, and I see no reason why the enemy alien here in Canada, should not, under similar conditions, be forced to pay that penalty if necessary.

As a reason for not handling this situation the Government say: we have an agreement with the labour unions of this country. Only last Friday the Prime Minister, when he was giving certain figures of enlistment, said that 227,000 skilled and unskilled labourers had gone overseas. These men from the labour unions who have gone to fight are surely entitled to some sort of consideration when they come back. To-day the ranks of labour are full of enemy aliens. I venture to say that at least one-third of the total membership of the labour unions in Canada consists of enemy aliens or aliens of neutral countries. Labour represents in Canada some 200,000 men. The number of men that Canada has so far sent overseas is 364,750. The balance, therefore, is as two to one, and I submit that the men who have gone overseas are more entitled to attention and consideration from the Government than those who remain behind to work and earn big wages.

It may be suggested that if we insist on enemy aliens in this country working, our prisoners of war may be badly treated, or worse treated than they are now. I have under my hand a letter which I received this morning from the father of one of my men who was taken prisoner at Ypres three years ago the day after to-morrow. He says:

> Now as regards the boy. We have received a picture of him a few days ago, and a letter was the first in which he really made a murmur, and that was only, "Believe me, my chum and I have certainly been through the mill." He looked pretty good, a little hard round the mouth but still as "straight as a die." The poor lad with him looked terribly ill.

This boy of nineteen, who went over with me, had no hard lines about his mouth when I saw him three years ago, but he has to-day. If you say that any action on our part to deal with enemy aliens in this country will affect our Canadian prisoners of war, you forget that Canadians in Germany cannot be subjected to greater indignity than that to which they are now subjected; that no more insults could be heaped upon them; that they could not be more starved than they are to-day. Their position, therefore, cannot be made easier by our being lenient with enemy aliens in this country. Our men in Germany to-day are earning thirty pfennings a day for their work. Thirty pfennings amounts to threepence—six cents—and the enemy alien in Canada, who has absolute liberty, earns $3, $4, $5, $10, $14 a day, and he does not care a snap of his finger about our authority.

Then, the Hague Convention. What is the Hague Convention? It has meant a good deal to the Allied powers; what has it meant to the Teutonic powers? Nothing at all. The Prime Minister on Friday mentioned the deportations from Lille; he spoke of the women who were sent back of the German lines in France. Yes, and I can tell you of a monument that has been raised at Bac St. Maur, a place now in the hands of the Germans, to the memory of four women of France who in 1914 were raped by the Germans; they were then covered with gasoline and burned. That is possible in Canada if we allow these enemy aliens uncontrolled freedom.

In my country, in the fisheries especially, we have many Scandinavians. Well, there are Scandinavians and Scandinavians. We know that the Norwegians are friendly to us; they are more likely to help us than anything else. But what of the Swedes? These men are openly antagonistic to us; yet they go round filling our men's places and giving nothing in return for the liberty that is accorded to them. On Friday the leader of the Opposition denounced auto-

cracy in no uncertain tones. That may be all right from the standpoint of the citizen, but as a soldier I say that as long as this war continues, long live autocracy. It is the only way you can conduct a war. Think what would happen if, when an officer commanding a division gave an order, his brigadiers and officers consulted whether they should obey the order or not. Take the case of Russia. Russia consulted the people as to what she would do in the war—and look at her to-day.

I wish, in conclusion, to quote from the Prime Minister's speech on Friday last these great words:

> As to our duty, the first line of defence is held in France and Flanders; the second line of defence is here. Will those in the second line desert and betray the first? If such an outcome were possible, it would be to the everlasting disgrace of the Canadian people. Only those who have been among the men in the fighting line can realize with what faith and confidence the Canadian soldiers rely upon us for that aid and support which are their due; only those who have been among them can realize how intense a bitterness and disappointment would possess their souls if that aid should fail them. I beg you to remember that in this country we are all in one sense in the battle-line; that we must all discharge our duty with the same indomitable spirit as those who are holding back the German onset. May we not estimate that duty in the words of a great Frenchman: "Life was not intended as either a pleasure or a sorrow, but as a great duty committed to our charge and which we are bound to carry on and fulfil by the standards of honour." If that is true of the individual life, is it not equally true of the national life? What we inherit from the past we hold in trust for the future; let us see to it then that Canada's honour is maintained and her escutcheon kept untarnished to the end.

Those are great words; but what are the feelings of our 364,000 men who have gone overseas if they know that here in Canada there will be no room for them when they do come back; that the enemy alien is protected in every way, and that the enemy alien and the neutral alien hold the fat jobs? Will they not feel that, although the Government have courageously enforced the Military Service Act and sent men overseas to aid them in the fighting line, they have been deserted in their home life, in regard to which they are entitled to some consideration just as they are entitled to be reinforced? The Government should seriously consider this question. There must be some means whereby the Government can control the present practically uncontrolled liberties of the enemy alien in Canada. There must be some means whereby the Government can make those enemy aliens contribute something towards the cost of the war which is being waged against us by the country of their birth. The Government should grapple with this matter without delay, because the people of Canada, and, more especially, the people of the West of Canada, are tired of procrastination, and must insist on the Government dealing immediately with this question.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some surprise to the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements). I have followed his career since he entered this House many years ago. He disappeared for a while. He left his good old county of Kent and went West. He followed the advice of the great American editor, "Go West, young man;" but I am sorry that, in coming back East, he has brought with him very strange notions in regard to the unity of this country. At first sight, the object of his motion is very commendable:

> That, in the opinion of this House, all the regulations and Orders in Council respecting Alien Labour in Canada should be consolidated into one uniform law but that in framing such legislation due regard should be had to the local conditions and needs of the different parts of the Dominion.

The last portion of the motion could not be understood had the House not heard the comments made by my hon. friend, but the first portion of his motion is commendable. When the hon. gentleman undertakes to state how the enemy alien should be treated, he goes a little too far. The enemy alien must, in Canada as elsewhere, be treated according to the tenets of international law. No one is above international law, and no civilized country which took part in the Hague convention in 1908 is above the regulations which were framed there by the representatives of those civilized nations.

Mr. CURRIE: What about Germany and Austria?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Germany is without the pale of civilization. My hon. friend (Mr. Clements), I am sorry to say, discards international law. So did Bethmann Hollweg, Chancellor of Germany, when, in 1914, he said to the British Ambassador that the treaty, which was binding on England, France, Russia and Germany, was a mere scrap of paper. When again the German Chancellor said: "Necessity knows no law," and "We must hack our way through," he was doing exactly what my hon. friend stated a moment ago—he was discarding

international law. He was speaking the same language as my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) interrupts me by saying: What about Germany? What about Austria? A British soldier speaking in that way! Germany committed the awful murder of Edith Cavell and that of Captain Fryatt. Would my hon. friend say that it would be right for England to follow Germany's example.

Mr. CURRIE: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, it would not be right for England to follow Germany's example.

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend cannot quote from the Hague convention any clause dealing with aliens. He is setting up a straw man and arguing from that. I should like him to quote the clause.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I listened to my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) and I heard him state to the House that as regards our treatment of aliens he made light of international law, because Germany knew no international law. My answer is, that just because Germany is putting herself without the pale of civilization, Canada, being a civilized country, should not imitate Germany. We have, unfortunately, in Canada some people who are bound to out-Prussian the Prussians. The War-time Elections Act, passed by Parliament last year, was a Prussian act, nothing more and nothing less.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are sitting on the other side of the House gentlemen who stated it a few days ago.

Mr. CURRIE: I rise to a point of order. It is not the first time that an hon. member has been expelled from the House of Commons for reflecting discredit upon the House of Commons, and I say that the hon. gentleman, in the manner in which he has stated his opinion in regard to the War-times Elections Act, is reflecting discredit upon this House, and he should be asked to take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I hardly consider the point of order well taken. I did not judge from the expression used by the hon. member that he intended to reflect any discredit upon the House of Commons. If he did so, he should, of course, take it back.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year, Sir, the Government disfranchised the Galicians who, although they came from Austria, were far from sympathetic with the Central Empires. The Galicians should not have been deprived of their right to exercise the franchise as they came to Canada, they, the victims of the Austrians in Europe, solely to enjoy here the freedom which they had been denied for centuries under the Austrian flag. That is what I meant a moment ago when I qualified the War-time Elections Act as being nothing else but a Hunnish and Kaiser-like measure.

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. Mr. Speaker, not the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) has spoken about the aliens, but he forgot to refer to the Japanese. Surely he should know that the Tories of British Columbia at the election of 1908 made the same splash over the Japanese as my hon. friend has made this afternoon, and that they were elected on the slogan of "A white British Columbia." Will my hon. friend tell me whether the Japanese are still coming to British Columbia? Will he not admit that his friends in British Columbia were wrong in advocating that drastic policy in 1908, if he remembers that at the beginning of this war the coast of British Columbia, which is the coast of Canada, was protected by Japanese warships? My hon. friend, who, I am sorry to say would make a poor diplomat, when speaking of aliens referred to the French Canadians, of course. In the minds of many, naturally, the French Canadians are but aliens. I do not know how many centuries ago the forebears of my hon. friend came to Canada, but I do know that every French Canadian can claim three hundred years of ancestry in Canada; so, for any one to refer to French Canadians as aliens, is simply to display his ignorance or his fanaticism.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I wish to correct my hon. friend. I did not refer to the French Canadians as aliens at all, but referred to the unpatriotic sentiments of the French Canadians, and I still stick to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend evidently refers to his Nationalist allies of 1911—probably to the Postmaster General, who in 1911 went through the province of Quebec shooting holes in the British flag and was taken into the Tory Government and is still a member of the present Unionist Government. Aliens as the French Canadians may be, to my hon. friend, he was cute enough to suggest that they should be

taken from their smiling fields in the province of Quebec, where for generations they have been farming on those narrow strips of land, living a happy and prosperous life, and should settle in a certain bankrupt province at the extreme west of Canada. Yes, that would increase the population of British Columbia, and would probably fill the holes which the late Administration left in the exchequer of that province. I might remind my hon. friend that the province of Quebec, settled by these habitants, these alien farmers, is the most prosperous province in all the Dominion. The bonds of the province of Quebec are sold at par on the New York market to-day, and I can tell my hon. friend that the French Canadian habitant would not exchange province of Quebec bonds for those of British Columbia. Moreover, as long as there are gentlemen in British Columbia who treat the habitants as aliens they will remain in old Quebec staunch Canadians as ever. My hon. friend repeats the old stock phrase of our Milner jingoes in Canada, that the time has come to have one flag, one king, one language, and one Empire. Well, I do not object to having one flag—the British flag. We have it to-day, and cannot replace it, and I would not if I could, nor would any French Canadian. We pray in our churches every Sunday for our good lord the King of Great Britain and of the Dominions Overseas, in the words "Domine salvum fac regem." One Empire? We cannot have two empires, unless, indeed, the ideas expressed by my hon. friend this afternoon were to be generally accepted by a section of the people of this country, and then we would have alongside of the present Empire a Prussian Empire; but, thank Heaven, British statesmanship will never accept such narrow ideas as he has expressed this afternoon. One language? There would be no British Empire if it had not been built on a broader basis than that. Sir, the British Empire is the mother of many languages and of many races. The Maltese in the Mediterranean have kept their Italian language, the Welshmen their Welsh idiom and their national schools, and the Highland Scotch the language of their forebears, and as long as there are Highlanders in this world they will speak the language of Auld Scotia. The type of Empire of one language is the German Empire, and the methods advocated by my hon. friend this afternoon are the very methods pursued by the Germans in Poland, where at Posen the young Poles were deprived of their national schools, where the lands of the farmers were taken and the farmers deported, as my hon. friend would have the French Canadians deported from Quebec and where all were forced under the lash of the school master to speak and to pray in the German language. In conclusion, I will not say, Mr. Speaker, that there are strangers in the House, but after having heard the language used by some hon. members this afternoon I will say that there are Prussians in the House.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): The resolution submitted by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) opens up a very wide question. So far as I am concerned I am not going to weary the House or extend the scope of the discussion to the extent that the hon. member from Maisonneuve did. I do not consider that that phase of the subject requires to be dealt with in any sense while we are considering a resolution affecting labour in Canada. The question, however, of organizing and co-ordinating the labour forces of this country is, to my mind, second only in importance to that of conscripting men to reinforce our troops at the front—the most vital matter that we have to deal with. Everything we are endeavouring to do, our effort to maintain and increase food production, our efforts to continue the production of war material, our efforts to increase the efficiency of, or at least to maintain, our transportation systems, all hinge on our ability to organize the labour forces of this country up to one hundred per cent of its capacity. That fact has been emphasized many times during the present session by hon. members on both sides in dealing with such questions as, for instance, the fuel problem, the shipbuilding problem, and the many other vital issues that confront the country at the present time, and it is unnecessary that I should weary the House by repeating any of those arguments. As a matter of fact the whole war problem resolves itself into the question of manpower, and if we are going to do our part, as I believe we all desire to do it, we must organize that power.

I am particularly impressed by an address which I heard a short time ago by a man who had just returned from the front after spending two years in France, in which he gave a description of the organization of the forces at the front, starting with the front line trenches and taking in succession the second line and supporting trenches all the way back to the most remote ammunition depot in the far

rear. That description of the wonderful way in which every part of that machinery worked, just like one well oiled machine, could not help but grip one, so to speak, with the efficiency of the organization. The thought that struck me was that we have so far failed to carry our supporting lines back far enough; and I say to you, Sir, and to this House, that those supporting lines will not be carried back far enough until they are extended to the most remote farm, mine and factory in the farthest corner of Canada. We must organize our man-power if we are going to be successful in carrying on the war. I believe that we are all fairly well agreed in regard to that. It is, however, when they come to the question of methods, and the manner in which we are to attain the object aimed at that there seems to be a fairly wide divergence of opinion. There are those—such for example as the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, if I understood him aright—who would introduce a complete measure of conscription of the entire man-power of this country. There are others, as per example the hon. member who seconded the resolution, if I correctly gathered the purport of his arguments, who would confine that system to the aliens of this country. There are others again, and I have met a good many of them, who will say to you: Leave the situation just as it is. Let the labour problem work itself out. Give each individual the right to work where he likes, and to do what he likes, and to work or not, as he pleases. I am not in accord with either of these three. I will include the question of the conscription of all working men, and the conscription of aliens under one head for the purpose of making a few remarks on that phase of the subject. I do not believe that it is practicable to conscript any class of working men, and in the last analysis it is practicability that we want, what we require to secure from the men of this country is one hundred per cent of efficiency in man power, whether they are aliens or whether they are Canadians, let me repeat again: I do not believe that it is practicable to conscript men in the manner in which you would conscript an army, put them to work in groups and get efficiency out of them. I may be asked, if you can conscript men for one service, why can you not conscript them for another service? For instance if you can say to one man, your duty is to don khaki, shoulder a rifle and go to the front, why cannot you say to another man, your duty is to don overalls, take a monkey wrench and hammer and go to work in a machine shop. The answer I give to that is simply the conditions of service. In one case you have an army of men, every single one of whom is engaged in the same business, working under the same environment and under the same discipline, and with the age-long traditions of the army to back them up. On the other hand you have a group of civilians—an army of civilians if you will permit me to use the term—engaged in a multitude of different classes and kinds of employment, from the janitor in the apartment house to the high salaried official in some of our large industrial and financial institutions, each one working in his own way; and if we are going to be successful in connection with these organizations and industries the element of personal initiative and adaptability is the one thing that is going to mean success. So that on the ground of practicability, I say to you that the conscription of men for industrial pursuits is, to my mind, simply out of the question. I am speaking as one who had something to do with the labour problem, in one form or another, during the whole of my life. I appreciate very much what one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke this afternoon said with regard to the aims and desires of the Great War Veterans Association, but in the last anaiysis I believe that the representations that have been made by that association, and the position they have taken with regard to this question, is very much the same as that taken by any of the rest of us, who may have a heart interest in this war through the fact that some near relative is at present engaged in it. But after all, the view we take from that standpoint is purely sentimental, and you cannot deal with a subject such as this on sentimental grounds. It would be very nice indeed if we could accept and gratify all the sentimental desires of those who have relatives at the front, or of the men who have returned from the front, What we want to do is to find some means by which we can in the best way possible, support these men at the front. It is not as I said, after all, a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of finding some means by which we can, if possible, get 100 per cent efficiency out of the working men of this country and put every man to work in some useful form of employment.

That leads me to a brief consideration of the Order in Council that was laid on the table of this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden)

on the 5th of this month. I am not going to criticise what has been done; nor do I wish to anticipate anything that may yet be contemplated in that regard. With the main principle embodied in that Order in Council I am in full and complete accord. I believe that the time has come when every able-bodied man in this country must go to work without regard to where it is or who he is. He must become engaged in some useful form of employment. It may be said that this does not harmonize with the view that I have already expressed. You cannot conscript men. The idea of conscripting a man in the form in which you ordinarily conscript men and the idea of saying to a man: You must get into some useful form of employment, leaving it in the latter case to the individual to voluntarily find any employment he sees fit to choose, are absolutely and entirely different matters.

As I have said, I am in full accord with the main principle of the Order in Council laid on the table of the House by the Prime Minister. But, Sir, it seems to me that the Order in Council, in at least one or two particulars, does not go far enough. The first to which I would refer is that relating to strikes. If I can read the Order in Council aright, there is a clause in it that leaves the door wide open to any group of men to strike if they wish and also leaves the door wide open to any wooden-headed employer who wishes to enforce conditions which would cause his men to strike and to force a tie up of his business. In war time I believe such a situation as that to be utterly illogical. Are we, or are we not, in earnest in connection with this whole subject? The question is: Are we determined to throw the whole weight of this country's power behind our men at the front? We have sent overseas almost 400,000 men, possibly more; I have not the figures, but that is neither here nor there. Every one of these men who volunteered went with the whole force of this country behind him as expressed by this Parliament. Every man who has gone there, or who may go as a conscript, has behind him the definite pledge of the great majority of the people of this country that they are going to support him to the last. What then would be the result if with all of these men over in France, the locomotive engineers on the Canadian railways, on the first of September next, should decide to tie up our transportation system? What would happen to our men at the front? If I am properly informed there is at this moment—or if there is not at this moment, there was a short time ago—a strike on in Nova Scotia in one or two of the most vital industries of this country in so far as our war effort is concerned.

5 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he is entirely misinformed; there is no such condition in Nova Scotia.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I am very glad indeed to hear that. The newspapers of Toronto gave us the impression that the employees of the Nova Scotia Steel Company and one of the coal companies, were going out on strike. If that has been averted it has been a splendid thing for this country.

An hon. MEMBER: They did go out.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: An hon. gentleman says they did go out. They may have gone back to work again, but I submit that so long as the Order in Council remains as it is, the opportunity is right there to do just what I have said. It is open to some employer of labour, on the one hand, to put his men in such a position as to compel them to strike, or it is open to some group of agitators, such as has been referred to by the seconder of this resolution, to organize an effort that will make it impossible for the employer to carry on the industry on which he is engaged. Neither of these conditions should be permitted during the war. I believe that it is entirely unnecesary that they should exist.

There is one other clause in the Order in Council that, if the House will bear with me, I will read. It is:

> Useful occupation and reasonable distance shall be a question of fact to be decided by the magistrates.

If useful occupation or the distance that a man has to go to secure that occupation is going to remain a question of fact that can be decided by some magistrate, the door is thrown wide open for a repetition of the farcical drama we have seen enacted in many parts of the country in connection with the Military Service Act. All manner and kinds of excuses will be used and acted upon in order to keep men out of work and to keep them from doing the things that men should be doing in this country. Instead of that being left for some magistrate, or any other local individual for that matter, to say what is a useful employment or how far a man should go to accept employment, there should be some central authority to pronounce on that. If necessary, I say that he should be compelled to

go from the Atlantic to the Pacific or vice versa. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) would say that it should be vice versa, and that he should be compelled to go from the Pacific to the Atlantic. There should be no limitation as to the place in Canada in which a man should be required to work if that is the place where workmen are necesary. In order that we may get away from the possibility of these difficulties, there must be some central authority set up to direct the course in which the whole labour effort of this country will flow if we are going to do the things we must do.

In that connection, I would suggest to this House and to the Government that the labour organizations should be utilized as one of the means by which this can be brought about. I, as one of those who have been following closely the course of events in this connection, was very much gratified when I learned that the Prime Minister, in following up the position that he had previously taken in inviting into his Cabinet a representative of labour in the person of the Hon. Senator Robertson, had called into council here in Ottawa, the representatives of some sixty-five labour unions in Canada. I, with many others, felt then that this was going to result in some real constructive effort to co-ordinate the forces of labour in Canada. But we were somewhat disappointed when according to the reports that were published in the Press and some of the statements made by labour leaders who were present, that the whole result of that conference in so far as the labour organizations were concerned was largely a negative one. I am not going to criticise the representatives of labour who participated in the conference. They were acting, I am prepared to admit, on their best judgment and doing the thing which they, at that time, believed to be the right thing. But negative propositions will never land us anywhere. Negative propositions will not win this war. We must get something constructive. And if the leaders of the labour organizations in Canada are going to take the part that their position in the community demands of them, they must get away from a negative attitude towards these great world problems.

Now, Sir, I am prepared to admit that there are reasons why the leaders of organized labour should be somewhat skeptical of any suggestion which has underlying it the idea that they are going to be drawn into the industrial life of this country, so to speak, or to be made responsible for carrying on the industrial work. There are two or three reasons for that. In the first place, it is only within the past dozen years, or possibly twenty years at the most, that it became in any way nearly fully recognized that labour had the right to organize. Prior to that such a thing as a labour organization was looked upon as an alien institution, and right up until the present time there are many employers of labour—men who are themselves leaders in what we may call "big business," who desire that they themselves shall have the right to organize large combinations of finance in order to carry on their business—who still say that labour has no right to organize. I have heard men say quite recently: "Just wait until this war is over and we get these fellows where they belong, and we will then show them what we are going to do with labour organizations." Now, Sir, I say to you that if there is an employer of labour anywhere in this country who believes that he has simply got to wait until the war is over until he can return to his former position of capitalizing the flesh and blood of his fellow beings in order that he may use them for his own selfish ends, he is living in a fool's paradise. My opinion is that that time will never return in this country again.

Another reason why organized labour is somewhat skeptical is that governments and parliaments in times past have not been any too ready to listen to the legitimate demands of labour, while they have, as a rule, I believe, been fairly ready to listen to the importunities of those who would make use of organized labour. We are passing out of that stage, and the leaders of organized labour must recognize that we are passing out of it. May I repeat, that, in order to attain the position I believe they are aiming at, they must be called upon to accept the responsibilities that go with the privileges they enjoy. Every advance politically that democracy has ever made has carried with it a corresponding responsibility, and the leaders of organized labour must accept that responsibility. One form of autocracy is not very much better than another, and the autocracy of lab ur would be just as great a curse to this country as the autocracy of the Bolsheviki. If the Russian peasants had the privilege of answering the question to-morrow, I believe they would say that they preferred the Czardom of the Czar to that of such men as Trotzky.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: And if we are going to fight just such a condition, we must call upon the leaders of the working forces of this country to take their positions and accept their responsibility in connection with working out the great problems before us. The suggestion I have to make to this House and to the Government is, that a commission, or a committee, or anything else you like, representing organized labour in Canada, and representing the employers of labour in Canada, should be given the responsibility of seeing that there is no such thing as a strike so long as this war lasts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: And I can go further and suggest something in the nature of a foundation upon which that may be built. I have before me the text of an agreement reached between the Director General of Railroads in the United States and the heads of all the railroad labour organizations in the United States, by which no such thing as a strike is possible for the duration of the war, or so long as the railroads of the United States are under the jurisdiction of the Director General. Now, if it is possible to bring that about in the case of American railways, I say that I do not think it is impossible to bring it about in every single industry in which this country is interested at the present time; and the responsibility for it can be laid directly on the shoulders of the men most vitally interested in the whole problem, the working men and the employers of working men. But, with this behind it: that the Government is going to see to it that every single man is put to work at some useful employment. I am not going to take up time in endeavouring to define what useful employment is, but I believe I can find a hundred men in Ottawa to-day who are blackening other men's boots. That is not in my opinion at least useful employment during the war; it is not making munitions or producing foodstuffs for our men at the front. I am ready to go so far as to say that the time has come for the Government to declare what are not useful employments, no matter whether or not they can define everything that is useful employment.

It may be said: What if the leaders of organized labour refuse to be drawn into that position? They were here in conference in Ottawa with the Government sometime ago, and, while I speak subject to correction, my information is that they did not arrive at any basis of constructive effort along the line of keeping men at work and avoiding industrial trouble. Be that as it may, I say that there is still room for another effort. Labour leaders, like politicians, sometimes do not accurately represent the will of their constituents. I believe we have had evidences of that in this country within the quite recent past. I think, if my memory serves me right, that I remember reading a speech delivered by a man who claimed to be a representative of organized labour in this House, on a certain topic, not more than seven or eight months ago; and I think that the answer the working men gave to that man's attitude is clear proof that labour leaders do not always interpret the will of their constituents any more than politicians do. And, as a man who has been a member of a large body of organized labour for thirty-two years, and who is constantly being brought into touch with the working men of this country, organized and unorganized, I say that the working men of this country do want to see their leaders take just such a position as I have outlined here this afternoon; and I challenge any labour leader anywhere to come before an audience of representative organized labour men and say that that is not the position that organized labour wants to take. There are without question certain individual agitators, men who live by agitation, who would take an opposite position; but the heart of organized labour towards this question is right, and I believe that I know it.

Now, as to an alternative. The question was referred to quite briefly in connection with the discussion as to the importation of coolie labour in British Columbia or any part of the Canadian West. I do not believe——

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the hon. member permit a question. He is dealing with a vital point. He states that he knows what the will of the body of labour on a certain question is. He did not state what he understands the mind of labour to be on that certain point.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: My conviction from personal contact with workingmen throughout this country is that they desire to do everything they can to reinforce the efforts our men are making at the front to win this war, and the only way they can reinforce that effort is by going to work and staying at work. Do not misunderstand me: I do not speak in any official capacity for organized labour, nor do I wish to be understood as saying even that I represent

a majority of organized labour. But I believe that I speak for the real feeling of organized labour in its best sense when I make that statement. I had the privilege recently of discussing this subject with a group of one hundred representative men of this country, drawn from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I put the question to them straight: Do you think that the representatives of organized labour in Canada are willing to bring about a system such as was brought about between the Director of Railroads in the United States and the representatives of the railway organizations there? The answer was: Emphatically, yes.

To pass to the alternative. As I have said, I believe that we can find in Canada sufficient men to do all the things that we are endeavouring to do, including the sending of reinforcements to our boys at the front, which is the most vital necessity of all. If we cannot do that, if our men or some portion of them fail to respond to the imperative call of going to work, then I say that the Government will be justified in importing labour from any part of the world where labour can be found. I have no hesitation in saying that 50,000 coolies from Northern China could be imported into Canada, if necessity arose, without jeopardizing to the slightest degree the interests of Canadian workingmen, because when their services were no longer required they could be sent back to the country from which they came. People who say that coolie labour should not be introduced into this country under any circumstances do so purely for sentimental reasons. Our boys in France never talked of going on strike because the ghourkas or the men from Algeria went into the trenches beside them. Nor do they raise any objection to the employment of 100,000 Chinese labourers in France, who are doing transport work and many other things necessary to the support of the boys in the front lines. The people, therefore, will not object if our boys are supported by coolies imported from other countries in order to produce foodstuffs, make munitions and war equipment, and do anything else necessary to assist in carrying on this war.

I am convinced that this House will support the Government; I am convinced that the people will support this House, in any measure, no matter how drastic it is, that may be found necessary to organize the industrial and productive work of this country up to the limit of its capacity. I therefore urge upon the Government the desirability of their taking any steps—I think I can speak for organized labour when I say that in the last analysis they will support the Government also in this respect—to accomplish that end.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the House at any length, but the question now under discussion is a very burning one in many parts of our great Dominion. Men fail to see the reason why their boys should voluntarily go overseas and work for $1.10 a day, while foreigners come in and take their places in the ordinary walks of life and earn $7 and $8 a day. This question is talked of and spoken about all over Canada. But we are to-day face to face with a somewhat different condition. On Friday last we passed an Act under which all the young men of Canada between certain ages are required to go to the front, whether they have business at home or not. The man who is to-day earning $20, $30 or $40 a week, the man who has a large income, will be required to accept the $1.10 a day of the soldier. Perhaps this man has a widowed mother; perhaps he has young sisters depending on him, who, when he is sent overseas, will have their ordinary source of income cut off, while Austrians or Germans will take up his work. The mothers and sisters of these Austrians and Germans will thereby receive the benefit of earnings which had formerly accrued to the men who went overseas. Some say that these foreigners are doing very little good in the industrial world; that many of them are agitators; that many of them are leaders in strikes and other activities not favourable to the prosecution of Canada's part in the war. Other men argue that we cannot do anything because these men are members of trade unions. I think, however, that the proper solution is somewhat along the line suggested by the member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) that we should come to some agreement; that this matter should be talked over by men who know their business; that some plan should be arrived at whereby we may obtain the services of these men and at the same time do equal justice to all.

The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) said that we could not do anything along this line because of international law; that any action would be a violation of the arrangements made at the Hague tribunal. But I would call his attention to the fact that the bombing of open and unfortified towns is not in accordance with the conditions of the Hague tribunal. Moreover,

it is against the ordinary canons of war to use gas; but the Germans have adopted this, and in self-defence the Allies have had to take the same course. If we take the same course with the German citizens of Canada that the Germans take with subjects of the Allies now in their country, no reasonable objection can be made by them.

The hon. member also dragged in a discussion of the Military Service Act. He had a great deal of sympathy with the Galicians who had come to this country, as he said, not because they were, favourable to, but in order to get away from, the Central Powers. It is quite true that many Galicians came here in order to better their condition, and the same may be said of many Germans. But may I ask the hon. gentleman this—he refused me the right to ask him the question when he was dealing with the matter—where are the brothers, the cousins, and the uncles of these men for whom he professes so much sympathy? They are fighting to-day against the Allies, and they are the men who are making these measures now necessary in Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) also said something—I believe that was the one thing which brought him to his feet—regarding conscription or the Military Service Act in his own province. Well, that is not akin to this subject, and I have no desire to raise the question here. Let me say this: the great majority of the people of Ontario are willing to make any sacrifice and to put up with any adverse conditions in order to assist in the common cause, but they do demand that in the matter of supplying men necessary for the reinforcing of our boys at the front, equal justice be done to all classes in the community and that each province and each military district should supply its quota of men.

The member for Maisonneuve finished with the remark that he did not know whether there were any strangers in the House, but he was quite satisfied that there were Prussians. I am not quite satisfied even that there are Prussians, but if there are men playing the Prussian game in this House, and who have been doing so for some time past, they are friends of hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, the discussion this afternoon has, as it very properly should, taken a wide range, and because of the width of the discussion and because we have on the Order Paper three different motions dealing with this question, it is only fair that all sides should be heard. The speeches that have been delivered, especially those that have been delivered by the new members of the House, are instructive in regard to the situation. The most important question that came up in December in my election campaign, and, I suppose, in the election campaigns of most of the other members of this House, was the winning of the war, and the next most important question was what was to be our attitude towards the enemy alien living in our country. As far as I could gather from the meetings, there was, in the elections throughout Ontario, practically a unanimity of opinion that something must be done by the Government of this country in relation to the aliens, and, in particular, the enemy aliens, in Canada. The returned veterans had their view, and that has been expressed here to-day. Women voted in that election, and now that we are enfranchising all the women of Canada, they will be an important factor in coming elections. The women of this country, especially those who have soldier relatives, are convinced that something is radically wrong about our treatment of enemy aliens in this time of war, and the same view is held by our soldiers. Things are so bad in this country, and they have been so bad in the United States since that country entered the war, that it is absolutely essential that there should be a re-writing of the definition of what constitutes citizenship, of the definition of an alien, and of the rights of an enemy alien. You hear it said in all parts of the country, and it is a fact, as has been stated by hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon, that women do not like to see their boys going to the front as volunteers, or under conscription, and being paid $1.10 a day, when enemy aliens are being given their jobs, many of them being paid as much as twelve dollars a day. I know that to be the fact in shop after shop throughout my constituency. There are enemy aliens in this country and in the United States. There are many enemy aliens in Great Britain. The outstanding feature of the question is that in English-speaking countries, and especially where British law prevails, we have made a great mistake in the privileges we have given in regard to the settlement here of aliens, and, in particular of enemy aliens.

One of the hon. members who spoke said that the time had come when we should have further regulation of labour, and he mentioned "bootblacking" as a non-essential employment. In every city of this country there are Greeks blacking boots and carrying on pool rooms, who ought to

be compelled to return to the land of their birth and to serve in their own army in the cause of the Allies.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the Italians?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The Italians should be dealt with in the same fashion. These aliens are scattered throughout Canada. The people see this condition of affairs, and they are demanding that our laws be changed. We cannot wait until the war is over to change our laws. We ought to be taking action now. We are now in the fourth year of this war and we have not taken any such action yet. We were to have an enumeration of the man-power of this country, but we have not had it. It is under way now, but when will it be accomplished, and what will be the regulation and disposition of this man-power? We have recently been told in this House that, in order to harvest our crops, it is absolutely necessary that idle labour, or labour that is useless, such as labour utilized in blacking boots or in running pool rooms, ought to be made to take some part in cultivating and harvesting the crops. We should get busy in regard to that at once. It is the duty of Parliament to take action to cope with the situation. Are we going to deal with these matters at this session? Are we going to define what our citizenship is, what an alien is, and what are the rights of an alien enemy in this country? At the present time the enemy alien and his wife and family are treated just as citizens of Canada, and yet they are not compelled to do anything to help win the war. They ought to be conscripted in some way. They might be conscripted into the army, but that is a delicate question. They can, however, be conscripted in some way so as to be made to work. As I understand the argument of the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson), whose argument was very plain and reasonable, the proposal involves the conscription and movement of labour from one part of the country to another, and especially the conscription of enemy alien labour. We have to take this action now, and it is now we ought to take it.

We are in the fourth year of this war, and we have not yet had enumeration of our man-power. In England an enumeration of man-power was taken at an early stage of the war. We are beginning to take this action now, and perhaps Union Government will enable us to do it. Labour is well organized in the old country and the people say there should not be any strikes, but one-half of the efforts of the Prime Minister of England has been to prevent strikes, and it is a very difficult matter to cope with. We should have progressive legislation similar to that carried out in the United States in regard to labour. I believe the labour organizations of this country will assent to a proposal whereby they will agree not to have strikes during the war. In England, strikes have threatened and production has been limited as a consequence. England is full of all kinds of foreigners and the authorities do not know what to do with them. They have at last practically come to the point that they are going to make numbers of them return home so as to enlist in the army of the country from which they came. In England there is an enormous population of foreigners who claim certain rights under international laws and former treaties. Former treaties and international laws are all right so long as they suit the conditions under which they were made, but when we find conditions have changed and the winning of the war is being prevented because of those treaties and conventions, then it is the duty of Parliament to make the necessary adjustments, and, in some way, to waive international law aside. If the Germans break international law, we can, at least, measure out similar treatment to their fellow German subjects. While we have been told by prominent legal authorities in this country that we cannot violate international law, that we cannot violate conventions that Great Britain has made with different countries, and that we must treat all alike, that is not quite the fact. We treat our own fellow British subjects, the Hindoos, in a different fashion from that in which they are treated in England. We have put a head tax on the Chinaman, which is not the way in which the Chinaman is treated in England. A similar statement might be made in regard to the Japanese. I understand that we have in British Columbia to-day a law which prevents our Allies, the Americans, from going into the ports of that province to follow their trades. That being the case, international law, whatever it may be, and the conventions, whatever they may be, involved in treaties between different nations, must make the concessions necessary to the winning of the war and to controlling the actions of enemy aliens in this country. What strengthens the enemy alien in his misconduct in this country? We all know how the enemy aliens have acted. As the

hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) has said, they strike when they like.

They go and spend a day in the woods when they like, and do not care whether the people in the rest of Canada get coal or not; they get twelve dollars a day and work when they like, and what strengthens them is this. The outstanding thing in this war is the extent of German intrigue, which has permeated France and Italy, and the most appalling thing the American people experience to-day, although they do not care to admit it, is the extent of German intrigue in the United States. We have also seen a good deal of it in Canada, and there has been a good deal of it in Great Britain. What strengthens these enemy aliens in our own country is the knowledge that Germany has intrigued in every country in the world—that is what backs them up in their attitude and makes them insolent. They take advantage of all kinds of treaties. Enemy aliens all over this country are saying, "We do not have to serve or work except we like." And yet these people are enjoying the protection of this country! What makes them insolent and so independent is the existence of these so called conventions, and international law. The only law to-day is the safety of the state, the safety of liberty, the safety of civilization, and the safety of these things depends upon a strong force in each country that will make every one do his duty, and which will especially make the alien respect the law and take his part in the defence of his adopted country.

There are any number of these aliens in Ontario but they have not even been registered yet. What do they do on the continent of Europe? If you take up your residence in France or Germany, the first thing you have to do is to state what country you come from, your occupation, and your residence. We have been too free on this continent in allowing all kinds of nationalities to come in without registering them or finding out where they came from. We have not found out to any degree whether Germans were coming in or not. What have the Kaiser and his Government been doing for the last twenty years? They have been perfecting a law by which the German abroad shall have a double citizenship, but he is first of all a citizen of Germany. He may take the oath of allegiance in the country in which he settles, but he is first of all a German citizen, and is really under German instructions. We are finding out all these things, and are saying how bad they are.

In the last election the one thing that came up on every platform was the question of the alien enemy, and I pledged myself to the people of South York to bring the matter up in the House and I shall not rest content until I see some law put on the statute book dealing with the condition that exists in Canada to-day. Just what that law is to be, I do not know yet. We have very able lawyers in the House and we shall hear their arguments later as to the difficulties, but the main thing for us to consider is not the difficulties but how to overcome them, and how to meet the views of the ordinary every day citizen of this country. We have to supply labour of some kind for our farmers, especially now that all exemptions have been swept away. We must start in immediately to register the man-power of this country to find out what the young men and boys, and even the women of this country can do. If we even approach doing the things which the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has suggested we shall find some kind of a solution, perhaps not a perfect one, but the more we study the question and the more speeches we have about it, and the more we hear of the difficulties, the nearer we shall be to a solution.

But let us not sidetrack the question, as has been too much our experience in the past in this country. If we will only study the question we will be able to find a reasonable solution that will define citizenship and make it a law that every man who enjoys the protection of this country, be he alien or alien enemy, shall do his share of the work in hand. And the thing in hand to-day is to beat the Germans and their allies, and the way to do it is to make those who enjoy our protection bear their share. But they are not doing that in Canada to-day; they are not doing it in Ontario, or in the West in regard to the coal mines, and they do not propose to do it until we make them. What are we going to do with them? It is a difficult question, I admit, and there are legal impedimenta in the way, but a solution has to be found and we should have started out to find one long ago. We are now in the fourth year of the war and the end is not in sight. I do not think any of the law officers of the Crown have yet been assigned to the duty of revising the definition of citizenship, of alien, and of alien enemy; we have not yet started to register the man-power of this country. It is true we have approached the question of idle labour, but there should not be a single man idle now.

In view of the seriousness of the situation, when the necessity is so great for men and food and munitions and war supplies of all kinds we should be on the job right now and Parliament should not dissolve until it has found a way of enumerating the man-power and women-power of this country and made provision for utilizing that power in the most effective way. The thing I appreciated most last Saturday, as an ordinary farmer, was to have two young boys come to our place and say: "We have read in the papers that they are making a list of the boys who will work on farms; we want to work on a farm." And we took them on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They knew a good thing.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Yes, those boys were patriots in their way. We must start right now to register the man-power of this country; it is no good postponing the matter any longer. I heard more in the last election of the alien enemy question than of any other. Our people are absolutely dissatisfied with the large alien element in this country, who tell us they are not under our law and are not subject to our discipline because of certain treaty rights. They are in our country and under any laws we choose to make to win the war and to maintain our rights which are now in jeopardy. It is all very well to make the issue a matter of ethics, and in that connection I have just one criticism to make of two men so great as Mr. Asquith and President Wilson. For a long time in the conduct of the war Mr. Asquith, as Premier, made the issue largely an ethical one; he talked about morals and the German attitude, and put his case in very fine English. For two years the President of the United States was engaged in that same ethical discussion with the powers in Germany. Now what is the good of having a moral discussion with an unethical people like the Germans? They hung President Wilson up for two years, and are hanging us up now by discussion of international law and what we should do and what not do. The thing in practical politics is that Asquith should have made an issue with Germany much earlier than he did, and President Wilson should have taken action when the Lusitania was torpedoed, and yet we have had to wait for a long time in both instances. I am voicing no criticism, I am merely suggesting to the House that the time has passed to indulge in an ethical discussion with an unmoral people like the Germans, and it is wrong to discuss international law and the rights of aliens who happen to be in this country, and who say that they do not have to fight, and that they do not have to work in Canada only when they see fit.

These aliens have got to be made to work, and those of them in this country belonging to allied nations who will not serve in our army, and say they will not do so, have all got to get out of this country and serve in the armies of their own country, and if we are to be fair and square with our own boys who have gone to the front. One-half the alien labour in this country are engaged in some occupation or another which is not of a useful character. As I said, you will find one-half the Greeks in Toronto keeping poolrooms, or blacking boots, or running fruit stands, and the same with many other aliens. They should be made to get into some useful occupation, and my advice to the Minister of Agriculture, who sees the necessity of getting labour on the farms, is to insist on this enumeration and regulation of man-power. Let it be done right away; make every one of these aliens turn in and do something. I know it is a hard thing to do. You cannot, perhaps, intern them, but there is a way to deal with the problem. The Germans have found a way. They have found a way to make our boys, and our fellow subjects who have fallen into their hands, do something. More than that they have made them take small pay and they have ill-treated them. I do not propose ill-treatment or anything of the kind, but the people whom I represent here, think, that, in the tenor of the motion that I have on the Order Paper, to-day, there are lots of these people who should be made to work, and that the difference between the wages they receive and the soldier's pay of $1.10 per day should be devoted to some war purpose.

We have been told that you cannot control this labour, but I tell you how you can control it. What is the fundamental thing in connection with many of the problems of the war? It is the enforcement of the idea of licensing. If you want to carry on a business you must pay a license. If you are manufacturing, and especially if you are making munitions, you have to take out a license under the law as it is now, and things may get so bad in this country, because the war is not over yet, that we may have to require every manufacturer no matter what his business is, to take out a license. Under that license we can make rules and regulations concerning the men that the manufacturer employs

in his work. As I say, that may reduce production somewhat, but it will put these people under discipline, both the employer and the man who works for him, and hitherto that has not been the case. As I said before, one of the most insolent things we find in the workshops of Ontario is the case of men who are getting from $6 to $10 and $12 a day. They work when they like, and they have been getting the preference, at least so I have been told, and hon. gentlemen who represent city constituencies will doubtless corroborate it. These foreigners are getting work in preference to the relatives of soldiers at the front. A great many hon. gentlemen in this House have had experience of that, certainly I have had, and the employers of this labour must be put under some kind of regulation, and under some kind of license. I have no cut and dried proposal to submit for the solution of these troubles, but the difficulties are with us for solution.

This is a Parliament fresh from the people of Canada empowered to deal largely with these war questions, and there never was so good an opportunity as now exists to define the word citizenship and define what an enemy alien is, and what we ought to do with all these aliens now in our country so as to make them contribute their share towards the winning of the war. Of course, there are any number of difficulties connected with the matter, but they can be dealt with and they have got to be dealt with one way or another. I agree with what the hon. member for E. Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) said, that we can get organized labour to join with the Government in working out some solution. Of course, the problem is a hard one to solve, but we have got to deal with it, and the United States have also got to deal with it. The war is not over, the question is with us, and people are talking about it at every opportunity. The women are talking about it most. The women are voters in this country, and even although it may be a question of sentiment, as the hon. member for East Algoma said, I am reminded of Napoleon's statement that, sentiment rules the world, and so it does. That being the case, I invite the House to have the fullest possible discussion on the matter. Let every hon. member state his experience and make suggestions as to what action he thinks should be taken, and let the Government maintain an open mind in connection with the subject, and then we will work out some solution of the very great problem now before the people of the country.

Mr. FRED. LANGDON DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss this question, I would like to make a few preliminary remarks on what has already been said. It is always exciting to meet gentlemen with an appetite for trouble, sometimes alarming, and alarm is my feeling at the suggestion, in connection with this question, of conscription. With the Union Government facing the question of conscription of soldiers, to add to its troubles the conscription of labour is quite too much. I do not want to see Union Government die of what I might term—coining a word for the purpose—conscriptitis. It may, however, be threatened with that complaint if an unwise course is followed, but there are other ways of dealing with the question. First of all, what is the idea which each member has in his mind with regard to the enemy alien? How many men has he acquaintance with who would come within that class? In Manitoba we have had many Austrians who are called alien enemies, offering for enlistment. A few we have accepted and some we have rejected. I know men of Polish, Hungarian and Galician birth who have given their lives for Great Britain on the battlefields of Western France. To-day, and I do not know whether I transgress any rule of the House in mentioning it, with three-quarters of the opposition to the present Government French Canadians, we are perhaps facing this situation: That we English-speaking people, with our usual insularity and self-sufficiency, are putting a tag upon a class of people whom we do not very well know, and whom we are not in complete sympathy with. One of the troubles I see to-day is that an hon. member from British Columbia, two thousand miles from Quebec, is proposing conscription for French Canadians. Well, it seems to me there is not only a great distance geographically between him and them, but also a great gap in the matter of sympathy and understanding. It does really seem as though we are separated to such an extent in the matter both of sympathy and of distance that we never can get together. Are we going to perpetuate such a situation with regard to the aliens who have come to our shores? Is it not well that we should look at the fact that perhaps a solid French Canada may some day extend her hand with special offers to people of foreign descent? Indeed, in Manitoba to-day we have a situation where the Galician population is already becoming assertive and reaching out for membership in our local

House. How long will it be before they will demand Galician members in this House? As a matter of fact it seems to me it would be a good thing if we had two or three of them here to-day to inform the House as to what would be the attitude of their people towards the conscription of alien labour. I do not think the solution of the question lies in that direction at all.

I do not think that it lies in the direction of the conscription of any labour whatsoever. It does lie, perhaps, in the direction of the policy which already European countries and the United States have adopted. We know that in Great Britain and in France they have undertaken to restrict the less essential industries. In the United States they are doing the same. Have we not the courage to advance along the same line?

Before dealing with the question in that sense, let us look at the situation which faces us to-day, because, again, I think there may not be sufficient clearness in our minds as to the actual facts. Owing to the long seeding time we have had this spring, we are not very greatly in need of agricultural labour just now. More than that, from the best information I can gather, we need, perhaps 5,000 or 10,000 men for railway right of way maintenance purposes. Whether we need more men for actual mining or not I cannot tell; I do not know where to get that information. I have asked men from the coal mining regions and they have told me that upwards of 1,000 men have left the coal mining regions of Nova Scotia and gone to Halifax, where labour is in demand and high wages are offered. With regard to our western mines, the matter depends entirely, I believe, on the situation in regard to railway transportation and on how far the West will answer to the request that is now being made that we should lay in 70 per cent of our supply of fuel during the coming summer. If that is done we are going to need labour in the coal mines. The ordinary requirements of the West in regard to agriculture from the first of August to the 15th November are from 25,000 to 40,000 extra men. We have been getting them from the United States and the eastern provinces. But, as a result of conscription and of the enlistment of so many thousands of men, we find that in the last year or so we are not getting nearly so many; so that, in all probability we will find that we are limited there. Added to this will be the effect of the Order in Council brought down last week which will take, according to the estimate of the Prime Minister, 10,000 in each year called.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the hour for recess arrived, I was trying to summarize the present need for labour. I had mentioned that from 40,000 to 50,000 men might be required in agriculture; that in shipbuilding we should have 100,000 to 200,000 men engaged; that in railroad work, 5,000 to 10,000 men are needed for maintenance of way purposes; and that there is need for help in certain other essential industries. In the present situation possibly there is employment, or will be this fall, for 75,000 to 100,000 men.

We face that situation with practically one-seventh of the man-power of our state engaged in war or in war industry. We were told by the Prime Minister that our men sent overseas numbered some 365,000; and we know that in munitions work we have over 200,000 men engaged, besides many women. Added to these, will come the further draft upon our man-power under the recent Order in Council, taking, as the Prime Minister said, 10,000 men for each age-year that will now be called up, the three years, ages 20, 21 and 22, yielding 30,000 men. If, besides that, we are compelled to call up the classes of 19 and 23 years of age, we have for the latter class another 10,000, and for the former probably 55,000 or 60,000 men. Now, with this situation confronting us, we are endeavouring to carry on our industries as heretofore—"business as usual." "Business as usual" is no longer possible; and the state must, in some way, intervene.

I thoroughly believe in the principle of as little interference as possible with the life of the people. I do not believe in compulsion, or in fixing prices or wages, but in letting economic forces work. What then would be proposed? Just what would happen in the case of a depression. If we came to a depression, certain industries, essential and non-essential, would cut down their use of labour, and employment would be sought by many of these employees in other industries. In consequence, the suggestion that I would make is that we should now examine with care the less essential industries of the country, and, if not actually cut them off, at least curtail them. I know that its organization of an industry is of prime importance to an industry and that

if operation be absolutely stopped, the skilled operatives, the management itself, and the organization fall to pieces, and it is not easy again to pick up and start. But take what has happened in just one industry. I understand that one piano firm, which was producing six pianos a day when the war began, is now producing and selling fifteen pianos a day. Similar expansion of trade has taken place in many of the less essential industries of our country. On such an examination as I can make of the census returns I estimate that there are 25,000 or 30,000 men engaged in such industries as I should classify as less essential. But we are not confined to our own judgment as to what the state might consider less essential industries. If you will turn to the last manual of the War Measures Regulations of the British Government, you will find at page 304 an order of the Minister of Munitions, providing that no man over the age of eighteen or under the age of sixty-one shall be employed, without license, in any of the industries named in a schedule attached to that order. That schedule contains some twelve classes of industries, and in order that the House may, without taking too much time, have some idea of what is there proposed, I will read a few of the items which are there specified. Among the restricted occupations are the following: Under the heading metals, machines, implements and conveyances, are included manufacture of furnishing ironmongery, including bedsteads and parts thereof; gas and electric light fittings; safes and steel office furniture; and the machinery for the trades mentioned. In woodworking, furniture and cabinet making and upholstery, are included manufacture of show cases and shop fronts and fittings. In the stone and slate trades, stone, marble and slate quarrying and stone, marble, granite and slate cutting and polishing are restricted. In these industries, we have in Canada some 1,200 to 1,500 men engaged, producing monuments in this time of great need, an industry that could very well be cut off, and afterward taken up when the war has ceased. In pottery, bricks and glass, we have the manufacture of bricks cut out. In house building and repairing, no building is permitted except on a permit from the Government, unless it is below £500 in value. We would, of course, cut that standard lower. House painting and decorating are also in this restricted list. In the paper and printing trades, bookbinding, letterpress and lithograph printing are restricted. We are going on producing books to no end, and at a time when industry is sorely needed in the production of foodstuffs. In the textile and allied trades, the manufacture of carpets, floor rugs, furniture hangings and upholstery materials, linoleum, oilcloth and table baize, are all restricted. In clothing—and here, I may say, we will have to make an exception for the benefit of the giant of the House, the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) who couldn't get a ready made suit to fit him—no clothing can be made to order, nothing but ready-made clothing. Millinery is in the same class. In food, drink and tobacco, the manufacture of aerated waters is cut out. We are employing some 1,500 men in this occupation. The baking of biscuits, the manufacture of sugar and chocolate confectionery, and the manufacture of cigars (which would again hit some of us hard) are restricted. In miscellaneous manufactures, we find the manufacture of games and sports, goldsmiths' and silversmiths' wares, and jewellery, the making of musical instruments and photographic apparatus, all restricted. I would like to read in full a list of occupations in the last two classication of the schedule.

XI. Commercial Occupations.

All foregoing trades. Distribution and sale of products of.

Other trades:—

Advertising agents.

Commercial travellers and canvassers, commission agents, hawkers and pedlars.

Shop assistants.

Clerks, except those with technical knowledge of a high order, or acting in a managerial or administrative capacity.

XII. Miscellaneous Occupations.

Flowers and ornamental shrubs and plants, production and sale of.

Domestic servants, indoor, including waiters and servants in clubs, hotels, lodging-houses, restaurants and cafés.

Domestic servants, outdoor.

Employees at theatres, music halls, cinemas, and other places of amusement.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not propose to cut these out, but to cut the men out of them, to let them be run by women. If in England they can draw from the ranks of women for operators of tramcars and for members of the police forces, why should not similar positions in this country be filled by women? I have given but a partial list of what is done in Great Britain. France has done the same; the United States are now going over their industries and treating them in the same way.

We must not for a moment think of treating our aliens as enemies. "Enemy

alien" is a concept which has not a truth in it. These men have expatriated themselves for the purpose of becoming Canadian citizens; many of them have changed their names to Anglicized forms in order that they might be able to enlist. If we treat such men as men and brothers, it will make Canadians of them; if we treat them in any other fashion, we will make of them an alien element in Canada—and that, above all things, God forbid.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (Toronto West): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in sympathy with the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) when he tells us that he has not been able to find any complete solution for the difficulty which is indicated in the motion now under consideration. I myself have given a good deal of thought—with the application, perhaps, of less brains than the member for South York would apply to it—to the finding of a solution of the problem that would be satisfactory to me and that I would feel like urging on the Government.

The electors in every riding in the city of Toronto are hedged round by a foreign population which is contributing nothing to the conduct of the war, and which is living in ease, comfort and luxury. Some of them, indeed, are laughing at their English-speaking neighbours who have been forced to do their duty. I quite appreciate the difficult nature of the problem that confronts the Government, but it is a problem which, I think, we might be able to solve at least in part. A certain exasperation exists throughout Canada when men of English birth and blood see foreigners, neighbours of theirs, go to the tribunals—as they have been going in the city of Toronto—with a smile upon their faces, declaring: "I am not naturalized"; and upon the strength of that statement walking out free to do as they like and not bearing any of the burdens incident to the war. Take, for instance, the case of a man conducting a grocery store in the east end of our city. He was taken away from his occupation, and his store had to be closed. Across the way from him, a block or two down the street, was a Greek, conducting the same kind of business. This Greek remains, not only to carry on the business with the customers that he previously had, but to take over the customers of the English-speaking merchant who had to go and fight, at the soldier's pay of $1.10 a day. I am sure that this is a state of affairs that would exasperate anybody, and it is no wonder that in the district the member for South York represents, as well as in every other part of Toronto, this feeling has become so strong. I sympathize particularly with the member for South York, because he has in his riding what was formerly a suburb of Toronto, and which is now incorporated in the city—the district called Earlscourt. This district, which was at that time a distant part of the city, was settled by Englishmen who bought their little twenty or twenty-five foot lots by paying a dollar a month for them, built their little homes—some of them not much larger than a couple of packing boxes put together—and, as time went on, put up more respectable and more commodious residences, showing the splendid spirit of the Englishman to be independent. When the war broke out, that whole district was depleted of its men; thousands of them left that small section of our city. The women who have been left behind to carry on the work would have been just as glad to go to the front as their husbands, if it had been possible for them to do so. There is not in Canada any finer class of people than these men and women in Earlscourt. The men, on the day of the declaration of war, stepped out and announced their willingness to take their share of the burden; and the women were left at home, and voted in the last election. These are the people the member for South York has had to meet; they are the ones who made representations to me to try to have something done towards the conscription of alien enemies. It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that they should press upon me with great earnestness, even as they have pressed it upon the member for South York and the member for East York (Mr. Foster) and, indeed, every hon. gentleman who represents a Toronto constituency.

I respect international law, and believe that we should not ignore it. At the same time, however, one's respect for these conventions must be somewhat limited when he sees chaos approaching his country. If the Germans should win this war, it would be chaos for Canada; and if any good purpose, any great end, is to be served by modifying our observance of international law under conditions such as those which confront us, I join the member for South York in saying that steps in that direction ought to be taken. Just how far we should go, I am no more prepared to say than he is; but in view of the desperate state of affairs in which we find ourselves, we should take all necessary measures for the protection of our country and for the organization of our man power, whether of

enemy aliens or of native and naturalized citizens, in order to get the very best results.

We have been informed that attempts are being made to arrange conventions with neutral countries in order that those who have come from those countries to Canada may be enlisted in our forces or be required by law to contribute their services to the State in some other way. I think that is a most commendable thing for the Government to do, and I most sincerely hope that they will press their efforts to arrange such conventions. We should at least be able to make such a convention with the kingdom of Italy; that of itself would mean a tremendous increase in man power, either by having men who came here from Italy enlist in their own armies, or by causing them to join our armies here.

How this conscription of enemy aliens can best be carried out, I have not determined, but I am still thinking about it, and perhaps I may be able to find some solution, if only in part, and submit it later if I have opportunity. But one thing we can do and ought to do is to follow the suggestion of the member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) and cut down non-essential industries.

If I go into a hotel, I find twenty to thirty men serving victuals to the guests. Those twenty or thirty men could be better employed and could give better and more important service to this country than they are giving at present, and there is not one of them who could not be replaced by a young woman who would do the work quite at satisfactorily. I shall go further than that and say that fruit stores and confectionary stores should be conducted by women; that the Government should require them to be conducted by women. Work of that nature is surely not beyond either the physical or the mental powers of an ordinary intelligent woman. Out of those fruit stores, confectionery stores and other stores of that character, a large number of men could be obtained to be put at more important and essential work. If I were the Prime Minister of this country, I would go so far as to close up every pool room, billard room and bowling alley in the land until this war was over, for not only are young men required to conduct these places, but in a great many instances they are a resort for idlers, and they should at least be restricted, if not entirely done away with. Surely there are other forms of amusement in which men could engage without requiring the assistance of those who are at present employed conducting such establishments. I fail to see how any person can argue that those places of amusement are essential to the carrying on of the war or to the comfort, convenience and happiness of the people of Canada at this time.

My hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) suggests that it might be a good thing to get a large number of French Canadians to go out to British Columbia to work there. I can give him a plan that will enable him to achieve that purpose if he goes at it seriously. We attracted a great many to the city of Toronto by paying them $6 a day. During the period of voluntary enlistment very large numbers came in, and as the young men of our city went into the ranks at $1.10 a day, the men from Quebec came in to take their places at $6 a day. They have been living very comfortably and happily, and they are very welcome in the city of Toronto. I have no doubt, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni says, they will go back to Quebec with broader minds and be better citizens because of this association with the English-speaking people of the city of Toronto. A good many of them went to Halifax. My information—and it was obtained upon the spot—is that from Point Lévis alone several hundreds went down to Halifax to engage in the work of restoring that city. Afterwards, according to the press, the military police went down to Halifax to find some men for whom they were searching, and they found a good many of those men who had left Point Lévis to go down to Halifax engaged on the restoration work, and at the same time carrying in their pockets exemption certificates on the ground that they were farmers. Perhaps the offer of $6 a day might secure the relief in British Columbia that my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni desires.

I was glad to hear the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) state that the bonds of the province of Quebec are so attractive to the investors of this country. I have been reading of some parts of the province in which the bonds are not so satisfactory. If the Montreal press tells the truth, that great city, the greatest in the Dominion of Canada, has been upon the verge of bankruptcy. That statement was made in a number of Montreal papers, and it was also stated that the bonds are somewhat difficult to dispose of.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I hesitate to call the hon. member to order, but I think he is wandering somewhat afield.

Mr. HOCKEN: I was merely referring to the statement made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve that the bonds had been so attractive, but they did not seem to be so because the city was put under a commission.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Is the hon. member aware that the bonds of that city, which he claims is bankrupt, were all underwritten by the Bank of Montreal?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. This is not germane to the discussion at all.

Mr. HOCKEN: It was not I who said the city of Montreal was bankrupt. I was quoting the Montreal press. If there is any way in which the enemy alien in this country can be conscripted for service, I am prepared to support such legislation in every way in my power, and I would urge the Government to go into this matter a little more thoroughly than they have hitherto done. If they consider they have gone into the question thoroughly, let them take it up again and see if some way cannot be found of using this alien labour for the benefit of the country. It is not enough to take the idlers—none of us will have any sympathy with that class, and so far as taking them goes, that is all right, but it is not enough for us to conscript the idlers and make them work. They are a comparatively small element in the Dominion of Canada. We have to go further than that and say that the men who are doing work that is of no advantage and is not essential to this country, must cease doing that and undertake work of greater importance.

I am not satisfied simply with dealing with man power in that way. The Government ought to go further and deal with woman power. The women of this country are capable of doing much more than they are doing at present. Many of them could engage in different forms of industry. Many of them could work upon the farms, not doing ploughing or other heavy operations, but carrying on some of the lighter operations, thereby releasing men for work requiring greater physical strength.

Conscription in any form is repugnant to every man of the British race. Until the present time, we have never had conscription for military service, but we are fighting an enemy that is using autocratic methods, and if we are going to succeed against him, we must have consideration for his methods and meet him in the best way we can. The people on Ontario do not like conscription any more than do the people of any other province, but they recognize that it is either conscription and service with the forces at the front, or defeat for the British Empire with the possibility of German possession of the Dominion of Canada. That is why we are willing to have conscription. The Government of this country, in addition to conscripting the men for the army, should seriously consider the possibility of extending this principle in regard to the carrying on of the essential industries and the greater production of things necessary for the winning of the war.

Mr. R. F. GREEN (West Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House at any length. It has not yet been demonstrated in this House that we have not sufficient man-power in Canada to attend to all the essential industries that we possess. The difficulty is that we, as a whole, have not yet realized that we are at war. We have not yet realized the necessity of production, not only of foodstuffs, but of everything else essential to the winning of the war. This debate is covering rather a wide field when one considers the substance of the resolution on the Order Paper.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) this afternoon took an opportunity to throw the usual brick at the province of British Columbia.

This is not the first time has has done so; it seems to be one of his chief pleasures, though why I am at a loss to understand. He said that we in British Columbia fought the 1908 election on a white British Columbia, and he is perfectly right; not only did we fight for a white British Columbia in 1908, but we are prepared to fight an election to-day for a white Canada. I believe that we have white inhabitants enough in Canada to carry on the industries of this country, and I think I can demonstrate to this House that it would be false economy to attempt to bring Orientals into our Dominion. The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) said he felt the time might come when it would be well to introduce coolies from Northern China into Canada. That time may possibly come, but God grant that it may not, because we who have lived and suffered under Oriental labour know best what it means. I repeat it would be false economy to introduce Oriental labour into this country except as a last resort. You cannot compare Canada to-day with France, where every able-bodied man, and many who are not able-bodied, are in the ranks, and only the women are left to run the farms and the munition

factories. In such a country at this time they might well introduce Chinese or anybody else to do their work. But we are not in that position, and until it is demonstrated that we have not sufficient white men in this country to do our work, I for one am prepared to fight every inch of the ground that would be taken by any one seeking to introduce Orientals into Canada. How can you possibly expect to build up an industry with a class of labour that you cannot assimilate and do not want to assimilate? A class of slave labour, you may call it, because these men come in under contract to superior Chinese and work as slaves until they have paid off the money which has been advanced to them at a large percentage of profit to the men who have contracts for their labour. These men come in and work at a wage a white man cannot live on. Suppose an industry is built up by that kind of labour, and then suddenly the time comes when you realize the detriment these Orientals are to your country and you want to get rid of them. If you send them out of the country the industry is then in a worse position than before, because it has been carried on under false economy; the products it has put upon the market have been produced by cheap labour. You cannot possibly get white men to take their place for the same wage, and the consequence is that the industry is bound to be ruined then and there. The only way to build up Canada is to do what we are trying to do in British Columbia—build it up with our own people, white people from other countries as well as from the British Islands, whom we can take into our families and assimilate, and who will grow up and become a part of us. An industry built up under those circumstances can live.

As to the alien enemy within our gates, I did not know the trouble was as widespread as it appears to be. We on the Pacific coast have the problem very close to us, because we have a great many of these people there. In my opinion a great many of the aliens are in very much the same position as the alien enemies. They are not troublesome; I do not agree with some statements that have been made this afternoon that they are always ready to make trouble wherever they are working. I believe these men are willing to work as long as they are paid the high wages that are being paid at the present time, but I do say they are not bearing their share of the burdens of this country while the war is on. While I do not wish to see anything done to make things worse for civilians of British or Allied birth, or for prisoners of war in Germany, I do hope that some solution will be found so that these alien enemies and aliens will be made to bear their share of the burdens of this war. There are in British Columbia to-day two or three internment camps. These men were given the opportunity of working at 25 cents a day, in addition to their food and clothing. This would enable them to buy a few luxuries, but the men had not been very long in the camps, which had been started in order to make some use of their services, before they made up their minds they were not going to work. They refused to work ,and from that day to this they have been kept in the camps and fed on the fat of the land; in fact, if my information is correct, they are better fed than a great many of the working people of this country. That is one of the places where the Government should put forth its hand; it should reorganize the conditions under which these men are interned. They have not, unless it is recently, I understand, been put upon rations, and I believe they are still allowed white bread, beef, and all such foods. I think the Government should take this matter up at once and see that these men are treated in a very different manner. The ordinary alien at large in this country, and the alien enemy who will not bear his fair share of the burden imposed by this awful war should be forced to do so. Like some other hon. members, I cannot state exactly how that should be done, but I repeat that these men within our gates enjoying all the privileges that the Canadian citizen enjoys, and making high wages as well, should be compelled to take up the duties of citizenship or else be told to leave this country, and until they do bear their full share of the burdens of this war they should not be allowed to use the food produced by the other citizens of Canada.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Parliamentary Secretary): With much that has been said in support of this resolution all will agree. Since the war has entered its present phase, I am sure that there can be only one desire in this country, that is, in what way, and in what manner, can Canada's striking force in the conflict be strengthened.

The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) suggested that it should be done by co-ordinating the labour of the country The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Green)

was of the opinion that the country is not short of labour.

I spent an interesting hour, a day or two ago, reading what happened in the United States during the Civil War, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote a paragraph from this book, issued by MacMillan and Co., entitled, "Social and Industrial Conditions During the Civil War." The writer states:

> Although the crops of 1859 were probably the largest in the history of the country up to that time, the production of wheat in that year was surpassed in no other year during the war. In this record year one hundred and thirty-eight million bushels of wheat were produced by the northern states, in 1862 one hundred and seventy-seven million bushels, and the leading agricultural states in three years doubled their output.

Their output was doubled during the time that the war was in progress, when conditions with regard to man-power were described by the same writer, to take a sample community in Wisconsin, to be as follows:

> A home missionary in Wisconsin wrote: "In common with all our frontier towns we feel the sad effects of the war. From this town of 250 voters 111 have volunteered, and from Westfield and Ironton about an equal number in ratio of population. In this village of 90 families, 20, or more than one-fifth, are those of volunteers."
>
> From Illinois another missionary wrote: "The township in which our church is, counts 147 men liable to the draft, and has now in the field or under marching orders 117 of these."

Now what does that experience show, Mr. Speaker? Simply that under the stress of wartime conditions a nation can accomplish what it will not accomplish in ordinary times. Canada, under the impulse of patriotic endeavour can expect greater productive results even without an increase in personel. To what extent can the Government aid in further facilitating production? Obviously the starting point is an inventory of human power available. Up to the present time there has not been sufficient data available for the Administration to know exactly what conditions exist with regard to man-power in Canada.

As hon. gentlemen doubtless are aware, the Government has already formulated a registration plan to gather this information. Under Order in Council No. 404, a copy of which has already been laid on the Table, passed on the 23rd of February, was appointed the Canada Registration Board as a sub-committee of the War Committee of the Cabinet. That Board includes the chairman of the Labour Problems Committee, the Director of Agricultural Labour, the secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the secretary of the Labour conference which was held at Ottawa in February, a representative of women's organizations, and the chairman of the Military Service Council. The duties and powers of the Board provide that they shall take such steps as are found necessary and expedient to have at all times as accurate information as possible respecting the man power and woman power of the nation; to obtain accurate knowledge of the extent to which the various classes of labour are employed by such industries, the hours of employment, wages, and such other information as is advisable; also to formulate plans, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, whereby the available men and women of the nation may be made readily available for such industries as are most essential to the prosecution of the war. This committee began its sittings on the 26th of February, and work has gone on uninterruptedly since. It is expected that before the end of June a registration will have been made of all males and females in the country over sixteen years of age, under regulations which have been approved by the Governor in Council, and a summary of which, Mr. Speaker, I will give to the House:

A day will be set by proclamation on which this registration will be effected. It is proposed that it be done in one day, and the same day, throughout Canada, excepting the district of the Yukon. As each person registers, the registrar shall issue to him or her a certificate of registration which is supposed to be always carried by the registrant. Every male and female, being upwards of sixteen years of age, including aliens, shall on the day appointed present him or herself at the registration place, or booth, and give the particulars required by the card of registration.

Provision is also made that when youths attain the age of sixteen subsequent to registration day, they shall register through the medium of the post office.

The only exceptions are persons upon active service, while they are on active service—and when they leave active service they must register within thirty days—cloistered nuns, and the inmates of certain institutions. The inmates of institutions will, however, be registered by the officers in charge of these institutions.

It is proposed to follow in the plan of registration, as nearly as possible the present polling constituencies of the country,

and the plan is modelled after that of taking the vote at a general election.

The smaller provinces will each constitute a district under charge of a district registrar. The larger provinces will constitute more than one district, each district in charge of a registrar, all reporting to a central registrar at Ottawa. The district registrar will appoint a deputy registrar in charge of each constituency. Deputy registrars will appoint officers, similar to presiding officers in each polling subdivision and assistants will be employed so that as far as possible each clerk in the booth shall be called upon to register not more than 120 registrants during the day.

The handicaps of the previous registration for national service are probably known to the House. The difficulties in war time of undertaking to do anything in a comprehensive way, and still relying absolutely on voluntary service, are well known. Perhaps not the least of these is the fact that a sense of injustice is felt by some members of a community when, for instance, under voluntary recruiting, one man may feel it to be his duty to go out and fight while others, equally qualified, will stay at home. You thus have differences and inequalities and where inequality of that kind exists it always interferes with the operation of a plan, which to succeed contemplates the participation of every one in the community.

The registration, which is planned to be made in June, is a compulsory registration. Penalties are provided for failure to register. For instance, any person of the age of 16 years and upwards who neglects to register is liable,

(1) To a penalty of $100 and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, and a further penalty of $10 per day for every day that he should have registered, during which he shall continue to be unregistered.

Then it is provided:

(2.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered, forfeit his right and be disentitled to vote at any Dominion election; and if he fails to register within thirty days, after the day appointed, he shall forfeit his right and be disentitled to vote at the next general election;

(3.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered forfeit his right and be disentitled to obtain or continue in any employment, or to receive or earn any salary, emolument or wages;

(4.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered, forfeit his right and be disentitled to the services of any person in his employment, although he shall nevertheless remain liable for any salary, emolument or wages earned by such person during that time;

(5.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered, forfeit his right and be disentitled to perform the duties of any office, Dominion, provincial or municipal.

(6.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered, forfeit his right and be disentitled to purchase, receive or have in his possession any railway, steamboat, or other public conveyance ticket, other than a tramcar or street car ticket, or to travel by any railway, steamboat or other public conveyance, except a tramcar or street car, unless for the purpose of any prosecution or execution of sentence under these regulations;

(7.) He shall, for so long as he remains unregistered, forfeit his right and be disentitled to board or lodging at any hotel, public house, inn, tavern, club, restaurant or boarding house;

Any person who employs or continues him in his employment while unregistered or pays him any salary, emolument or wages in respect of any period while he is unregistered shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty corresponding in character and amount to that which the unregistered employee himself, shall, by reason of his non-registration at the time, have incurred.

Any person who sells, gives or delivers any railway, steamboat or other public conveyance ticket, other than a tram car or street car ticket, to an unregistered person after the time when the latter person should have registered, knowing such person to be unregistered; and any person in charge of any railway, steamboat or other public conveyance, except a tram car or street car, who permits any unregistered person to travel thereby after the time when he should have registered, knowing such person to be unregistered, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding $100.

Any landlord, proprietor, manager, clerk or employee of any hotel, public house, inn, tavern, club, restaurant or boarding house who knowingly permits any unregistered person required by these regulations to be registered, to board, lodge or be entertained at such hotel, public house, inn, tavern, club, restaurant or boarding house, after the time when such person should have registered, knowing such person to be unregistered, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding $100.

Every person who shall have registered shall at all times thereafter carry upon his person his registration certificate and shall produce it for inspection upon reasonable demand to any peace officer, police officer, or constable.

Any person who fails to produce his registration certificate without reasonable excuse shall be subject to a penalty of $20. Then, provision is made that a police officer may accost any person who is apparently of registration age. In case of default or misleading answers being given to any question which is submitted, there is a penalty of $500, and imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months. For a man who falsely represents himself as the holder of a certificate, not having registered, there is a penalty of $200, and imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months.

Furthermore, any person who afterwards marries or changes his place of residence, and who, without lawful excuse, fails within fourteen days to notify the central registrar of the date of his marriage, and of his place of residence, shall be guilty of an offence

The form of questionnaire makes provision for obtaining the information that is required by the Registration Board under such headings as name, nationality, age, physical disabilities, if any, number of children in the family, present occupation, length of experience in that occupation, and name of employer, if there is such. There are also questions to ascertain in what other line of activity the registrant would be useful if he left his present employment.

With this machinery it is confidently hoped that the Government will be put in possession of a record of the man and woman power of the country which is necessary to the further utilization of this power in the more essential industries; and for war effort. During the discussion this afternoon, many references were made to organized or union labour as such. Is it not possible that we should fall into the error of treating men as a class? General statements are apt to be misleading. I remember some time ago in connection with an investigation of conditions surrounding returned soldiers, visiting a plant in Montreal, where some 500 or 600 returned soldiers were employed. I asked the foreman of the shop, a most intelligent man, what had been his experience with the returned soldier as an employee. He said: "Come with me," and took me to a machine where a man was working with a great deal of dexterity, and said: "There is the best man in the whole shop; he is a returned soldier." There were perhaps two or three thousand employees in all. We went a little further, and he showed me a man working at another machine, and said: "There is the worst man in the whole shop; he is a returned soldier." So he had among one particular class of men at once the best man and the worst in the shop. From the employers' point of view I was clearly in error in suggesting any division by class alone. And it seems to me that in referring to unions as such, there is a danger of falling into a similar error. Neither labour unions, organized labour, or organized financial groups as such, can have any monopoly of patriotism. You find just as true a heart beating under the workman's jacket as under the frock coat of the employer, and, conversely, the same is true.

What has been done by Canada since the war began? In the matter of recruiting, who expected at the outbreak of war that we should have had upwards of 400,000 men coming forward voluntarily and joining the colours? Who, at that time, would have hazarded a prediction that after four years of war, Canada would have been able to float a loan of $400,000,000? The experience in the American Civil War and of Canada in this war, if it illustrates one thing more than another, illustrates that under stress of war conditions, with their stimulating effect upon the patriotism of the people, results can be achieved far beyond the standard of peace times.

So, may we not expect that, when the information is available, that this inventory of man power and woman power will yield, we can, even should we have to depend on the labour which is now in this country, further strengthen our war effort?

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a very strong sentiment prevailing throughout the Dominion that something should be done with the aliens in this country. This is indicated by the fact that we have already on the Order Paper notice of resolutions by three members of this House, and possibly three other members had it in mind to bring forward similar resolutions. This sentiment prevailing from the Atlantic to the Pacific is not only confined to members of this House, but the press of the country has strongly urged that some action should be taken.

The Prime Minister told us a few days ago that he had about completed a treaty with the United States whereby Canadians in that country and Americans in Canada can be conscripted, or some action taken whereby they can do their part. And the same will apply to Canadians in the United States. But the Prime Minister stated that it would take months, or possibly a year or two, before a treaty could be effected to take in the nations of Italy, France, Spain or Russia. We must have some immediate action along this line, as has been mentioned this afternoon. What do we find in the city of Toronto? In one section of that city, there are about 20,000 Macedonians and Bulgarians; in another section, about 25,000 Italians. There are about 35,000 Jews, about 5,000 Greeks, and about 4,000 Chinamen. Throughout the city there are 70,000 or 80,000 foreigners. I venture to say that perhaps fifty per cent of that population has not been naturalized. Is it fair that these people should remain here, and at the expense of our own boys who are left, earn the very large wages—from $5 to $10 a day—that they are making? I venture to say that there are many members of this House who do not know how these people live, or how they hoard their earnings. I

know that in some parts of the city, where I have had dealings with them, they earn very large wages and live on very little, perhaps fifteen or twenty-five cents a day. It takes two or three dollars a day to keep a Britisher, who spends his money furnishing his house and living on the best, keeping the factories going, and wearing good clothes. But what does the other class do? They wear the cheapest of clothes; they do not furnish or occupy houses as Britishers do, but herd together, perhaps ten or fifteen in a room, paying possibly, a dollar a week each to sleep in that room. They get their board very cheaply, and save the greater part of their earnings. As we know, the greater part of this population is not stable but floating. Why are there so many of them in Toronto? The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has explained that when you want to attract people you offer large wages. That is why so many have come to Toronto from all parts of the Dominion and outside of it. Thousands of these foreigners have been attracted to the city on account of the very large wages that are paid. To illustrate this situation: A few days ago an accident occurred to a foreigner, and when he was taken to the hospital the sum of $3,500 was found in his belt. In another case, $2,000 was found in the same way. In many cases we find that these people are comparatively rich, carrying large sums of money around. What have we done to get a share of that money paid back to the treasury of this country? We have not done anything. I think there should either be conscription of these people and part of their wages assigned, or that we should levy a war tax on what they earn. You would only have to levy a very small percentage upon their earnings to amount to millions of dollars. I venture to say that throughout this Dominion there will be 200,000 foreigners subject to war tax? If we levy a dollar a day upon these, it would run into millions of dollars, which would be easy revenue to the Dominion, and would come from a source where nobody would be materially affected, because these people earn large amounts and spend very little, and if times get better on the other side or in some other country they will float away. We have got nothing out of them, but they have done all they could to get money out of this country. Representations have been made to the Cabinet and to the Prime Minister by various portions of the Dominion that some action should be taken in this regard. Why should not we avail ourselves of this opportunity of increasing the revenues of the country, particularly when no serious hardship would result to anybody? In my district a man had to give up a splendid business, which has since been taken up by foreigners, among whose families may be found five or six husky young fellows whose services might well be devoted to securing some material benefit for the nation. But they are there, making a fortune, while our own men have been conscripted and taken away. Walking down one of the main streets of Toronto a few weeks ago I could not help thinking that it was difficult to tell whether I was in Italy, Jerusalem or Toronto—judging by the conversations of the people passing up and down the street. A few years ago a foreign voice was seldom heard in Toronto; to-day almost every second person you meet speaks a foreign language. I also noticed within three or four blocks thirty or forty husky foreigners, while very few of our own boys were to be seen. On the same day I met a lady who was much grieved that her boy, who on account of his delicate constitution had been brought up with a great deal of attention and care, had been conscripted, while hundreds of healthy, husky young foreigners were walking about, enjoying life and all that money could purchase. These young men earn large wages without any material hardship, because in the large factories, including many of the munition works, the strong, husky fellows are preferred to the more delicate or physically unfit. The Great War Veterans have taken this matter up and it seems to be becoming difficult to hold them under control and to prevent them from raiding some of the factories where so many foreigners are occupying important positions and earning much money, to the disadvantage of returned soldiers. It would appear that many of the manufacturers prefer the foreigners to the returned soldiers. Indeed, a few months ago a kind of raid was made on some factories; the men went in and took out foreigners who were working there. There have been many threats during the past week, and if some steps are not taken to deal with these alien enemies, I am afraid that trouble will develop. I should be very sorry to see it occur, but in this respect the responsibility rests upon the Government of endeavouring to solve the problem which confronts us. I do not say that I can solve it—indeed, I do not know that any of the members who have already spoken can solve it. I suggest that a special committee be named to go into the

matter and make a recommendation to the House. That is what the public are looking for. Before the session is over some action should be taken, or we may have trouble in some parts of the Dominion. The feeling is that while we should treat these people justly, it is not right that they should be earning a tremendous amount of money which may at any time go from this country into some other country, while our own boys are fighting overseas. I trust that, having regard to the discussion which has taken place, the Government will, before the session closes, take some action in the matter, and thus prevent anything unseemly that might occur against these alien enemies.

Mr. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose taking up much of the time of the House, because this subject has been very thoroughly threshed out. The present condition in British Columbia is very much like that which has been described by the previous speakers. A young man leaves to fight for his country, and his position is taken by a foreigner, who strikes, has his wages increased, and is able to live very much better than the relatives of the man who has gone to the front. As a result, conditions are becoming very acute. Last week a thousand men and women marched to the Government buildings in Victoria and presented their case, demanding that the alien labour question be immediately taken up and that some remedial legislation be adopted. I am informed that a similar demonstration took place in Vancouver last Saturday. It is the duty of the Government, in view of the conditions to thoroughly investigate the whole situation at the earliest possible moment, with a view to providing a remedy. Whether that remedy should be in the nature of conscription or by means of additional taxation, I am not prepared to say, but whatever the remedy, a thorough investigation should first be made. The feeling throughout the country is that, after four years of war, nothing entirely satisfactory has yet been done in this connection. The conditions have become more aggravated from time to time, and will continue to do unless some remedy is applied

I was much surprised at the remark of the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the glorious province of British Columbia. I can assure him that the people of British Columbia, as a whole, have the friendliest feeling towards the people of Quebec. The only argument we have with them is this: We have sent about 12 per cent of our man-power to the front to fight for our country, and we expect the province of Quebec and the other provinces of the Dominion of Canada to do their share. Hon. members on both sides of the House will admit that is only a fair request.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) spoke about British Columbia being bankrupt. That idea is ridiculous when one thinks of the wonderful natural resources of that province. The debt in comparison with those great natural resources is a mere bagatelle. I can assure my hon. friend that we shall not only take care of that debt, but continue to do our duty to the Mother country.

The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) referred to the Asiatic question. This is a live question with us. I was brought up in the province of British Columbia, and for forty years I have been able to study this question, and, in particular, the Chinese question. In one city in that province I have seen the Chinese begin with a single store, and they have gradually spread out until they have occupied several blocks. They are to-day in several lines of business. They practically control the truck farming business of the Coast. Asiatics control the fishing in the Fraser river. Two years ago they declared a strike, and they told the white fishermen when they should go on strike and when they were ready to return to work. That is a very unsatisfactory condition in a country under the British flag. In the Okanagan valley and in several other sections in the interior of the province they have gradually been getting a hold. There are several objections to Asiatic labour. The Asiatics will not assimilate with our people. They disorganize labour, being able to work more cheaply than the white man can afford to do. The Chinaman who works for you to-day is your competitor a year or two from now and will undersell you in your business. In this way we find them a class of competition that the white man cannot properly meet, while continuing to live under European conditions. It would, therefore, be the height of folly to suggest the introduction of 50,000 Chinamen at the present time. Before a question of that kind is even considered, we should do everything in our power to make available every bit of labour in this country. If the Government does finally decide, as a war measure, that it is of actual necessity that 50,000 Chinamen be brought into this country, they should be brought into Ontario

anything with the alien enemy. I have read a little international law, from the time of Erasmus down to that of Henry Ford, and I cannot find a single paragraph that says that we cannot intern the alien enemy, nor that we cannot compel him to work. I hold in my hand the "Manual of Military Law" issued by the British Government, and that manual sets forth the provisions of The Hague conventions which are referred to from time to time, but which nobody seems to be able to quote in this House. I have read the provisions of these conventions, and according to them you can, if necessary, conscript the alien enemy and compel him to work for you as long as you do not take away his personal property. The Hague convention, or conventions of war, consist of certain treaties and declarations. The first international convention relating to war is known as the Declaration of St. Petersburg of 1868, prohibiting the use in time of war of explosive projectiles under 400 grammes in weight. That is, explosive bullets. Then, the second are The Hague Declarations of 1899 respecting expanding bullets and the use of asphyxiating gases. We all know how the enemy has broken that convention, and how we have been compelled to break it also. The third is the Geneva Convention of 1906, which deals with Red Cross work, and has nothing to do with the question of prisoners or anything of that kind. It is unnecessary for me to quote that convention; everybody who takes an interest in Red Cross work knows what that means. Then, there is The Hague Convention of 1907. That is the one, no doubt, that everybody has referred to. A great many straw men have been set up in order to be knocked down, and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) put one up this afternoon. I asked him to name any clause in that convention that prevented us from conscripting alien enemies, but he could not refer to one for the reason that there was no much clause in the convention. People like my hon. friend from Maisonneuve are always talking about imaginary international law. The Hague Convention of 1907 provides first for what should be done upon the opening of hostilities. A declaration of war must ensue, and all that sort of thing. Then, second, there is a provision concerning the law and customs of war on land. That is pertinent to the very subject I am going to bring before the House. Paragraph 3 refers to the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in war on land. It alludes to the duties of neutrals, and it provides what is necessary for the welfare and safety of the State, a neutral may be taken prisoner and interned. He may be ordered to register and to carry on whatever business is required of him. So, you see there is nothing in this convention that prevents us from doing what has been suggested by the motions even to neutrals.

Another convention was made in 1907 respecting Bombardments by Naval Forces of Open Cities and Towns. We all know how faithfully the Germans have kept that treaty which bore the sign and seal of the Emperor. The Declaration of 1907 also prohibits the Discharge of Projectiles and Explosives from Balloons. That is another convention that has not been observed by the Germans. There is no convention that the enemy will not violate. He will poison the springs, use expanding or explosive bullets, and do everything or anything to destroy life and property.

Now, let us turn to what is dealt with under the heading of "Treatment of Resident Enemy Subjects." A chapter of this book is devoted to that question. Every soldier is familiar with this book. The members of the Great War Veterans Association are conversant with all that is contained in it. I carried it with me in the trenches. It is necessary for the soldiers to have it with them in order that they may study it and in order that they may know what should be the relationship of soldier to soldier and soldier to the enemy. I wish to put on record this authority on the Treatment of Resident Enemy Subjects. This book was written before the outbreak of war, and if anything, it would err on the side of leniency. At page 236 of the portion treating "The Laws and Usuages of War" it says:

TREATMENT OF RESIDENT ENEMY SUBJECTS.

(11.) According to the British view, the first consequence of the existence of a condition of war between two States is that every subject of the one State becomes an enemy to every subject of the other. For it is imposible to severe the subjects from their State, and the outbreak of war between two States cannot but make their subjects enemies. It is, however, a universally recognized rule of International Law that hostilities are restricted to the armed forces of the belligerents, and that the ordinary citizens of the contending states, who do not take up arms and who abstain from hostile acts, must be treated leniently, must not be injured in their lives or liberty, except for cause or after due trial, and must not as a rule be deprived of their private property.

It is thus no longer considered admissible to detain as prisoners subjects of one of the hostile parties travelling or resident in the

country of the other at the time of the outbreak of war.

(12) The view that such action was illegal except in grave emergency has steadily gained support. Article 5 of the Regulations annexed to the Convention, 1899, concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land, 1899, permitted the internment of prisoners of war, and it was contended at the Conference of 1907 that the terms of the article afforded a strong argument e contrario, that the internment of enemy subjects not prisoners of war was prohibited. No vote was taken on the point, but this interpretation of the article was generally accepted subject to the reservation of the right which every State undoubtedly possesses of taking such steps as it may seem necessary for the control of all persons whose presence or conduct appear dangerous to its safety.

13. This immunity, however, cannot apply to persons known to be active or reserve officers, or reservists, of the hostile army—for the principle of self-preservation must justify belligerents in refusing to furnish each other with resources that will increase their means of defence.

Men of the kind referred to by these resolutions are men of military age, reservists of the alien enemy.

14. The expulsion of subjects of the enemy from the territory of the opposing State is in strict law admissible, but is usually not resorted to unless grave reasons make it advisable.

15. Belligerents have in recent years always acted in obedience to this principle. Thus expulsion has been decreed from seaports, fortresses, and defended areas, where special precautions were necessary, and from the actual or expected theatres of hostilities.

16. Should the expulsion of any person be ordered he should be given such reasonable notice as may be consistent with public safety, in order to make arrangements for the custody of his property and preparations for his departure.

Now, that is the statement of the case by the British Government in their own Manual, and whilst they say there is a strong trend towards preventing the internment, and interfering with the liberty, of alien enemies, still at the same time it is stated distinctly there that at the Hague Convention no vote was taken on this subject. So the argument that international law interferes is quite contrary to the facts and to all international law. Let us see now what the Hague Convention says further—and I am going to read from the Regulation respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, with reference to prisoners of war, chapter 2:

Article 4. Prisoners of war are in the power of the hostile Government, but not of the individual or corps who capture them. They must be humanely treated.

All their personal belongings, except arms, horses, and military papers, remain their property.

[Mr. Currie.]

This is the article referred to in the selection from the Manual read by me and applies, as you note, to reservists.

Article 5. Prisoners of war may be interned in a town, fortress, camp, or other place, and are bound not to go beyond certain fixed limits; but they cannot be placed in confinement except as an indispensible measure of safety, and only while the circumstances which necessitate the measure continue to exist.

Article 6. The State may employ the labour of prisoners of war, other than officers, according to their rank and capacity. The work shall not be excessive, and shall have no connection with the operations of the war.

So that enemy reservists in this country, that is men of military age, can be conscripted by this state, and can be compelled to labour for the state at anything but munition work.

Prisoners may be authorized to work for the public service, for private persons, or on their own account.

Work done for the State is paid for at rates proportional to the work of a similar kind executed by soldiers of the national army, or, if there are no such rates in force, at rates proportional to the work executed.

When the work is for other branches of the public service, or for private persons, the conditions are settled in agreement with the military authorities.

So that, the State has absolute control to fix the wages even of these men who are alien enemy reservists.

The wages of the prisoners shall go towards improving their position, and the balance shall be paid them on their release, deductions on account of the cost of maintenance excepted.

Article 7. The government into whose hands the prisoners of war have fallen, is charged with their maintenance.

In default of special agreement between the belligerents, prisoners of war shall be treated, as regard rations, quarters and clothing, on the same footing as the troops of the Government which captured them.

Article 8. Prisoners of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders in force in the army of the State in the power of which they are. Any act of insubordination justifies the adoption towards them of such measures of severity as may be considered necessary.

Then it goes on to deal with other matters of this kind. So, you see, Mr. Speaker, as far as the question is concerned in its reference to alien enemies of military age, there is no doubt in the world of our perfect right to deal with them as prisoners of war. There is no convention or regulation to the contrary. And I might say further that the Emperor of Germany has added his signature to this convention. I might say that these conventions are plain, ordinary worded matters of treaty, and any man of ordinary intelligence can read and understand them. Any of my

friends who speak the French language, and who are not well versed in English, will find the French version parallel with the English in this volume. I think I have proved conclusively that we have a perfect right, as far as international law is concerned, to register all alien enemies, to even intern them, or make them prisoners of war, and that in so doing we are not contravening any of the Hague conventions. When this war broke out, we commenced to register these people, and a great many have been registered. A large number of them are good, honest men, Bohemians, Galicians, and men from the outlying provinces of Germany and Austria, who are doing good work in this country, going weekly to the registrar's, and giving notice to the police of their presence, and, on the whole, behaving themselves like respected citizens. Many are working in munition factories. If they should ever have to go back to their own country, God help them, because in doing that they are contravening the laws of their own country and rendering themselves liable to trial by court martial, with all that that involves. However, the question, as far as they are concerned, to my mind, is settled by the Hague convention, and there is no reason why the Government should not take action. Shortly before the election there was a feeling that in certain sections of this country these men were not registered. They were not registered in Waterloo county, and there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in my province because the law has not been carried out as strictly as it should have been, in Waterloo, and I regret very much I should have to bring this matter up in the House at the present moment, because nothing has even been done in that regard since the election. There has been no attempt to organize this country as a military power, because after all Canada is the greatest of the secondary military powers, as all the other small nationalities have dropped out. We must recognize that the British Empire and the Allies regard Canada and its army as a separate identity, the glorious action of our men on various fields having stamped us distinctly as a nationality of our own, quite capable of taking our place in the sun with any other nation, even the great German Empire.

Now, such being the case, the splendid discipline of our people at home is evident. They have sat for four years here without hardly raising a word of complaint on account of the lack of organization at home and the lack of any organized effort to carry on our industries after the war. Even within recent days, when it is proposed to take the son of the widow, nineteen years of age, from the handles of the plough and put him in uniform, there is no complaint, even while there are 35,000 exemptions in Quebec still going through the courts, which no doubt, will not, perhaps, be reviewed or disposed of until about the time that this war has ended. The people are quite conversant with these matters; they are not quite so dull as some may think they are. They know very well that this Order in Council is intended to get a number of new men very quickly, but that it does not at all heal the differences that exist with regard to the men in Quebec who are over the age of 23.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I hope the hon. gentleman will not——

Mr. CURRIE: I am not going any further with that subject, Mr. Speaker. I have said enough. With regard to the matter of labour unions, hon. gentlemen have dealt with this question very ably and I do not think I can add to what they have said. I wish, however, to refer to one special class of labour which aliens in Toronto have entirely taken to themselves; I refer to needle work. Enemy aliens have gone into the clothing factories in Toronto, organized labour unions of their own, taken possession of these factories so far as the clothing business is concerned, and driven English and Canadian women entirely out of employment. No Canadian women can get employment in these factories dominated by foreigners. Take the case of a woman whose son or husband has fallen on the battlefield and who desires to add to her little pension; or the case of a sister of a soldier who has fallen. It is very hard for such women, who have been earning their living by doing needle work, to see husky Austro-Germans or Russians employed in these factories, sewing women's petticoats. Thousands of them are so employed in Toronto; the Government should conscript these aliens and make regulations as what employment they shall engage in. We ask these women to go to the land and produce. Hundreds of delicate girls of university education went out last year and worked in the fields in Grimsby, Hamilton, and elsewhere in Canada, helping to produce food, responding as best they could to the call of the Crown. This year they are further organized. In my own riding local organizations have been established in every municipality known as Greater Produc-

tion Associations. All men and women in the respective municipalities belong to these associations, and they have taken a pledge that this year they will produce enough food to keep themselves and, if possible, to add to the Allied stores. The spirit of the people in that regard is splendid. But if we pass a regulation providing that alien enemies shall not be employed at occupations in which women can be employed, at least 25,000 able-bodied men will be released in Toronto alone and can be put to work on the farms of Ontario. In this way the labour problem would be partly solved—and the same would apply in the West and all over the country.

There are labour unions and labour unions. The members of such unions as the locomotive engineers, firemen's and trainmen's, and the like, are splendid citizens, loyal and true at heart, who work day after day and night after night with no rest and very little sleep, trying to do their duty to their country and to get the munitions to the seaboard. Other tradesmen, the shipbuilders and printers, too, are doing their best. But some labour unions have sprung up which consist almost entirely of agitators and with the foreign element as a backing and chief among them are unions connected with the great industry of mining. Sir, we have in Cobalt mines that are capable of producing enough minerals annually to pay all the expenses of the war and to pay our trade balances with other nations in gold. But we find that before the war was taken up by our Allies to the south, foreign agitators came from that country, entered these mines, and demanded such high rates of pay for the alien miners that most of the mines were crippled, and many were compelled to close down, not so much because the owners —who, in the great majority of cases, are loyal men—were not desirous of making big money, as because the workers demanded such high wages that the mines could be operated only at a loss. The result is that the minerals are not produced. I submit that the Government should take some action in this matter, not only with reference to the coal, but with reference to the gold and silver. As the Minister of Agriculture knows, wheat has been refused in exchange for our trade balance, but there is one thing that no nation will refuse to take or can, under the Hague Convention, or having regard to international usage, refuse to take, payment of their trade balance in gold. The efforts of the Government should, therefore, be directed to seeing that our gold and silver mines are operated to their full capacity, not standing still as many of them are to-day. If the owners do not operate them, then let the state operate them, as has been done in Australia and South Africa.

These foreigners who constitute the members of the labour unions to which I have referred are represented by very clever English-speaking talkers who come here, and who belong to what are known as the International Socialists Society. They speak in the name of labour; they do not want the foreigner conscripted, because they are sent here financed by the alien enemy, to talk thus to the Government. These foreign socialists think that the only great people in the world are the now Russian government, who have so greatly injured the cause of the Allies. They speak openly of socialism and revolution, but they are not interned; many of them have not done an honest day's work in years and have had nothing at all to do with labour in the true sense. Many of these organizations in Toronto and in other centres are purely Socialistic organizations, have no connection with true labour, and should not be listened to as the voice of labour. The true labour of this country, represented as it is by thousands of men in the trenches, is loyal and willing to do its share in this war; you never hear a complaint from them. I submit that during the war no man who is an alien enemy or a neutral alien should be permitted to join any association or organization that has to do with the military actions or industrial life of the country. That would stop a lot of the kicking about aliens. I do not believe that Canadian labour unions composed of Canadians are raising any objection to the conscription of aliens.

The registration of man power has been referred to by the member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy). I wish to refer to another registration which took place in this country. Two or three years ago the people were crying out for national service; they wanted the Government to organize such a system of national service as prevails in France, where every man, woman and child in the State must do his or her duty to the State. But in this country we always take half measures—half measures are what you can expect from an irresolute people. We had a registration which cost the country half a million dollars—the money might much better have been given to the widows and orphans. It is true that there is a card

system to which we may refer for information, I suppose, but there was no real registration under that system. I listened very carefully to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCurdy) said about the further registration system which is proposed, but to my mind the people of the country are now saying that this registration business is nothing but camouflage—is that it is an attempt on the part of the Government to deceive the people into thinking that they are doing something, and they never intend getting anywhere with it. What is a real registration? There is a registration in Belgium, and, I think, in a number of European countries. The system of registration there is that, when a man becomes of a certain age, he has to go to the mayor of the city and register himself, and then he gets his papers. He cannot move out of his municipality unless he goes to the mayor and states what he is going to do, and gets a paper, or passport. By that method and form of registration, they have almost abolished such refined artists as we have in this country, such as burglar, because if a man is found outside of his own limits, unless that stranger goes and registers at the office of the gendarme, or the police, or the mayor, he is immediately arrested, it does not matter whether he is a Lord, a Duke, or what he is. The foundation of the registration of the man-power and woman-power, as well as the alien enemy, in this country should be in that form. What is the use of building pyramids on their ends? They will only topple over. If you are going to have a registration, instead of an Order in Council, for Heaven's sake, let us have a law. This Parliament is quite prepared to discuss a Registration Bill, consider it clause by clause, and pass it. Not only is this Parliament a very old institution, but it follows in its act the Mother of Parliaments, and Parliaments act in a certain way; they move just like the planets. Parliaments were organized and ordained hundreds of years ago that all laws should be brought in to the Table of the Clerk; that those laws should be read three times on three separate days and discussed. Since the days of Henry VIII, it has been the regulation, that on three separate days the law has to be read, argued and discussed, so that there should be mature judgment, discussion and action.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: I knew I would be kept close to the line. I am arguing for the very subject named in the resolution, I am taking exception to the Orders in Council and regulations to which reference has been made in the resolution and by the hon. member. I say, as a member of Parliament, that it is quite contrary to precedent to establish regulations of this kind by Order in Council, when the matter should be referred to and could well be dealt with by this House, after which it would become statute law of the land.

I again repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that the great majority of the people of this country, 90 per cent of them, are opposed to this form of legislation. The manhood and womanhood of this country are prepared to do their duty. The Government has only been moving behind the time. There are throughout the country hundreds and thousands of organizations that are doing exactly what the Government proposes they should do—encouraging production. A number of young men are going to be taken away. Their places have to be filled by somebody. We should register the alien, ascertain what he is doing and put him under Government control. Then the Government can take him out of employment in which women or old men could be engaged, and put him where necessary. That is the object of this discussion, and that is what the members of the Great War Veterans Associations require.

I have nothing to say about the men from Quebec. They have a perfect right to go to British Columbia, or Ontario, or any other part of the country in which they can find employment with sufficient remuneration for their labour. The people of Ontario, the mothers, sisters and daughters of the men at the front, resent, to some extent, the stranger coming in and taking the place of the men who have gone overseas, but somebody must do the work, and I take no objection even to the alien enemy accepting any position in the country which he is capable of filling, as long as he takes it with the knowledge and under the regulation of the Government, so that we may know where we are going and what we are about. The English-speaking women in the large cities, such as the city of Toronto, and certain sections of this city, are becoming alarmed, afraid. I have received a great number of letters, not only from men but from women saying that they are beginning to be terrorized by conditions as they exist at present, because we have not placed the foreigners under any control. For that reason I say it is the immediate duty of this

Government, before it commences the registration of the man-power of this country, to proceed to the registration of the enemy alien; to open books in every municipality in this country, to see that he has fourteen or twenty days in which to register himself, to give him his papers, and then to have a duplicate of those papers sent down here so that we shall know exactly what employment he is in and whether or not we can place others in his employment. In the old country, what is the condition of the exemption law? It is not that a man is exempted because he is a farmer, or for a certain period of time during the war because he is in a certain occupation; the question is: Can this man's place be taken by somebody who is not of military age, or can his place be taken by a woman? We are not really in this war until we realize that is the rule that should govern us. Moreover, it is only right that in the promulgation of these regulations which are going to take our young men, exception should be made that the young men of nineteen, twenty and twenty-one years of age who are the only sons of widows, and especially those who are farmers, should not be taken and dragged from their homes to go to the war, leaving the work of operating the farm to the women. I do not hesitate to say that, because all the militia laws and conscription laws of the world say that the only son of a widow must be exempted. That is the French law, and it is a grand law. The Spanish law, the Prussian law, the Russian law, all make that exception. I do not think we would make any error or mistake in adopting the same principle. I have given my views on the subject. I am only voicing the sentiments of a very large element in this country—the female element and the element of the men who have gone to the war and who have returned.

Reference to the employment of the returned soldier has been made by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) who is a Parliamentary Secretary in one of the departments, and virtually a member of the Government, and surely I can speak in regard to that matter. I want hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that, with very few exceptions, the soldiers who have returned are men who have been wounded, men who have been very ill, or men who are over age and who have done their share in the war. In many cases, their efficiency is not one hundred per cent, although the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has said it should be one

hundred per cent. Their efficiency may not be that, and it takes quite a little while for their nerves and actions to become normal. The people of Canada are great and big enough and have enough common sense to realize that and to know that too much cannot be expected of those men at once.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to be interpreted as having said that I feel that the returned soldiers when they return to work should bring their labour efficiency up to one hundred per cent.

Mr. CURRIE: I am very sorry I mistook what the hon. member said. I thought it was a slam at the returned soldier.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I have tried to make it very clear that I am not going to take off my hat to any man in this House in my admiration of the work the soldier who has returned or the soldier who has not returned is doing, and I do not think it is fair I should be referred to in that way.

Mr. CURRIE: I take back any reference I made to that subject. I know very well that very few of the men who have returned are capable of giving 95 or even 65 per cent efficiency, but 80 per cent of the men who will return from the trenches as, I hope, victors, will be the finest specimens of manhood this country has ever seen. They will bring a new influence, not only into the industries of this country, but into our national life. As men who have undergone army discipline, they will place discipline in our factories and industries such as we have never had before, and they will be capable of organizing and directing our various industries. For that reason I say that we who remain at home with our eye on the battlefield waiting anxiously for the moment when victory and the end of the war shall come to us, must act here to-day as if we were putting ourselves in the place of those men in the trenches, and we must ask ourselves the question as we would ask one of them: What shall we do with the alien here? Every returned soldier to whom I have spoken has said without any hesitation: Conscript them. The Germans have interned every one of our men. I am in receipt of letters that I could not possibly read in this House from men who are prisoners of war in Germany. They have not been treated by any means according to the Hague Convention.

Everybody knows that we have to send them food, yet by the Hague Convention these men should be furnished by Germany

with food similar to the food their prisoners receive from us. I think the time has come when the Government will have to take steps in this direction, and what is the use of hesitating or pussy-footing? What is the element behind or in the Government that is preventing them from taking this patriotic action? I cannot conceive of any step the Government might take that would be more popular with the people of this country than to register all aliens in the country, and appoint a Board of some kind to supervise them and see that they are properly employed. Then our great national works, our coal mines, and our farms, would not be standing idle for lack of men so long as there was sufficient man power in the country, whether native or alien.

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, that we have had trouble with the alien enemy and foreigner within our gates goes without saying, but everybody has been beating about the bush instead of going directly to the point. If a man comes to me with a pain in his side or some other ailment, my first idea is to find out what is wrong, and then suggest a cure. The foreigner is not so much to blame for this trouble as our own people. It is a very sad fact that very few people, not only foreigners but men in every walk of life, can meet with but a small measure of success without having their heads turned. That, of course, applies to the foreigner also. When war broke out I had the honour of being medical officer to the 106th Regiment of Winnipeg, and I had hundreds of applications from these men whom we now call foreigners, to enlist. They were the first men to come into the recruiting office, but through the orders of the G. O. C. for the district we hesitated to take them lest they might be spies, or at all events not turn out satisfactorily when they got to the front. We were asked for 500 men from our regiment, and we took 685 to Valcartier, and I am satisfied we could have taken a full regiment if we had been able to enlist men of alien birth. But now matters have changed; these men have been receiving good wages, they have taken the place of our boys, and are enjoying prosperity such as they never knew before; they have achieved a great measure of success and many of them have gained a competency. But that is not the only thing that has put them wrong. We have also to take into account the English-speaking so-called leaders of labour. Hon. gentlemen will all remember the time when, for whatever reason, the price of grain on the Winnipeg market went over three dollars a bushel. Three men at least that I could name in Winnipeg—so-called leaders and directors of trade unions—went down among these aliens and said: "Look at the tremendous price farmers are going to get for their wheat. Do not think of working for them unless you get five dollars a day during the harvest," and that disrupted the whole labour situation. We ought to have more stringent laws for dealing with seditious utterances such as these men have made. One of these men I had the honour of defeating in the last election; he has been converted since and is now in khaki; but the other two are still at it, though a little bit more quietly than they used to be. I think it is high time the Government took these men in hand at once; it would certainly relieve the situation for Manitoba. These aliens are open to persuasion. The I. W. W. may have worked some influence among them—probably in the way of German propaganda—but they are docile at heart. I have the honour of representing probably the most cosmopolitan constituency in this Dominion, for in Winnipeg North thirty-seven languages are spoken. I know these aliens well; they may fight among themselves, and many a head I have had to sew up, but they are not given to pursuing any aggressive policy against the English-speaking people who have been in this country for years; they are very amenable to argument and to direction, and have great respect for the law; they can easily have the fear put into them, and if these labour leaders who have set them wrong were put down for two or three years, or until the termination of the war, they would soon come right.

With regard to the curtailment of unnecessary industry, sixty per cent of the wheat in southern Manitoba is in the ground to-day; in probably three weeks more it will all be sown, and in ninety days more, which is the usual time from seeding to harvest, the fields will be ripe. There is therefore plenty of time for the Government to give careful consideration to what the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) has said with regard to curtailing unessential industries. If these industries were closed down on July 31 that would give two weeks before harvest, which usually comes about the middle of August, for the men thrown out of work to rush to the farms and save the crops. We have heard all over this country talk of conscripting these men, and it comes mostly from people who have given very little thought to the subject and have little foreseen the

consequences of enforcing conscription among the foreigners. If these men were conscripted to the farms we have no means of making them do a reasonably good day's work. It is an old saying that a volunteer is worth two pressed men, and these men would undoubtedly take life very leisurely unless we had some way of keeping them on the go. If some one suggests that a returned soldier be sent to look after one or two men, there are very few farmers who want to be bothered with three men to do the work of two. It is an impossibility to conscript these foreigners to the farms, as far as the West is concerned, and it is for the West I am speaking; only on farms where they could be used in vast numbers would the scheme be practicable at all.

I have said that these labour leaders were of English-speaking origin, and I think that applies not only to the leaders of farm labour but to the labourers in mines as well. There are two main things to which our attention should be directed, and they are food and men. I believe that the men will not be got by the application of conscription to the foreigners, but I think our system in Winnipeg of registering alien enemies is a fairly complete one; I do not think there are many alien enemies living around Winnipeg who have not registered at the district registration office. That is not the whole number though. I have no doubt that those who are alien enemies are being looked after, and that there will be no trouble, by means of a registration system properly pursued, in getting every man and woman in this country registered.

The member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Andrews) has said he has had the pleasure of seeing France and England awaken, and I hope he is going to have the pleasure of seeing Canada awaken shortly. He has said that if the contemplated measures are put through we shall double our production by proper organization. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that such are the facts, and that by closing non-essential industries it will be possible to send many men to work on the land. It has been said that of the men who will come under this draft, aged from nineteen to twenty-two, sixty per cent will be physically unfit. That does not give any very alarming figures, when we think of the possibilities in connection with the cultivation of the land, as well as development along other lines, by registration, by direction and by proper organization. To turn men into channels which will produce the necessary food supplies is, to my mind, as essential almost, if not quite so important, as to secure the men.

Mr. T. HAY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I know the House is getting tired listening to this discussion, but it may be profitable in the end to pursue it a little further, and as I come from a constituency where there are a great number of foreigners I may, perhaps, be pardoned if I say a word.

I wish to state, first of all, that I have listened to the discussion that has so far taken place with pleasure, with interest and with profit, although I do not agree with all that has been said upon the subject. In the first place, I do not think it will be advisable to close up what we call non-essential industries, because the result would be, if that were done at the present time, to throw a great number of people out of employment that could not be utilized in any other capacity. To close up such industries would not only result in injustice to a great number of people, but would fail in achieving the desired object. The closing up of non-essential industries will not accomplish anything in the way of production at this time, and yet I suppose the object of taking such a course would be to compel the men now employed in those industries to go on the farm. Now a great many of these men that would thus lose their occupations, in the first place, would not and could not make good on the farms in Manitoba. In the second place, their labour would be lost, and any help they might have yielded from an industrial point of view would be lost by their being thrown out of employment. In my belief such a policy would not work in the interest of the country at this time. We must bear in mind that there is a period of reorganization coming, and if we dislocate the prevailing conditions by any such drastic method as has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen it will simply mean that we will have to reorganize later on in order to help the industries that would thereby be crippled to become properly and thoroughly established again. I feel that the Government is moving along right lines in obtaining a registration of the man-power and women-power of Canada. I am satisfied that through this means we will be better able to adjust labour and other conditions than by any other method, and we shall then know exactly where to lay our hands on the men needed for the different departments of agriculture and labour. Besides, in this way, we shall un-

doubtedly be in a far better position to deal with this question later on.

I want to say a word for the farmer before I close, or the alien enemy as he is called. There are a great many aliens in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and in the constituencies surrounding Winnipeg, and we can hardly call these people alien enemies because they are naturalized British subjects at this time. A great many of them are making good, and are now doing a great work in the interest of the empire; we do not want to forget that. These men are producers of food on a large scale, which is one of the things we want to see carried out at the present time. Furthermore, I desire to point out that we invited many of these people to come to this country to help us in building our railroads, and to help in solving the labour problem in Canada. We have been glad to have these foreigners here, and we want to show some consideration for them when they came here on our invitation. We should realize that they have done and are doing work that is in the interest of Canada. There is no shortage of labour perhaps at the present moment, but I desire to point out that from this out labour will be required in the upkeep and maintenance of our railroads, and we know that our railroads—and I believe in particular those that the Government are interested in—are in very bad shape at this time. We will need thousands of labouring men in this country to put our railroads into the shape in which we will be able to successfully handle the 1918 crop. We must utilize this class of labour for that purpose, and the Government should see that that labour is available when it is needed.

One word with reference to interned aliens. In my humble opinion, the men that are in detention camps at this time, the men that are disloyal to this country and are alien enemies in the true sense of the term, should, when peace is declared and we have won the victory for which we are now fighting, be deported by the Government to their own country.

The question dealt with by the resolution is a big one. It is one which will take considerable thought in order to solve the many problems connected with it arising out of labour conditions, and I hope that it will be thoroughly and efficiently dealt with in the best interests of the country.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Westminster District): It has been said that the resolutions before the House present one of the most difficult problems that the Government and Parliament will have to deal with. Perhaps I might say that, in my humble opinion, it is the most difficult of all. I consider that it is easier to present and adopt the resolutions which passed the House last Friday than to digest and settle this big labour question, which is perhaps the greatest problem before the people and Government of Canada to-day. There are four resolutions, I think, before the House. I shall not attempt to speak with regard to all of them, but will merely offer a word or two concerning the first. Coming also from a province where the situation is most acute regarding Chinese labour, I do not think that the men in Eastern Canada can properly appreciate the great difficulties arising from that situation as it obtains to-day in British Columbia.

A man must go there and live for some years and then he will be convinced of the seriousness of the situation in regard to the question of Chinese labour. I sincerely hope that there will be no further importation of Chinese labour into that country for some time to come. Probably members of this House do not know that in certain cases the Chinese themselves are beginning to be landlords and that in some cases they engage native labour. The morals resulting therefrom cannot be discussed here to-night. I come to the resolution presented by my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson):

> That, in the opinion of this House, the marked shortage of labour for agricultural and industrial purposes in all parts of the country provides ample justification for the introduction of a complete and comprehensive system of compulsory registration and direction of the country's man-power.

As I understand it, the registration clause of the resolution has been provided for, I take it amply provided for, and that perhaps need not be further discussed. But, in regard to the last five words, "direction of the country's man-power," it seems to me that the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis), given as No. 29 on the Order Paper, is the solution of the problem, or helps at any rate to accomplish the result aimed at. It reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the maintenance and increase of production of foodstuffs and war material requires national control and direction of the capital and labour of the people, in order that non-essential business may be curtailed and our wealth and work directed to serving the state.

It is quite evident that such a proposition as that, in order to be considered at all.

must rest upon some very serious national condition, and I need not detain the House at this hour to explain that the serious condition exists. We all know that. We all admit that. We went into this war, and we went into it from the sound conviction that it was based on justice and righteousness. In other words, we believe in the legitimacy, righteousness and necessity of our part in the war. Granting that position, I claim that everything else necessarily follows. I believe, Sir, that following the adoption of that premise, the dedication of the resources of the nation to the achievement of the object follows as a matter of course. I believe that everything that this nation possesses, every resource of manpower of material wealth at its command must in the last analysis be consecrated to adoption of the principle underlying the declaration of war. If that be so, and I do not suppose there is any disposition to dispute it, there should be no division in this House upon one side or the other. We are agreed, I take it, that although we may have differed in the past as to methods and as to the manner of approaching this subject, to-night, when we are facing the situation as it is on the continent of Europe, we are agreed upon the fact that we must unite. In order to unite, in order to make this a reality, I hang my hope upon a sentence uttered by the right hon. the Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden—"Industries essential to the winning of the war." I believe that phrase has been used also by other members of the Government. If that be done, then there must be, as I believe there will be, consideration given by the Government to the question involved in resolution number 29. Is there any man here who believes that all the industries carried on in Canada to-day are essential to the winning of the war?

The term used in the "loafer" law is "useful" but I do not think that is strong enough. There may be a great many useful industries in time of peace which are not essential to the winning of the war, and these are the industries which should be in some measure curtailed. I think we should curtail certain industries and thereby release a large number of men who could devote their energies to the prosecution of industries that are essential. It may mean a good deal of inconvenience, some rearrangement—perhaps a great deal—but suppose it does, are we not all inconvenienced, and have we not suffered more than can be expressed from all the inconveniences and losses during the course of this war? Nothing should stand in the way of setting aside certain industries with the view of releasing men, capital, and the resources of the country for the prosecution of such industries as are essential, more especially agricultural production, the making of munitions, and the manufacture of certain commodities for the clothing and feeding of civilians and soldiers. I claim that we should set aside the production of things that we can do without. Let me read a letter that just came to hand during the last few days and which is written by an ex-member of one of the provincial legislatures. It reads:

> During the last six days I have had no less than eight men here trying to sell oil and book my fall supply of gasolene. These men are not only wasting their own time, from a productive standpoint, but are wasting gas and oil and adding very materially to the cost of the very article which we must use, to produce more food with. I will venture to say that oil could be sold for at least ten cents a gallon less in the companies were all forced to take these men off the road. Gasolene and fuel oil could also be reduced from three to five cents per gallon. And surely in this hour when our nation is in such terrible straits for food as well as men, for all kinds of productive work, that these men could be better employed.
>
> I might say that at least three of these men were under 35 years of age. We are also deluged to death with machine men. All this must add to the cost of these articles and thus place a greater burden on the producing class, which is already heavily burdened.
>
> I think that as an addition to the Order in Council compelling all men to be usefully employed, that you should place some of these things as non-essential and thus drive the thin edge of the wedge to wipe this curse forever off the map.

That is the opinion and judgment of a man who is not in the House, who has not heard this discussion, and knows nothing of what has been going on here to-day. In regard to the alien question, I would only say that I do not see that it is wise or possible to conscript the alien for individual service. It may be advisable and possible to do so for national service, but it seems to me that there are great difficulties, indeed, grave difficulties, in the way of compelling an alien to work for an individual. It would take man for man to keep him at it. I am hoping that when we do know the mind of the Government on this question there may be such financial provision made that will apply to all men, perhaps in the way of a tax, perhaps in some other way, but formulated in some manner that will compel every man in this country to contribute his full quota towards the salvation of the country and the prosecution of the war. And I am prepared to give the

Government every chance to work out such a scheme and not embarrass them unnecessarily. We have not yet heard from the Government as to their policy on this question, but I am disposed to believe that from the members thereof there will come such a solution as will satisfy the House and the country. Further, I may add that in my judgment it will be a very difficult thing, Sir, for the Government to introduce any legislation that in the opinion either of this House or the country at large will be too drastic. I think it will be a difficult thing for them, when we are facing the situation that obtains to-day, to introduce any legislation that, from one ocean to the other, will be regarded as too drastic. We are one, and whatever difficulties or differences may have divided us in the past, I claim, Sir, they should not separate us in the future, and I trust that there will be, growing out of this discussion, and out of the spirit which prevails among true Canadians, a better spirit of unity and harmony than has been manifest in the past in certain sessions of this House.

May I be permitted to say one thing more? I have in my constituency one district composed almost entirely of French Canadians. Let me say that during the campaign I received from no audience a better hearing than was given to me by that body—or as we call them in the West "bunch"—of French Canadians.

An hon. MEMBER: How did they vote?

Mr. STACEY: I will tell you how they voted. It may be a little out of order, but the question has been asked, and if you will allow I shall answer it. They told me, before going to see them, that it was not much use for me to go there. They said: "Stacey, they are going to beat you by a hundred." "All right," I said, "I will go and see them anyway, I won't hurt them; I will go and see them and talk to them." I did so to the best of my humble ability. And, behold, Sir, when the returns came in the majority against me was not 100, but only 38. So, if we get more of them in the West, perhaps we shall have a somewhat similar result. Leaving all jokes aside—and I may be pardoned for speaking earnestly on this question, for I have a reason for doing so—I sincerely hope that no man on either side of the House will in the future utter what in his after moments he may be led to regret, and compelled to say before he goes to sleep at night: "I wish I had not said that."

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all realize that we have had an afternoon and evening which has added a great deal to our stock of information, at all events as regards the interest which is taken in this question of alien labour, more particularly of alien enemy labour, and the treatment of the alien enemy, by those who are represented by the hon. members who have spoken; and perhaps, most of all we have learned what a variety of opinion may be entertained with regard to this highly important subject. We have had suggestions that are valuable. We have had some that, perhaps, at first glance, look more catchy and attractive than they may prove to be practicable and feasible. But, upon the whole, I am satisfied that the Government will certainly be glad to give in all earnestness its serious consideration to the different views that have been put before us and to look at them, and into them, sympathetically, having before it the same purpose that, I am sure, has inspired the hon. members who brought these different resolutions before the House and those who, from one point of view or another, have spoken upon them.

I do not desire to detain the House at any length, but I do think that it is worth while, in view of the apparent lack of knowledge on the part of quite a few hon. members who have spoken, of what has been done with regard to the control of the alien enemy in this country, that I should, for a few moments, point out some of the outstanding, leading and principal things that have been done in that connection. I venture to say that it is a mistake to assume that the Government since the outbreak of this war has been oblivious of the existence of the alien enemy in this country, and has been blind to the necessity of taking such steps and such measures in the way of precaution as circumstances might indicate to be necessary.

Let me recall to hon. members that at the outset of the war the Government took a position with regard to the presence of the alien enemy nationality within the country. We had an option at that time. It was open to us if we had thought, and those responsible for the Government of the United Kingdom and the general direction of the policy as towards foreign nations had thought, that it was in the interests of this country to seek to expel the persons of enemy alien nationality, I think it would have been quite within our right to take that course.

I think, too, that it would have been, and is to-day, within our right to intern the persons of enemy alien nationality within this country, more particularly, perhaps, those of them who being of military age and under obligation to do service according to the laws of their respective countries, might very properly be treated as persons that this State has an interest to see did not get away from this country and return possibly to perform those obligations towards their respective countries and take part in this war against us. Now, at the outset of this war, we took the position, not only that we would allow these people to remain within the country, but I might say at the suggestion—and I might even say upon the insistence—of the authorities of the Mother Country we took the position that these people, those of them at all events who were of military age, should not be allowed to leave this country. And, taking that position, not only consenting that they should remain but actually preventing their departure, we felt bound, under these circumstances, so long as they violated no law of this country, so long as they behaved themselves as good citizens within this country, to extend to them the protection of the law. We announced that to them. We announced to them at the same time that those of them who by act or word showed a spirit of hostility to this country, or who did not conform to the laws of this country, would be interned. And large numbers were interned.

Sir SAM HUGHES: For cause.

Mr. DOHERTY: Some of them for cause. Quite a number of them were interned more largely under the inspiration of the sentiment of compassion, if I may use the expression, than because of hostility. At that time, when the labour market was glutted and there was a natural disposition to give the preference in the matter of employment to our own people, thousands of these aliens were starving in some of our cities. There were thousands of them in Montreal, great numbers of them in Winnipeg, large numbers in Port Arthur. In many instances we interned these people because we felt that, saying to them, "You shall not leave the country," we were not entitled to say, "You shall starve within the country." However that may be, a considerable number for cause, and an additional number for the reasons which I have given, were interned, until at one time we had some seven or eight thousand interned aliens. So that we were not

[Mr. Doherty.]

oblivious of the existence of aliens in this country, nor absolutely inactive with regard to looking after them.

Very shortly after the outbreak of war we established a very general system of registration. We established registration offices in the places throughout the country where there were considerable numbers of persons of alien enemy nationality. We summoned them to register—at Montreal, Sydney, Toronto, Winnipeg and cities throughout the West; among them, I think, two cities of British Columbia. We called for a general registration of persons of alien enemy nationality, and that registration was very thorough and very complete. But there came a time when the persons of alien enemy nationality were registered, and when the work was completed there remained only the task of supervising the reporting of those who had registered. We found that with one or two exceptions the work could be done as effectively through the police officers in the different localities, and we did not feel justified in keeping up offices and large staffs wholly for the purpose of taking these reports. Up to the present day, by the police officers in different parts of the country, under the supervision and direction of the Chief Commissioner of Police, track is kept of the alien enemies. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) referred to the county of Waterloo as a place where there had been no registration office. It is quite true that we did not have a registration office there, but the Chief Commissioner of Dominion Police appointed a representative to gather the necessary information with regard to persons of alien enemy nationality in that district and to take proceedings wherever that might be necessary. People who are familiar with the conditions in that county will, perhaps, see why we did not consider it necessary to establish a registration office there. The great bulk of the people of alien enemy nationality within that county were not people such as you have to deal with in the western provinces, or in the cities of Montreal, Toronto, and other places—that is, recently arrived immigrants. They were, in large volume—the bulk of them, I think—people who had resided there for many years, who were located on farms, established there, known to everybody. The purpose of registration is to acquire information about people, and when you are dealing with an old, settled community, where information with regard to everybody is easily procurable, there is not the same need

to call for registration as there is when you are dealing with a floating or unknown population. However, whether we were mistaken in that particular—

Mr. CURRIE: Were there not many alien enemies in Waterloo of recent arrival? I understand that about twenty-five per cent of them had come to the country only within the last ten or fifteen years. I agree that a large number of them were old-timers, but were those registered who were of recent arrival?

Mr. DOHERTY: We did not establish a registration office in that particular county, but we did establish a system by which we were able to keep track of the alien enemy population there, just as throughout the rest of the country. It is well that we should have the suggestions which hon. gentlemen have thrown out as to what we might do that might be better; on the other hand, it is well also that hon. members should know that we have not been absolutely doing nothing, waiting to hear from them this evening.

Not only did we have that system of registration and of internment, but we had a very effective system by which the incoming and the out-going of the alien enemy was controlled. This was done under the direction also of the Dominion police, and largely through the instrumentality of the immigration officers. The coming and going was very closely watched and very effectively controlled. I must render testimony to the work of Sir Percy Sherwood. Ever since the war broke out he has maintained a most careful supervision over the action of alien enemies in this country. Reports were received from all quarters in the early stages of the war—in much greater number than they are received to-day—embodying suggestions of groups here and individuals there who were reported as being dangerous. All these suggestions were gone into and run to the ground, even in cases where on the face of them they appeared to be futile. The greatest possible care was taken. At the outset of the war, when we were apprehensive of trouble from the alien enemy resident in the United States—that country then being at peace—we had a most effective system of ascertaining what was going on there, and complete reports were received. That system, of course, is better when carried out quietly. As some evidence that we were not entirely idle, may I not say this: we are in the fourth year of the war; what have we had in the way of outrage or crime or violence from the alien of enemy nationality? When this war broke out, I was very apprehensive on this subject, and so was Sir Percy Sherwood who set to work to make plans to guard against such occurrences. It goes to show probably that our apprehensions were exaggerated; it goes to show that some of the fears expressed here to-night of what the alien enemy might do were exaggerated, but it also goes to show that effective methods to keep in touch with what was going on must have been resorted to. Strong testimony that there was somewhere an eye that was watching and a hand that was controlling is to be found in the fact that we have gone as far as we have, and that with this large population of alien enemy nationality, we have had so little of crime, of violence, proceeding from them in this country.

There are just two other subjects with regard to which I should like to say something. There is the question of our conscripting, or compelling to join in our military operations, persons of allied nationality residing in this country. That is a matter on which we have not been idle. Just after the conscription law was passed, following out a suggestion that had been made before it was passed and which, at that time, did not seem feasible, we took steps to make provision, and there is presently a law in force in this country, enacted by Order in Council, under which, if our allies were ready to take their men home, we provided the necessary machinery for rounding the men up and delivering them to their respective countries. That was passed at the instance of the Italian Consul, the French Consul, the Belgian Consul; and it was passed because we did not want to wait for a treaty. As hon. members all know, we are not in a position to make treaties directly. Everybody knows the slowness of diplomatic action. To get in advance of the treaties, we passed this law at that time in the full expectation that those respective Governments would be in a position to avail themselves of it. Our part is all ready, and we are ready to carry it out. What happened, unfortunately, was that the respective Governments were not able to find transportation for their men. The trouble is not for lack of our being ready to do our part. Shortage of transportation is the only reason why those have not been sent home to join the forces of their respective countries.

As to our conscripting them, that is something we cannot do until the treaties are carried out, and the treaties have to be negotiated and finally executed through

the home authorities. As hon. members know, an agreement has been come to with the United States. It is delayed awaiting the action of the United States Senate. There is no means by which we can hurry it. We have done the best within our power to press it As regards the treaties with France, Italy and Belgium, the British Government has, I understand, entered into treaties with those countries with regard to the people of those countries within the United Kingdom. They communicated with us some months ago, and we replied asking them to see that the treaty was so extended as to enable us to conscript the men of those nations within this country. I, myself, personally, on more than one occasion have cabled and written pressing for action upon the subject. I am not saying that by way of criticism of the authorities in the Old Country. Doubtless they have many things to attend to at the present moment. I mention the matter only for the purpose of bringing home to hon. members the fact that we are just as anxious as they can be to get that system into operation.

Just one more word upon the subject of how we can deal with the person of alien enemy nationality in the way of compelling him to work. It has been said that we can intern him. Yes, we can. It has been said that we we can make him register. Yes, we can. We have made him register and we have interned him, in the measure which it seemed to us useful to do it. I may say, before I leave the subject of internment, that when we had seven or eight thousand of those people interned, it was costing this country something over $1,500,000 a year. We found that the sentiment of every man who came into contact with the Austrian who was interned was that he was absolutely not dangerous.

Mr. CURRIE: What about an outbreak of Austrians at Kapuskasing?

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall get the exact information.

Mr. CURRIE: It was an Austrian officer who led that outbreak.

Mr DOHERTY: The hon. member may be better informed than I am. Let us concede for a moment that one or two of them are dangerous. When I speak of the Austrian, I am speaking of the bulk of the people of that nationality. Although there was a glut in the labour market, conditions changed until there was, in this country, a crying need for labour; we had people from all parts of the country, as loyal people as we are ourselves, asking for the labour of those men, and we discharged them and allowed them to go out where they found employment. We felt it our duty then, in fairness to the working people of this country, to stipulate that these men should be paid the ordinary wage, and we also felt it our duty to stipulate, and we did stipulate, that they should not be employed where our own people were available for employment. It is over a year ago since these men have gone out, and we have had no word of complaint as to their conduct subsequent to their going. To-day our interned prisoners number from two to three thousand, and these are for the most part Germans; I regret that I cannot say anything like the same thing about them as I said about the bulk of our interned Austrians.

One hon. gentleman has spoken of these interned people in British Columbia as living on the fat of the land. I would be glad to show the hon. gentleman just how much it costs to feed these people in these internment camps, but I do not propose to say it here and let it go out to the public, because I do not want a despatch from Germany complaining that these men are not being properly fed. They are being properly fed. But if there is one thing of which we can speak with some pride it is the system by which this has been carried out and the results we have been able to obtain in the way of economy, while still treating these men in a way which leave us open to no complaint.

I just want to say one word on the subject of our compelling them to work. A good deal has been said about international law and there has been a good deal of contempt expressed for too great an anxiety to adhere to international law. I would like to point this out. In dealing with these people we are not dealing with prisoners of war, to which the citations from the Hague Convention referred which were made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). We are dealing, not with people captured in an act of nostility towards this country, but with people who came to this country peaceably, and who happened to be found in this country when war broke out. We had the right, and might have said to them, "Go away. We do not want you here." But, when we told them they could stay here, when we left them free to stay here, it became our duty, so long as they were guilty of no hostile

act or deed and so long as we had no reason to suspect their readiness to obey the law, to treat them not as enemies but as people whom we have been willing to keep within our gates. That did not deprive us of our right to intern them if in any particular case there was ground for suspicion of their conduct; nor even if at a certain stage we had reached the conclusion that all of them were dangerous, did it prevent us from interning them all. It is open to us if we think it wise to intern them. When we did intern them, unless we are going to depart from the very well settled rule of international law, which I may say the United Kingdom has not seen fit to depart from, we have no right to compel them to work. The hon. member for North Simcoe read certain citations from The Hague Convention with regard to prisoners of war, and there is no doubt that he cited them correctly. If we were dealing with prisoners of war, with soldiers taken in performance of their duty as soldiers, and made prisoners of war, all those rules would apply to them, and there is no doubt that we have the right to compel men so taken to labour if we pay them the ordinary wage of a soldier. But the situation is absolutely different when you are dealing with civilian residents of this country, whom this country may find it necessary to intern by reason of the apprehension even of their being dangerous; you are not then dealing with a prisoner of war.

Mr. CURRIE: The extracts I read dealt with the rules governing alien enemies.

Mr. DOHERTY: If I understood the citations, the hon. gentleman was reading extracts with reference to prisoners resident in an alien enemy country.

Mr. CURRIE: It referred to clause 5. I read the whole thing.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman may have understood it differently from what I did, but I would suggest to him that if he will read over the rules of the Hague Convention carefully he will see that what those specific rules have in contemplation is the soldier prisoner of war, and they all indicate it; those rules state specifically that you must feed your prisoner of war the same as you feed your own soldiers.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the minister direct me to the clauses of the Hague Convention dealing with those who are not soldiers?

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there is no clause in the Hague Convention dealing with civilian prisoners at all. We have to fall back upon the accepted rule of international law, that you may deal with civilian prisoners in the manner which I have indicated. You may say to him, "You shall not stay in the country." Or you may let him stay in the country if you choose, and if you let him stay in the country you are not entitled to punish for being a prisoner of enemy nationality. You may intern him for your protection, that is your right, but when you do that, and cut him off from the means of earning his livelihood, you have to give him his bread and butter and his clothes, and you cannot compel him to labour, as you can compel the soldier prisoner of war under the rules of the Hague Convention. I may state that we have had repeated remonstrances from Germany through the United States consuls charging us with subjecting these men to compulsory labour, and the answer we sent back—and, of course, it was the truthful answer—was that we were not compelling them to labour, their labour was voluntary. We did not feel in a position to question the doctrine laid down by Germany that these sections of the Hague Convention did not apply to civilian prisoners; we acquiesced in that view and Great Britain acquiesced in that view.

It might be interesting to the House to learn what they do in Great Britain in regard to compulsory labour. We have heard a good deal about what Germany does, but I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen do not intend to hold Germany up to us as the model that we should follow. I fully appreciate the absolutely natural feeling of irritation that we all share when we see the advantage that is resulting to these people from the fact that our own young men have gone forth to do their duty and fight. But, after all, is it not a part of our duty to control our feelings? Is not one of the things that we want to preserve through this war the reputation which we have been given to boasting of—too much, perhaps—the reputation for the spirit of fair play under all circumstances. I would rather point to the model of Great Britain, and I do not think Great Britain is treating these interned men in any spirit of mawkish sentimentality or because she wants to be ethical with an unmoral people, as one hon. gentleman said this afternoon. She is doing this, no doubt, in recognition of her international law obligations, and also under the direct menace of Germany that otherwise there would be reprisals and it would be worse for us.

It is all very well to say that our men over there cannot be treated any worse than they are. I do not want to extenuate many instances of ill-treatment that have come to our knowledge, but I do know this: that for the long period of time before the United States came into this war we had the advantage of having the German internment camps inspected by the United States consular officers in that country, just as those same officers inspected the camps in this country and reported to Germany. I must say that the reports were on the whole favourable. There were instances where there was ground for complaint and in some of those instances the complaint was listened to and conditions remedied. It is all very well for us sitting at home here to say: "Oh, we don't care. We are mad with the alien enemy here; let us get after him. They cannot treat our boys any worse than they are already treating them." But it is our boys over there who will have to bear the brunt of it. I am a stickler for international law, but I must confess that that argument appeals to me in the strongest possible way. I hold in my hand a despatch from London, dated March 5, 1918, telling how they treat these men in England. It is as follows:

Downing Street, March 5, 1918.

My Lord Duke,—

I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency, for the information of your Ministers, a copy of a memorandum which has been prepared at the Home Office as to the procedure followed in the United Kingdom with regard to the internment and treatment of enemy aliens. This information has been furnished in reply to an enquiry made by the Government of New Zealand, and it is considered that a statement of the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to these matters might be of interest to your Ministers.

2. In connection with the memorandum I should explain that interned enemy subjects are not compelled to work. A number of them work as volunteers for wages, both inside the camps on such industries as can be organized with advantage, and also outside the camps, in quarrying, roadmaking, farm work and reclamation of land. Some hundreds of interned civilians in addition have volunteered for the special working camps, where they are employed in timber-cutting and constructional and other labouring work. Besides these, between 1,500 and 2,000 have on their own application been sent out to employers on license from the camps, either singly or in small groups, for employment in farm work or industries of national importance. In every case the work is undertaken voluntarily, and the alien is at liberty to give it up and go back to the camp from which he came if he so desires.

3. As regards male enemy subjects who are exempted from internment or, in the case of those above military age, from repatriation, it was decided early last year that all these, if physically fit, must do work of national utility as a condition of retaining their exemptions, and measures have since been taken through the Ministry of National Service and the Employment Exchanges to place them in suitable occupations. Here again, however, there is no absolute compulsion; the alien, if unwilling to undertake the work offered him, has always the option, if of military age, of going to an internment camp, or if above military age, of being repatriated; and in no case is an alien enemy required, as a condition of retaining his exemption from internment or repatriation, to undertake work on munitions or other work of such a kind.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord Duke,
Your Grace's most obedient,
humble servant,
WALTER H. LONG.

Governor General
His Excellency
THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, K.G., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., Etc., Etc., Etc.

The great point that I want to bring out is the absolute recognition by Great Britain that work of that kind is voluntary. Now Great Britain is a better country for us to go to for an example as to treatment of persons of enemy alien nationality. Great Britain does not require these persons to work unless she sees good reason for it, and I call attention to the words employed in the despatch which this is described "as the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to these matters". We must also keep in mind that we are not an absolutely independent nation, that the United Kingdom is the nation with which other countries deal, and that it would be becoming and proper that we should give some thought to the policy of the United Kingdom upon a matter of this sort. Because it must be remembered that reprisals will not fall on the Canadian alone; they will also be inflicted on the British subject from wherever he has come. So that I think that in so far as it is suggested that we should adopt a policy of compulsory labour to be imposed on the person of enemy alien nationality, there is very good ground at all events for us to pause before we decide upon it. Do we want to put ourselves outside the pale of the law? Do we want to put ourselves outside the pale because Germany is there? Do we want to be in the same class with Germany, or would we rather stand within the pale, and so standing be in the company of the Mother Country? But when you get down to the practical question, as one hon. gentleman from Winnipeg said here this evening, how are you going to make men work? You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. What

will be the result of your law if the alien does not want to work? You will have to send him to jail, or possibly intern him. Which is the best for this country, to have these persons of alien enemy nationality living in internment camps at the expense of the country at a time when there is a great call for labour here, or to have them working on productive labour which is to the advantage of Canada and supporting themselves, even if they get large wages? Of course, we may so control or arrange matters that we may see to it that these people do not unduly profit to the detriment of our own people; but upon the abstract question of conscripting the labour of persons of enemy alien nationality and making them work, while it sounds very satisfactory, yet when you come to carry out the idea and send them out to work, what kind of a day's work will you get from men of that kind? Surely it would not be suggested that we should send a slave driver out with the alien armed with a whip to keep him working; and, short of doing that, what course can you pursue? You can either, as I have already stated, send them to jail or you can intern them.

I do not say but that perhaps I would be anxious, just as anxious as any hon. member, to find some equitable and practical method by which everybody in this country, including this particular class, should be compelled to contribute to the support of our effort by taxation or by some other means. I think I can safely say, speaking for myself, and I think perhaps I am also safe in saying I can speak for the Government, that the different suggestions thrown out this afternoon will certainly have careful consideration. More than that they are the very things that are filling our own minds all the time, because we are seeking to discover methods that will properly and effectively deal with this exceedingly difficult question.

I have occupied a longer time than I intended when I rose, but I did think it worth while to remind those who knew it before, and to inform those who perhaps were not aware of it, of what has been done with regard to this matter, and of the very serious questions that arise in connection, at all events with one of the suggested remedies. Now there can be no objection to the motion passing, because it suggests only a consolidation of existing laws. There may be advantages in that, and there certainly cannot be any evil results from it. I would rather hope that good will flow from the discussion which we have had, inasmuch as it has furnished us with many suggestions that I believe will give room for profitable thought.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I desire only to detain the House for a very few moments in connection with this resolution. It is not very clear to me as a lawyer what is intended by the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements). The only law that I am familiar with in connection with alien labour is the Alien Labour Act, and if that is the law that the hon. member wants to consolidate, its consolidation will not be effected by Order in Council. If there are other alien labour laws which required consolidation, or which should be consolidated, I am not familiar with them and the hon. gentleman did not allude to them. The resolution is a somewhat broad proposition, and having listened with the greatest attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks, I am forced to the conclusion that he had in his travelling bag a great many things that had very little relation to the subject. I cannot for the life of me see the connection, for instance, between this resolution and the conscripting of labour in the province of Quebec. It would simply appear to me that the hon. gentleman was making a stool-pigeon of the resolution with a view to having a fling at that province.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman was probably not in the House when Mr. Speaker announced that it had been decided to discuss all the resolutions on the Order Paper bearing on the subject at the same time as the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements).

Mr. McKENZIE: I have been for quite a number of years in this House with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, and I have always found him to have enough to do in dealing with his own little affairs in his own way. I must remain convinced that my mind is still strong enough to persuade me that the hon. member was dealing entirely with his own resolution, and with what was in his own mind when the Speaker gave a wider scope to the discussion. And what I have stated was what he undoubtedly had in mind himself. However, before going any further into the matter, let me say that my mind is so constructed that I find it difficult not to criticize a man who is doing something that is not consistent with his history and with his career, and

who does not seem to be straight and honest and open. If there is anything in the world that the member from British Columbia should keep mum on it is the question of labour, the question of aliens, and the question of colour and race and creed in respect to labour matters. I remember well when I sat behind the Government in this House up to the time of the change of Administration in 1911, that we heard a great deal from the Pacific province about a "white British Columbia." I remember it well, and I have with me the Hansard containing a report of a discussion in the early part of January, 1908, when the famous telegram of whether the Conservatives were for a white British Columbia, or were absolutely opposed to anything in the colour line, was sent.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman was not a member during that session.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps so, but he was here shortly afterwards if he was not here then. British Columbia sent us a solid representation of Conservatives in 1908. I think the hon. gentleman was here then; perhaps he was not. He does not say himself that he was not. I think the hon. member came here in 1908.

Mr. CLEMENTS: The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken; it was in 1911 that the solid representation came here.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite understand the reference. This telegram was the basis for sending a solid representation from British Columbia in 1908.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And then it was a forgery.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was said to have been a forgery, but it was allowed to do its work. It was not until after the election it was discovered to be a forgery. After the election, when we came to this House, there was some discussion, and it turned out that it was a forgery. Up to that time nobody in this Parliament had any knowledge that there was anything spurious or improper about it. But it was brought to the notice of the House, in the discussion on the Address soon after the election of 1908. The discussion is in Hansard, and any body who cares to read the speech of the then leader of the Opposition, now the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden), will find his reference to it. I believe my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni came here first in 1908. He does not dispute that. At any rate, my recollection of him goes that far. We had a telegram, whether proper or genuine or not, and these gentlemen came here basing their principles and their policy upon that declaration. When they were in opposition they were full of the fight. But the day came when there was a change and they found themselves behind a government which had power to do the things that they said our government had power to do. From that time down to this day, year after year, session after session, the same coloured races, the same Chinese, the same Japanese, were good enough for my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni. We have heard not a word from him complaining about these laws. He has not a word to say about the consolidation of regulations which are good enough for him. But before that his party in the British Columbia Legislature, under the Government which he was supporting, passed forty-two fake Acts which they knew they had no business to pass, which they had not the slightest authority to pass. They were playing a fake game, and my hon. friend was behind them. He never raised a voice or a hand in protest against it. It was simply a scheme to deceive the people of British Columbia into supposing that they were passing laws and sending them to Ottawa when they knew that the Minister of Justice would have to advise that they were ultra vires of the provincial legislature as they were ultra vires of this House even if we attempted to pass them. But still they went on doing this with the knowledge of my hon. friend, doing it for political purposes and taking all the benefits that were coming to them from it. He never complained. But now, when there is perhaps enough foreign element in this Government to justify him in pulling out the old knife again, he is prepared to slash it around, to find fault, and to say that there must be a different colour. The sun must rise in a different way, the electric light in British Columbia must flare a different light upon the situation. Because, forsooth, there are a few Liberals, or men who were Liberals, and who, I hope, are Liberals still, in this Government, he thinks it gives him a justification to introduce this question again. I would say to the hon. member that if he expects labour to have confidence in him and his party, if he expects the man who has no capital, no backing, no strength, except the strength of his arm, and of the brain that the Lord put in his head, to be behind him, to believe him, and to have confidence in him, he must place himself behind legislation that is true, straight, honest and

simple, and such that the man who runs may read. If he expects to enlist the favour of the labouring men of this country, he must show genuine earnestness in the support of the interests of labour.

There are new men here, whom I should not accuse of anything wrong, because I do not know their histories. But I know the men who have been here since 1908, and I know that they have been playing the political game as strongly as it could be played, and who care nothing for labour, except for the use they can make out of labour to further their own political ends and purposes. I submit to my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni that I simply regard this motion to-day as another scheme like the passing of these 42 or 50 nonsensical Acts of the Legislature which they sent here to be disallowed, and which were passed for the purpose of fooling the labour men and making them believe that something was going to be done. That is the history of the Tory party in British Columbia, and that is the history of the hon. member himself, in so far as labour in that country is concerned. Upon that history he must stand or fall. He cannot be allowed to come to us to be redeemed, washed, and made whiter than snow upon a death-bed repentance of this kind. I would not sleep well to-night if I should allow my hon. friend to escape with a history of that kind behind him, and not tell our friends from British Columbia and these new and zealous men who have come here lately, and who are, perhaps, ignorant of the history of their predecessors in connection with matters of this kind, what the actual facts are. For the betterment of the matter, I would tell them to begin at Jerusalem, begin at British Columbia. Establish a clean, straight, consistent record of your own in regard to the matter, and then come to us for the betterment of the situation. We can assure hon. gentlemen that we are with labour every time and will give consistent laws and regulations, in so far as they can possibly be given, to both capital and labour. It is of the highest importance for us that the best possible relation and the greatest degree of confidence should exist between capital and labour. There can only be confidence and consistency and true living and life in this country by all acting upon the square, acting in a straightforward way, saying what they think, and governing themselves accordingly. That is the spirit of life, that is the practice that I would like to see carried out, that has always been the policy of the Liberal party and that is why to-day everywhere in this country labour is looking to that grand old party for what is necessary for the upholding of its hands in connection with the industries of the country.

I have only one word more to say. As far as the province from which I come is concerned, we have no trouble with alien labour. I think that a great part of the difficulty with alien labour in other parts of the Dominion is due to the fact that, perhaps, a proper example is not set before it by the people who inhabit the country and who are really Canadians or English-speaking people. I say that with the greatest possible respect. The men who come to this country should familiarize themselves with our laws and be assimilated by and become familiar with the regulations, laws and practices of our own people. In the province from which I come we have a very excellent class of labour.

We have splendid characters in our miners, good, Christian, well educated people. And foreigners coming in have noticed what our own people do, how they observe the law, keep the Sabbath day, go to church, pay their debts, and dress well. They notice that these things are being done in Nova Scotia, and they dare not, to any great extent, depart from them. For that reason, within a few years after the foreigner comes to our province, he becomes a man who is hard to distinguish from the person who has been with us for a great many years. Unfortunately, when this terrible war came upon us, we had hundreds, if not thousands, of these people in our province. We had a few internments, but I think for reasons given by the Minister of Justice to-night, that they were not permitted to go away; and there was some fear, perhaps not greatly justified, that they should not be allowed to work in the mines, because any one wanting to be mischievous could make a great deal of trouble in a coal mine, causing disaster and probably loss of live, and it was thought that some of these foreigners might perhaps be willing to sacrifice their lives for the purpose of causing serious destruction; and there was fear, perhaps unjustifiable fear, on the part of our own men against allowing them to work in the mines. For that reason, some, not a great many, were interned. But, taking them all in all, we have no complaint to make. We have no trouble with them, and although hundreds and no doubt thousands of aliens are work-

ing in the steel works and coal mines and generally in our larger industries, I know of only one case where it was rumoured that one of them threatened or remarked that, "Some day the mine would be on fire." I do not know whether he meant anything by it, but he was interned. That is the only case of that kind that we have had, and that man is still interned in some part of the province. Coming from that part of the country and knowing these people, and sitting in this House while this discussion is going on, it is very likely, as many of them are watching events, that they would think ill of me if I did not bring to the notice of the House that in the province of Nova Scotia we have no such trouble as has been spoken of in British Columbia. And so far as general labour is concerned, as that subject has been touched upon, we have every reason to be proud of the conduct of the labouring classes not only in Nova Scotia but in every part of the Dominion and not only in the Dominion but in every part of the Empire. When we compare the way in which the poor man is exercising the power of his capital with the way in which the millionaire is exercising his in food production and other things, I think the labouring man is far superior in his patriotism and sacrifice to his wealthy competitor. He has nothing to put forward, as I said before, but the brain in his head and the strength in his arm. And, knowing, as we do, that they could have given us a great deal of trouble, I think we have reason to be proud and thankful, and to recognize with appreciation and praise what our labouring men in every part of the Empire, and particularly in Canada, have done.

If there is any necessity for the consolidation of any laws, or if any better condition of things can be brought about by consolidation of them, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I have no objection at all. But I must say that I do not know what I am agreeing to when I am agreeing to a consolidation of laws in respect of alien labour in this country, when, apart from the Alien Labour Act, I am not aware that there is any law at all. However, if there is not, no harm can happen.

I must congratulate hon. gentlemen who took part in this debate. I have watched it very closely, and I am particularly proud of our new members for the high tone to which they kept this debate and the very excellent manner in which they have expressed themselves. I am sure we have every reason to hope that while such men remain with us, not only the interests of labour, but every other Canadian interest, will be well maintained, and our reputation as a Parliament will not be impaired.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS: In conclusion, I would like to say a word. I appreciate very much indeed the acceptance of the resolution by the Government, and I sincerely hope that legislation along the line of the resolution will be brought down ere long. I have no thought of replying to the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie), who has just taken his seat. I came into this House some four years before the hon. member did, and neither he, nor any one else, can accuse me of ever being a partisan in this House. I should like to have seen the hon. member for once in his life, when dealing with this resolution, get away from that partisanship which he always exhibits. That is all I have to say to the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

Motion of Mr. Clements agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. McKENZIE: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. SIFTON: The War Appropriation, probably.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 23, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Memorandum No. 4 respecting the work of the Department of Militia and Defence from January 1, 1917 to December 31, 1917. —Major-General Mewburn.

Copy of Order in Council dated 3rd April, 1918, respecting the reservation of Dominion lands for disposition under the Soldiers' Settlement Act.—Hon Mr. Meighen.

Copy of Orders in Council approving regulations adopted by the Canada Registration Board.—Mr. McCurdy.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It appears that the resolution adopted by the House on the 18th instant with regard to the business of the House, in the form in which it was

passed, does away with the Order for Private Bills on Monday. I therefore move:

That the resolution adopted by the House on 18th April, 1918, be amended so that it shall read:

That on Monday the 29th day of April and on subsequent Mondays until the end of the Session, Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence after Questions and Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was ready to proceed with two different matters under the heading "Notices of Motions," but at the request of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, I delayed them. I suppose that when the Estimates come up, the rule that we must not refer to questions which have already appeared on the Order Paper shall not apply.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the production of papers is desired, they can be procured through non-controversial motions. If hon. gentlemen desire to discuss any matter included in a Notice of Motion, the motion can be dropped and the matter brought up on the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: The difficulty could be obviated by a motion on a future day that the Notice of Motion in question be discharged from the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY SERVICE.

QUESTION AS TO THE EXEMPTION OF FARMERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): I have been asked by several of my constituents whether the Order in Council passed on December 3 last still stands. In view of the declaration made by the Minister of Militia at Hamilton last Saturday, when he emphasized the importance of food production, I should be glad if he would inform the House whether he will continue to release from military service farmers between the ages of 20 and 22, liable to the Order in Council recently passed, who are indispensable to the work of food production.

Major-General MEWBURN: My powers are limited entirely to the Order in Council passed last week; I cannot go beyond the powers therein defined.

Mr. PROULX: I did not understand that the Order in Council of December 3 had been repealed.

Major-General MEWBURN: Under the Order in Council recently passed, there will be no exemptions within the ages as called out. I assume that the Order in Council will still be operative in respect of those classes under the Military Service Act whose exemptions have not been specifically cancelled by the recent Order in Council.

WAR GRANT—$500,000,000.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 38, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 2—payment of $500,000,000 may be made:

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am informed that, some time last fall, in the case of Charles, alias "Ti-Noir" Desjardins, that was pending before the police court at Montreal, the Government of Canada wrote the Department of Justice and deposited as security for bail—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will pardon me a moment, with all deference to him, I do not think the matter which he proposes to bring before the committee can properly be brought up now. It can, of course, be brought up on the Estimates of the Department of Justice. It has, so far as I understand, no relation whatever to this appropriation. There will be ample scope on the Estimates of the Department of Justice for discussing the matter to the fullest extent desired.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am informed on reliable authority that the cheque which was deposited in the court at that time had the word "war" printed on it, and that is why I should like to bring up this matter at the present juncture, because it would appear, by the very fact of the word "war" being printed on the cheque, that the money would come out of the War Appropriation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not seen the cheque, and I do not know what was marked on it; but, even if that be so, the proper time for discussing this matter would be upon the Estimates of the Department of Justice. This appropriation is very urgently needed at the present time, and as there is a full opportunity to discuss the matter then, I see no reason why this appropriation should be delayed now.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would it be possible for the Prime Minister to set a day or to give us some opportunity of discussing this

matter, as we shall have no more private members' day this session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is not a matter pertaining to private members' day; it can be discussed, as long and as fully as the hon. member desires upon the Estimates of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am bringing this matter up now because, if I bring it up on the Estimates of the Department of Justice, the objection will be raised that it is a matter that appertains to the Militia Department, and I shall not be permitted to discuss it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can assure my hon. friend that no such objection will be raised.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Very well.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One man satisfied.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend has intimated that he has satisfied one man. I wonder if I can add another one to his list. The Prime Minister will recall that, when this Bill was under discussion last week, I asked for certain information which I assume he has not had time to bring down. I refer to the promise made by the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in regard to giving the details as to the publicity and advertising expenses paid out of the War Appropriation. If my right hon. friend has not had time to bring down the information I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill just now, if he will be good enough to say he will bring it down.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Acting Minister of Finance spoke to me yesterday about it. He said it would be available today, but he has not sent it to me. There are other opportunities on which full information may be obtained, and we shall not interpose any technical difficulty to obtaining that information. We shall regard it as entirely an open matter.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SALARIES ACT AMENDMENT.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

On motion of Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, Bill No. 13, to amend the Salaries Act and the provisions for preserving the Independence of Parliament, was read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

GOLD AND SILVER MARKING ACT (1913) AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce), Bill No. 50, to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act, 1913, was read the third time and passed.

ORGANIZATION AND CO-ORDINATION OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICES.

On motion of Hon. T. W. Crothers (Minister of Labour) Bill No. 57, to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—powers of minister:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who is the minister in charge of this Bill?

Mr. CROTHERS: Section 2 says that "minister" means the Minister of Labour.

Mr. CAHILL: What means will be taken to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices? Is it intended that the encouragement shall come from the minister or from the provinces?

Mr. CROTHERS: Section 4 provides that $50,000 shall be appropriated the first year for the purpose of encouraging the provinces to establish labour exchanges, and section 5 provides that the Federal Government shall not pay to any province a larger sum than is expended by the province itself in establishing and maintaining labour exchanges.

Mr. CAHILL: Upon what basis is the aid to be given as between the different provinces?

Mr. CROTHERS: The moneys to be paid to the governments of the respective provinces will be in the proportion which their expenditure bears to the total expenditure by all the provinces for such purposes.

Mr. CAHILL: Am I to understand that if one province spent the full amount of this appropriation it would get $50,000?

Mr. CROTHERS: Suppose that all the provinces together expended $50,000, and one province expended one-fifth of that, that province would get $5,000, or one-tenth of the appropriation.

Mr. CAHILL: Suppose one province spent $100,000 on labour exchanges. On what basis would you distribute this appropriation as between the provinces?

Mr. CROTHERS: That depends on circumstances. If one province spent $50,000

and the other provinces nothing, it would receive one-half the $50,000 we are appropriating for the first year.

Mr. FIELDING: When the resolution was before the committee, I called attention to a point which possibly was not well taken, but if it was well taken, it would apply just as much to the Bill as to the resolution. If the Bill contemplates the organization of offices at Ottawa, and I presume the Minister of Labour has that in mind, I would point out that this Bill provides for the entire appropriation being paid to the governments of the different provinces. Section 5 says that the "moneys appropriated for each year shall be allotted and paid to the governments of the respective provinces," so it would appear to me that under this Bill not a dollar of this money could be appropriated for any organization work in Ottawa. If that is the intention, the Bill is all right; but if it is contemplated to maintain any organization at Ottawa and pay its expenses out of this Bill, I would ask the minister to consider whether this Bill gives him the power that he wants.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is the intention that the whole amount shall be paid to the provinces under certain circumstances. Whatever moneys may be required for the work done at Ottawa will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Section 3 authorizes the minister to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices, and to promote unity of methods among them. If the underlying principle is to establish a system of public employment agencies, the Bill is all right, but as a means of meeting the immediate needs of the situation, in my judgment, it is not all right. I have had some little to do with employment agencies of one kind and another in a business way, and some little to do in endeavouring to keep in touch with Government-owned or Government-controlled employment agencies, and with all due respect to those who are responsible for their organization, I must say that they have not got us anywhere. If there is one vital question in connection with the distribution of labour throughout this country, it is to find some channel through which the employer and the man looking for work can get in touch with each other; and, so far as I know, in no system of Government-controlled employment offices in this country has there been any near approach to that desideratum. If we wait until we develop a complete organization for that purpose we will wait until the vital period, in my judgment, is passed. I hold no brief for any private employment agency or private institution of any description, but if it is desired to provide adequate machinery, and provide it quickly and effectively, by which the employer in the first instance may get in touch with the man looking for work, and the man looking for work may get in touch with the employer, the minister has that machinery right at hand if he will but take efficient control of the private employment agencies. Establish a central clearing house, if you like, for these private employment agencies, and pass regulations under which it will be necessary for them to report daily to that clearing house the number of men they are looking for to fill the needs of employers of labour, and, on the other hand, the list of men on their books who are searching for employment, to provide information as to where that employment may be found, how it may be reached, the rate of wages, and everything else in connection therewith, I say that you have ready made machinery right at hand that you can adopt for this purpose, without the establishment of anything new, without going into any comprehensive scheme of interprovincial employment, and agencies working in co-operation, or in co-ordination, with the Dominion. All that may be well enough in its way, but it will take too much time, and I suggest to the hon. minister that they will take control of the direction of the private employment agencies, and make use of the machinery that they now have at hand.

Mr. HALLIDAY: I would suggest to the minister that he make use of the Post Offices already established throughout the Dominion. A large board can be posted up in an office which will give the information. If a man wants to employ so many men, he goes into the office and buys a five-cent stamp for each man he requires, and his name is posted up, showing that he requires these men. If I require a position, I buy a five-cent postage stamp, and my name is posted up, to show that I require a position. We could have employment offices all over the Dominion, if we adopted such a system.

Mr. DEVLIN: I find by the interpretation clause that an employment office means an employment office operated by any provincial government, and by section 5 the manner in which the moneys are to be paid out is stipulated. I presume that

this money will be paid out solely to the provincial government to maintain any employment offices they may organize. The minister, in answering the hon. gentleman from Queens-Shelburne, said that he contemplated the organization of a central employment bureau in Ottawa. I take it that this Bill does not cover that point at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is not intended that this Government should establish a Labour Bureau in Ottawa, but it is intended to establish a clearing house in this city. There are various kinds of labour bureaus. You have some national labour bureaus, provincial labour bureaus, municipal labour bureaus, private labour bureaus, and some philanthropic labour bureaus. No country so large territorally as Canada has established a national system of labour bureaus. Great Britain has done so, but in territorial extent Great Britain is small compared with Canada. New Zealand also has a labour bureau, but she is a very small country. No large country has undertaken to establish and maintain a national system of labour bureaus, and it was not considered advisable to do so here. In Canada, five of the nine provinces—Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia—have already legislated for the establishment of labour bureaus in the various provinces, Several of them have already established a great many labour bureaus. It was thought the provinces could more conveniently deal with these matters than the Dominion. My hon. friend will notice that this Act provides that agreements shall be entered into between the Federal Government and the provincial Government, setting forth the terms upon which they will be entitled to receive the sum due them under this section. We will provide for inspections, and so forth, in the agreement which will be something like the agreement that is made in agricultural matters between the Dominion Government and the provincial Governments—setting forth the conditions upon which they will be entitled to receive this money. In the province of Quebec already several labour bureaus have been established at different points, namely, the cities of Quebec, Montreal, Sherbrooke, and two or three other places. In Ontario provision was made three or four years ago for the establishment of labour bureaus. They have already established them in all the large centres in Ontario like Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, London, Fort William, Port Arthur and St. Thomas. They are doing the very sort of work that my hon. friend suggests ought to be done. Special provisions are being carried out by several of the provinces. Alberta and Saskatchewan have established temporarily for war purposes, especially for the purpose of getting the men on the land, these labour exchanges at various points in their respective provinces. At its last session, the legislature of British Columbia passed an Act to provide for the establishment of these bureaus, and they are proceeding to establish them right away. We expect to get from the clearing houses in the several provinces a weekly statement of labour conditions throughout each province at the different points, so that we will have, every week, in the clearing house in Ottawa a bird's eye view of the whole labour situation of Canada. It would be a herculean task for this Government to undertake to establish a labour bureau in each town and city in Canada, as five provinces have already legislated in that direction, it was not thought wise for us to attempt to establish a new system to conflict with that.

Mr. DEVLIN: Under clause 3 the Government has power to establish a clearing house. By clause 4 bonuses are given to the different employment bureaus in the province. By clause 5 the minister allots the bonuses in the proportion set out in that section, but there is no provision in this Bill whatever to pay for any of these clearing houses.

Mr. CROTHERS: Does my hon. friend refer to the clearing house at Ottawa?

Mr. DEVLIN: What do you mean by clearing house? There is no definition of it.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was trying to explain a moment ago that we are going to establish a clearing house at Ottawa for all Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: What do you mean by clearing house?

Mr. CROTHERS: A house that receives reports from all the provincial clearing houses tabulates and circulates them.

Mr. DEVLIN: Can the Department of Labour not do that, without establishing another clearing house?

Mr. CROTHERS: We may utilize the department for that purpose.

Mr. DEVLIN: But we are trying to save money now.

Mr. CROTHERS: As I said to the hon. member for Queens-Shelburne, the expense of this central clearing House and the preparation of the forms, and so on, will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We understand what a clearing house in banking circles is, but I have not heard anything yet as to the way this clearing house is going to operate. What is the method of obtaining the information and how will it be distributed?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is a matter that will be more fully considered hereafter. We will establish a clearing house here to receive weekly reports from the various provincial clearing houses. They will give us a statement of conditions in each of the provinces and that information will be distributed throughout the country by some means—we have not yet determined exactly just how. That will be a part of the working of the clearing houses. The provinces will have clearing houses where information and reports will be received from various places. For instance, in Toronto, they will have a clearing house for the province of Ontario at which information will be received from St. Thomas, London, Windsor and other places. It may be useful for the whole Dominion to know that there are a certain number of idle men in a certain craft in Halifax and that a similar number of men may be required in Vancouver. The provincial bureaus would not deal with a matter of that kind. They would not report to their sister provinces but they would report to us. We are in a position to see the situation exactly and to give the information which it seems to demand.

Mr. BUTTS: In nearly every province they have Workmen's Compensation Acts or Employers' Liability Acts. Would it not be well for the Dominion to consolidate all these Acts and make one for the whole of Canada?

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend had been present one evening last week he would have noticed an Act passing through this House providing compensation for all employees of the Dominion.

Mr. BUTTS: I know; but these Acts are different in every province. If we consolidated them into one Canadian Act, would it not be better?

Mr. CROTHERS: Does my hon. friend suggest that this Parliament—

Mr. BUTTS: I think so.

Mr. CROTHERS: —has the right—

Mr. BUTTS: Sure, I think so.

Mr. CROTHERS: —to consolidate the various compensation Acts?

Mr. DEVLIN: If we are going to aid in the winning of this war in every way possible we must do so by conserving what we can of the taxes of the people and directing them towards war expenditure. The minister told me a moment ago that he could take some men in his department and utilize them for the purpose of collating the information that is to be got from the different provincial clearing houses. I can understand that. But what I want to direct the minister's attention to is the fact that he must have in his department employees who are at present free from work of any kind. I presume he must have had up to a few days ago. For instance, he had a cost of living examiner or commissioner. He found, for one reason or another, that he could dispense with this gentleman's services and he did dispense with them. I am not criticising the minister at the present moment for dispensing with his services. That may come up later. But we know that he dispensed with his services and he has given the further information to the newspapers in Toronto that he would not be inclined to take him back because he had submitted what he had written to the Commissioner and he had received certain answers. If the commissioner was not necessary he should not have been kept on. He could not have been necessary because he has not been replaced. If the commissioner was not necessary the staff employed by him cannot be necessary and therefore could easily be dispensed with. This staff, for instance, might be given the work of collating this information and some saving might be made in that way. On the other hand, we find that every time a Bill such as this is proposed, which purports to create some bureau or service, we have enormous expenditures. Take, for instance, the cost of the Food Controller's office. That is costing the country, I dare say, millions of dollars per year. There is a staff of hundreds and they are paid thousands and thousands of dollars, a great deal of which money could be saved to the people of the country and diverted directly to war channels. I would ask the minister if he has in his mind, as a result of the passage of this Bill, the idea of creating a new staff other than that which he has in his department in order to carry

on the work of what he styles a clearing house, or if he will give to the House an assurance that no outside help will be taken in and that the work will be done by employees of this department under the salaries they are getting now.

Mr. CROTHERS: The position occupied by Mr. O'Connor would not have been created had it not been considered necessary for the administration of the Order in Council passed early in November, 1916. I thought it was necessary to have such a man as Mr. O'Connor in the department, and arrangements have been made for another man to take his place. I think the public interest will not suffer in the least by the appointment of the new man who is to take that place. I have no idea now of establishing a separate staff, but I am not in a position to promise my hon. friend that it will not be necessary to have one, or two, or three additional clerks in the department. I think I can assure my hon. friend that there will be nobody engaged in that department to do work who is not necessary, and when I tell him that the expenditure of the department has not increased in the last six years he will be satisfied that I am keeping the cost down as low as possible.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to have a little information from the minister as to the co-ordination of effort between the provincial governments and this Government. There is nothing here to compel a provincial government to establish an employment office or clearing house unless it wishes to do so. It must be by agreement, as I read the Act. Suppose a provincial government does not see eye to eye with the minister, does not create an employment bureau, or fails to come in to the clearing house, what provision has the minister against that? Does he propose to allow one-half of the Dominion to go without that operative machinery which will make a complete system? In case a province says: We will not have anything to do with this, has the minister any guarantee or assurance from the provinces that they will co-operate in this measure? Has the minister provided, in the event of the failure of a province to come in, that the Dominion shall open an employment office in such province so as to get the information and make the system complete? Has the minister any information from the provinces tending to insure the smooth and easy working of the Bill, which, on the whole, is commendable?

[Mr. Devlin.]

Mr. CROTHERS: I can only say that, so far as five of the provinces are concerned, they have shown a good deal of anxiety in this direction, and are moving forward quite rapidly. Two or three of the provinces I have no communications with. But I think that the inducement we are holding out in this Bill, substantially to pay to each province one-half of what it expends in this direction, will be sufficient inducement for them to do, as the other provinces have done, namely to legislate and establish labour bureaus. If they do not do so, it will be a matter for future consideration.

Mr. MORPHY: In that case, I would call the minister's attention to the fact that this whole scheme, if it is so necessary to be inaugurated now, would fall to the ground for lack of a comprehensive scheme covering the whole Dominion, and his Bill is only partially effective throughout the whole of the Dominion.

Mr. CROTHERS: We have practically six out of nine provinces now lined up.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have followed with a good deal of interest the statements of the Minister of Labour with regard to this Bill. I quite realize that the Department of Labour should be the department under which the placing of labour could be most appropriately carried on. On several occasions during the past few years, I have pointed out the conditions which have existed throughout the various provinces with regard to the placing of labour, and the abnormal conditions under which we are now living have intensified the situation, making it much more imperative to co-ordinate this system, and have a broad, comprehensive policy with regard to this question, rather than having it divided up among a number of Governmental departments under the federal and provincial jurisdictions. I thought, and have contended for years, that the immigration department should not be coupled up with the Department of the Interior. Heretofore, the placing of labour has been carried on, I believe, almost entirely by the Department of the Interior through the minister and the immigration officials. Lately we have had a separation, and a Ministry of Immigration has been formed, and estimates have been put through this House increasing the expenditure under that department. I did hope that this new arrangement would accomplish the object I have had in my

mind for many years past, of co-ordinating and consolidating these various interests, but I am inclined to think that under the present proposal, we will be quite a little farther away from that idea than we were before. I do not believe it will work out to the very best advantage. The Department of Immigration, for instance, has in the province of Ontario, I believe, over one hundred officers scattered throughout the various counties. It also has officers in certain cities of the province to carry on employment work. Now, it is proposed to encourage the provinces generally to carry on similar work by making them a grant through a department other than the Department of Immigration. I believe that this method will hardly accomplish the best results. The placing of labour at the present time is a very important matter. It is referred to in clause 7 of the Bill, which reads:

That the offices shall endeavour to fill situations in all trades and for both male and female employees

The Department of Immigration receives reports constantly from its officers in many parts of the province of Ontario and Western Canada, which are published. By arranging to have another set of reports along similar lines come through the Department of Labour, in my opinion, will not accomplish the best results, but will be more confusing. I believe this matter should be consolidated as much as possible. With the situation arising because of the drafting of men for overseas service, and the need by reason of this fact which will arise to place men in other occupations, it seems to me that this is a matter which, at the present time, should be almost entirely under the Federal authority, instead of being delegated to the several provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said the other evening, when the Minister of Labour introduced this legislation by way of resolution, that, on general lines, I approved of the policy of establishing labour bureaus throughout Canada. I stated then, and I repeat now, that my hon. friend seems to be a convert to this idea. On two different occasions during past sessions I brought the matter up by way of motion before the House, and on two occasions the minister made light of the question. This year, I am pleased to say, he has accepted the views which were held not only by your humble servant, but by many friends of labour in Canada and in the United States as well. My hon. friend intends to promote the establishment of these labour bureaus by a money grant paid out of a special fund which will be appropriated to that end, to those of the provinces which will accept the principle of this legislation. He states that already six provinces have labour bureaus or employment offices. The amount to be appropriated is not large, but I believe that if well spent it may produce good results. There is no question that, in view of the reconstruction period ahead of Canada, the establishment of labour bureaus will be very much needed indeed. The minister may well look to what has been done in this connection by the Mother Country and by Australia and New Zealand, where the labour element, I might say the Labour party, is to-day predominant. To any one of us who has read the speech delivered not long ago by that eminent British labour leader, Mr. Henderson, or the platform of the Labour party in England for the coming general elections, it is clear that in Great Britain labour will be the dominant factor before long, if it is not so now. My hon. friend, however, does not seem to do enough, in my judgment, for labour in Canada. I do not wish to play the demagogue, but in view of what must be done during the reconstruction period after the war, the Government should now take steps to provide for the interests of labour after peace is concluded. A more drastic and business-like policy should be adopted than that which is embodied in the present legislation, commendable though it may be. When peace is declared, industry in this country and all over the North American continent will be disorganized and dislocated. Men and women who since 1914 have been employed in munition plants will be removed from these activities and virtually left on the street. Employers of labour will be forced, so to speak, to empty factories and plants which have been engaged in the production of munitions; men and women who have taken the place of soldiers in industrial establishments and manufacturing plants will be turned out, and the plants themselves will have to be remodelled. As was pointed out the other day by an hon. gentleman who is affiliated with the Labour party, a remarkably large number of men engaged in industrial work enlisted in the Canadian overseas forces. Imagine the condition of things when peace is concluded. Men and women now employed will be on the streets; plants will be idle for a time owing to the necessity of their being remodelled, and the soldiers will be returning to Canada, many of them anxious to obtain the positions they occu-

pied before they went away. It is good policy to provide for labour bureaus, but the Government must go one step further; they must foresee the conditions that will arise when peace is declared. The conditions affecting labour when this war is over will be much more serious than labour conditions were in England and in France after Waterloo and the Crimean war, and after other great wars. Conditions of labour and employment after a period of war are always such as require serious consideration and attention. If the soldiers who return to Canada are not provided with work; if the operation of manufactories and industrial plants is suspended or interfered with, there may be unrest; the times will be revolutionary. The Government, therefore, should provide now for the better equipment of the labour of Canada when the war is over. How could my hon. friend better serve the interests of labour than by giving to returned soldiers and to persons now employed in labour throughout Canada a better technical education? The Imperial Trades Commission, in their last report to the British and Dominion Governments, made specific recommendations on this subject. If Canada is to take a lead after the war in the industrial battle that will then be waged, our labour must be equipped to meet its rivals on that occasion. Some years ago the Ontario Labour Commission made similar recommendations, and I see now that the manufacturers and business men of Toronto are working on the same problem. Not later than this morning I received from the Canadian Industrial Reconstruction Association an outline of the work to be undertaken by that new body. It will endeavour to assist in the development and extension of technical education. It will maintain a sympathetic attitude towards projects of land settlement. It will extend co-operation among rural producers and endeavour to improve rural conditions. It will give its support to movements, whether directed by leaders of labour or employers of labour, which aim at establishing fair working agreements between workers and employers and improving relations between labour and capital. Recognizing the equal rights of citizenship which women have acquired, it will seek to improve their position in industry and to co-operate, so far as opportunity offers, with women's organizations in investigating and improving conditions which peculiarly affect the domestic, social and industrial welfare of women. My hon. friend can take a lesson from the programme of this Industrial Reconstruction Association. The Bill which we are considering is a good one, in a way, but the only power taken by my hon. friend is to grant to some of the provinces various amounts of money, based, I suppose, on population. Reports will then be made to the Labour Department in Ottawa as to the work of these labour bureaus. I do not see that it is at all necessary, in connection with the work of these labour bureaus to spend any money at Ottawa, because you have here the whole machinery of the Labour Department to collect the statistics which may come from the various labour bureaus in the provinces. It, therefore, seems to me that by this Bill my hon. friend does not materially assist labour and does not foresee the period of reconstruction which, I hope, is fast approaching.

I have just mentioned this Industrial Reconstruction Association programme. The manufacturers of Canada are wide awake. They are looking after the interests of labour; they are looking after the interests of the farmers; but, of course, they are, in their circular, also looking after the interests of number one. All this deep interest in the farmer and in labour is to conclude by the assertion of the rights of the Canadian manufacturers to get from the Government a higher tariff when the proper time comes. My hon. friend, therefore, should not be satisfied with establishing labour bureaus, he should also see that a proper allowance is made to the various provinces in order to stimulate the cause of technical education in Canada. We have, in every province in Canada, a most intelligent class of labourers. I am sorry to say that only a few of the provinces have promoted the cause of technical education. It is technical education which has given England, Scotland, Germany, France, the United States, their lead in the industrial world. If Canada is to follow that lead, Canada should do something towards equipping her labourers by imparting to them that very necessary technical knowledge. If you have in Canada a well equipped labourer, if he has, at the technical school, attained the secrets of his craft, you do not require a tariff for the employer or for the employee. The Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian labourer, provided the latter is given the technical educational assistance which the labourer in other countries receives, can compete with the world. I rose just to make those observations. I support the Bill, but I do not think that the Minister of Labour is

doing enough for the cause of labour. I hope that the money grants appropriated by this Bill will not be wasted. There is no need for more officers in the Labour Department at Ottawa. This money is to be paid to the various provinces for the establishment of labour bureaus. Let my hon. friend, through his correspondents of the Labour Gazette, gather all the data, all the statistics, and the grant would thus be wisely spent. But once more I say: This is, it seems to me picayune legislation. My hon. friend should be bold, he should assert himself as the leader of labour in Canada, and see that for the reconstruction period our labourers get the technical education which the Governments of other countries are freely giving to their fellow men of the working class.

Mr. BURNHAM: It would be a great calamity if this legislation should not pass. It may be quite true that not all that could be desired is comprised within the four corners of this Bill, but if we are advancing we are doing something.

Section 3 states that:

> The Minister is authorized and empowered,—
> (a) to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices and to promote uniformity of methods among them;
> (b) to establish one or more clearing houses for the interchange of information between employment offices concerning the transfer of labour and other matters;
> (c) to compile and distribute information received from employment offices and from other sources, regarding prevailing conditions of employment.

Surely no one can object to that broad, general and comprehensive statement, and, at the same time, have a real idea as to the requirements and development of labour conditions in this country. If we do not have co-ordination, we have confusion. Co-ordination is, therefore, very plainly, absolutely necessary. It is also very plain that, in the past, we have not had co-ordination. That is one of the weaknesses of the Federal system of government. The rapprochement of the provinces with the Dominion is one of the most difficult of things to bring about. Therefore, everything that leads up to that, to the identification and consolidation of their aims and actions in a matter of this kind must surely be viewed with an encouraging eye. A clearing house for information is, of all things, the most necessary and the most sane. To sit down and discuss what is actually taking place means, with sane people, that the difficulty will shortly be removed. Not to have a clearing house means that when men sit down to consider the question they will not really know what they are speaking about, and their actions will be in the future as they have been in the past, very largely a misfit and a misfire. People, scientifically minded, will at once admit that your information must be accurate and carefully gathered. Then, if it is not properly dealt with, that is due to the mental weakness and incapacity of those who assume the reins of government. But it is impossible for the wisest man, for the man with the most acute intellect, to deal properly with anything on wrong premises, and unless such a clearing house is established no Minister of Labour can possibly do justice to labour conditions.

The third clause regarding the compiling and distribution of information follows from those preceding it. It enables the minister to deal with the problem of aiding and encouraging the organization and co-ordination of employment offices and the establishment of clearing houses, for the interchange of information between employment offices. The rest of the Bill, apart from the earlier provisions which I have mentioned, is merely a statement of technicalities. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that I have ever seen a determination upon the part of this House to clothe the Minister of Labour with ample power and to justify his existence.

When this Bill is passed and a clearing house is established, the minister will be able to find out just how and when and where labour should be employed, and he will have every means within his grasp for dealing with the labour problems of Canada. After he has made known to working men the conditions and circumstances throughout the country, it will be for them to come forward and deal with them in an individual way, and as loyal and enterprising citizens, as we know them to be, they will do it. But if we do not empower the minister to deal with these matters, we are simply asking labour throughout the country to look in vain to the directing power. To appoint a Department of Labour under such conditions is really to mock labour, and to show that labour conditions throughout the country are not regarded seriously. It would be showing an entire lack of a scientific grasp of the situation such as, if it were exhibited in medicine or in law, would result in anarchy in those walks of life at once. It has taken years and years to sweep away misconceptions and to make the slightest progress in the way of a sympathetic co-ordination of the various rival interests

in the employment of labour. Now, we have the chance to empower a capable minister to look into these matters, and from the serene height of his federal position to tell the country what are the facts, and I say that to fail to give him this power and to back him up by such an Act as this, would be a calamity of the direst possible kind.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind hon. members that this is not a debate on the second reading of the Bill. We have had some excellent speeches on the principle of the Bill, but we are now in committee, and I ask hon. members to confine their remarks as closely as possible to the clause under discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was pretty late in the evening when the Resolution was introduced the other day, and the House had only a few minutes in which to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN: The second reading took place to-day.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I shall endeavour to confine myself to the clause under discussion. Before I heard the hon. member for Maisonneuve speak I was under the impression that this Bill was fairly simple, that it was merely to provide, if possible the means whereby the employer and the man seeking work could get in touch with one another. But after listening to the hon. member I think the House must have got the impression that this Bill had something to do with a variety of subjects other than what is set out in the Bill, because my hon. friend dealt with technical education, the tariff, the reconstruction period after the war, the relationship of the Manufacturers' Association to the industrial life of the country, and many other kindred subjects. However, the clause immediately before us is to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices, and to promote unity of method among them. The minister has told us what the province of Ontario has done in the direction of creating employment agencies at different centres. As the minister said, the number is confined to about five or six, located in Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, London, and one or two other large centres. I have no desire either to be captious or critical; I agree with every provision of the Bill; I think the Bill is vitally necessary at the present time, but I must say that the machinery which the provinces have so far set up is utterly inadequate to meet the situation which this Bill is apparently designed to take care of. I would again impress upon the minister the necessity of approaching the provinces in an effort to secure their co-operation in setting up provincial clearing houses for employment purposes, and making use of the machinery afforded by the private employment agencies until the Federal Government established a system of its own. The minister has said it would be impossible for the Government to establish a comprehensive system of employment agencies, taking in every town and hamlet in this country, but some such system as that must be provided if the men looking for employment and the employers looking for labour are to be given the information they must have in order to get in touch with each other. You will find that from one end of this province to the other—and I think I know something of what I am talking about—the large employers of labour are constantly in touch with the employment offices, not only in the large centres, but in the smaller towns and hamlets throughout the whole country, and it is only by that means they are able to get the necessary supply of labour, and that the men seeking employment can get in touch with the men desiring their help. I repeat, I do not wish to be critical of the provisions of the Bill, which I say is a step in the right direction; but if we want immediate results I would urge the minister to embody in his scheme the principle of making use of the things we have ready-made to hand.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: The principle of this Bill is a good one, but in my opinion the Bill does not go far enough. It only seeks to encourage the employment offices already in operation by the provinces. I would like to see this Government establish employment offices where now there are none, especially in places where there is a great demand for them. I know for a fact that these labour exchanges are rendering a great service to employers and employees, and they should be looked after by the minister with great care. An inspector should be appointed to look into their operation, for I know of many cases where there has been difficulty in getting work through these channels.

Mr. CROTHERS: Section 8 provides for an inspection.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Not more than a month ago a delegation from my county came to my office, and spoke to me regarding works that were to be constructed by the Government in Halifax, or, at least,

to which this Government was contributing money. These people had to disburse to certain agents or bureaus to be permitted to go to Halifax to work. They had to get into communication with the Minister of Labour, and, for some reason or another, they got no satisfaction. They were called upon to disburse ten or fifteen dollars before they could be employed at all. Such dealings as these should disappear completely. In large centres like Montreal, for instance, different private bureaus charge the men for obtaining employment for them. After three or four days' work, these men are turned out. They have to come back again to the agency and pay perhaps two or three dollars—which means a lot to them—in order to secure employment. I simply draw these facts to the attention of the Minister of Labour. I endorse the statements of the hon. member for Maisonneuve in regard to technical education. It is a great thing for the country. The officers who are going to be appointed under this Bill should consider the question. It is absolutely imperative that this matter should be looked into, in the interests of the labour men. After the war is over, it will be very difficult to obtain employment. I suggest that a commission should be appointed as soon as possible to look into these matters, to ascertain how the labour men in this country may be employed after the war.

Mr. BUTTS: I have considerable sympathy with the remarks generally of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve. I come from a county where nearly all the people are miners, or steel workers, and the labour question, as a general rule, is a very prominent one. I think when the Minister of Labour comes to consider the matter he will find that the Bill he has presented to the House does not go quite far enough. In order to have a labour organization that would be properly conducted, I think the Government should consult the different provincial governments, and provide for a uniform system throughout the Dominion. Labour and capital are getting very wide apart. The antagonism between them is becoming too pronounced to conduce to a healthy condition in this country. It is pretty nearly time we began to realize the present condition of affairs, and endeavour to bring capital and labour closer to one another. In this way only can we bring about a healthy condition in Canada. Parliament should do something. I make a special appeal to the Minister of Labour, and urge him to get in touch with all the provinces of Canada and endeavour to frame a uniform labour law. In the local legislature we have been dealing, year after year, with the question of workmen's compensation, employers' liability, and kindred matters. These matters are important and ought to be taken seriously, without regard to politics. As sane men we should regard these matters as being pertinent to the well-being of the community and the Dominion at large. The Sydney Post records that a poor woman got a verdict from a jury for $35,000 for the death of her husband, who was as dear to her as if he were earning a million dollars a year; but that verdict will, of course, be appealed to a higher court. If the judgment had been for $10,000, possibly it would have been sustained. The other evening, when we discussed the subject of coal, some hon. gentlemen said they were paying $10 a ton for it, when I obtain it for $3.90. I told you the other day about a man who had a salary of $100,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I do feel that his remarks are very far from the clause under consideration, and I would ask him to address his remarks to clause 3.

Mr. BUTTS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, but we were talking about the matter of capital and labour.

The CHAIRMAN: This is not a discussion upon the question of capital and labour.

Mr. BUTTS: At the same time it boils down to that.

The CHAIRMAN: I will have to rule that the discussion of the question of capital and labour is out of order. I regret to do so, but hon. members, this afternoon, have certainly gone far beyond the latitude allowed in discussions in committee. Some hon. members do not seem to have understood me when I asked them to speak to the clause under consideration. I hope I shall not be again obliged to call attention to this.

Mr. BUTTS: I think that the discussion this afternoon has been largely a debate on the question of capital and labour. I will submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The debate so far would in some respects lead to that conclusion, but it has been out of order.

Mr. BUTTS: Will you give me a little latitude? You have given latitude to all hands this afternoon. I intended to speak of the debate that took place here a few nights ago. Perhaps I am altogether out of

order, but as you have acknowledged yourself, Sir, that the whole debate has been out of order this afternoon. We had a debate the other evening about the high cost of coal, about which the people in Ontario complain. Just think of it—a Yankee comes over from the land of Uncle Sam and exacts from one of our small steel and coal companies $100,000 in yearly salary. What can you expect? You have to pay for it in your coal. Through this Bill you have an opportunity of doing something to alleviate the ill-feeling that exists between capital and labour. Every person knows perfectly well that nothing is more desirable than to bring about such a condition of things as will make it possible for capital and labour to go hand in hand together. If we can secure the adoption of a Bill which will result in a good understanding between capital and labour we will be helping the Minister of Labour to do something for the country that no one ever did before.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not quite understand how the minister expects to encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices. Is there any demand from the different provinces for this Bill? What would be the result if all this money were expended in one province? It would not in that case be of any assistance in the way of encouraging an interprovincial exchange of labour. On what basis is it expected that the money is to be distributed? Is there any encouragement to the provinces to bring about such an organization or is it the intention that there shall be any encouragement offered to them? What is the purpose of it?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am afraid I will not be able to throw any light on this subject beyond what is contained in two or three sections of the Bill itself. They seem to me to make it perfectly plain.

Mr. CAHILL: I am very sorry to say they do not make it plain to me and if it is plain to the minister perhaps he will throw some light on it.

Mr. EULER: I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Cahill). We have discussed this Bill for an hour and a half, or two hours, and I feel that the minister has not told us just what he expects to accomplish by its enactment. I do not understand what he is driving at. If it is the intention simply to relieve the provincial governments of the expense of maintaining labour bureaus we would like to know that. If, as clause 3 suggests, it is intended to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices in the various provinces, I think the minister should tell us a little more in detail as to what he has worked out in the way of co-ordination, and possibly co-operation, between the various provinces. I would like to see my way clear in a matter of this kind and I agree with him that a great deal can be done with proper co-operation and co-ordination of the different provinces. I would like to ask him whether he has himself, or with his officials, or with the officials of the provinces, worked out any definite scheme in detail by which he is going to proceed. If he could tell a little more about that I believe the Bill might carry quite readily and perhaps without such diffuse discussion as we have had here. Take, for example, the situation in our own city of Kitchener. We have there a labour bureau under the provincial government. We know very little about it in so far as the actual work is concerned of supplying employers with labour. That is done almost entirely by a private organization and the provincial body is very seldom heard of. If that state of affairs could be remedied so that we really received something for the money expended then I think this Bill would be useful. I would like to suggest that probably a good deal might be accomplished that would be in the interest of both employers and employees if the employees themselves, the workmen, whether through their organizations or otherwise, and the employers, were consulted as to the best means of working out the scheme which the minister has in mind.

Mr. CAHILL: We should have some light on this question from the Minister of Labour. At least, I am willing to sit here for some time until I do hear from him.

Mr. EULER: Would the minister describe the nature of the agreement which he is expecting to draw up with the various provinces, stating what points would be covered? Perhaps, however, these matters would more properly come up in connection with clause 7.

Mr. CROTHERS: I should be glad if I could throw any light on this matter that would help any hon. gentleman present to understand it, but it seems to me absolutely clear, so far as the disposition of the money is concerned. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Euler) asks about the details of the agreement which we are to make with the various provinces. I do not think this is the time to enter into details. We had better get authority to do something first by way

of this Bill. Perhaps my hon. friend will remember the Act granting assistance to the various provinces with respect to agriculture. No details were set forth in the Bill as to the agreements that might be made thereafter, but agreements are made year after year between the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the Government of a province as to how the sum of money to be paid by the Federal Government shall be expended during that year. In the same way, the details will be gone into between the Minister of Labour and the provincial government when this Bill is passed, and we know that we are authorized to make a contribution.

Mr. EULER: I would ask the minister whether it is the intention of the department to make a grant of this money to the provincial organizations, and to leave the initiative of the work almost entirely as it is, or whether the Labour Department, or its officers, intend to take some action towards initiating new ideas and schemes in connection with the getting together of employers and employee, and, if so, whether some definite scheme has been worked out, no matter whether or not all the details are already arranged, or whether the Department knows exactly what it is going to do in connection with the legislation asked for?

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read section 7, he will get some idea of it. There have been several references to private agencies and to the use that might be made of private labour exchanges. These have not proved themselves satisfactory, generally speaking. One hon. gentleman mentioned some frauds perpetrated upon poor people by some of these agencies which charged them large sums of money. That matter came to our attention four or five years ago when I happened, for the time being, to be in the Department of the Interior. We made regulations then governing all these private agencies so far as their treatment of immigrants went. We had no authority to deal with them in any other respect. We cannot abolish them. So little satisfaction have private agencies given in some places, and so much dissatisfaction have they given, that the legislature of the province of Quebec has abolished them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Abolished what?

Mr. CROTHERS: These private agencies have been substantially abolished in Quebec by the imposition of such very large license fees as would practically put them out of business.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my right hon. friend will allow me: The law in Quebec was amended last session. Now, a fee of $200 is exacted from any one opening a labour agency. Besides that, there is a fee also imposed by the city of Montreal of $300 or $400 a year. There is a regular inspection also by the civic and provincial authorities. The effect is that only well-to-do people can open agencies.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, I had the advantage of speaking to Sir Lomer Gouin a few months ago about that matter, and he told me that, in substance, these labour agencies had been legislated out of existence because they had proved unsatisfactory. However, so far as that is concerned, we had no jurisdiction over them, except where they were dealing with immigrants, and we provided that all of them should take out licenses from the central Government to authorize them to deal with immigrants at all, and we fixed by regulation the limit of fee that they should be allowed to charge. It is not thought that private agencies are the best means of getting the employer and the employee together, and of securing for the workingman steady work. It is in the interest of the private agent to get the man out of work as often as possible so that he will come back to him and pay him another fee to get another job. Whether they are considered desirable or not, we have no jurisdiction over them, and we are not proposing to deal with them at all in this Bill. Neither are we proposing to deal with municipal labour exchanges, but only with exchanges operated by a province. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) spoke in favour of a national system. As I said earlier in the discussion, I know of no large country where any such system exists. In Australia there is no co-ordination whatever, each of the States establishes its own labour bureaus, and there is no linking up between the governments of the various states and the central government. There is a Bill before the Congress of the United States now, substantially like this Bill. Heretofore, the various States of the Union have established labour bureaus, but there has been no connection between the Federal Government at Washington and the State governments concerning these bureaus. The Bill now before Congress provides for such co-ordination as we are providing in this Bill. Apparently some insignificant points have caused the United States' Bill to be held up for some little

time, and the Secretary of Labour has undertaken—(there is a vote of $250,000 appropriated for that purpose)—to establish these bureaus at different points in the country because of the war emergency. One has been established in Seattle, and a few others are in operation. In neither Germany, nor Holland, nor other countries, do they undertake to manage a national system, but the central governments assist local states and municipalities in defraying the expenses of these bureaus. It is not intended by these bureaus to create employment; it never was so intended in England or anywhere else. The intention is to facilitate the means of getting the employer and the employee together. We think that can best be worked out by the various provinces, and that we ought to assist them in that respect. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) said that I had been converted to this Bill. Nothing similar to this Bill has been brought up in this House during my time here. The suggestion was made that a national system should be established, but I thought that such a system would be too cumbersome. I was not in favour of it when the proposal was made, and I am not in favour of it now. I think that the hon. gentleman who has been converted is the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). It is astonishing how enthusiastically he now favours labour bureaus and technical education, although during the years that he was a member of the Federal Government and at the head of the Labour Department we heard nothing from him about labour bureaus or technical education. As soon as the hon. gentleman got on the other side of the House, however, he became very enthusiastic over these suggested reforms and denounced us for not introducing measures to carry them out right away.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does this Bill not provide for a national system? I understood that the system was to be a national one, with headquarters in the office of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. CROTHERS: My idea of a national system is the establishing of bureaus in all the large and medium-sized centres throughout Canada, to be operated and maintained entirely by the Federal Government. We are not proposing anything of that kind.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—money grants:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am under the impression that in Western Canada the Department of the Interior has control of the placing of labour, while in the older provinces this work is carried on by the Provincial Government. Is there any danger of overlapping as between the new Department of Immigration and the Department of Labour. The Department of Labour would naturally be expected to furnish information in all matters pertaining to labour and to see that quick action is taken by the authorities to ensure such placing of labour as is imperative under present conditions. The need for co-ordination was never more apparent than it is at present. We should have a uniform system. In Ontario the work carried on by the Federal and Provincial Governments has been overlapping to some extent. Sometimes you have, under the party system of government, a conflict between the two parties in connection with this work, and some jealousies may arise. But no effective system of co-operation with regard to labour conditions in Canada has been so far established, and I think that something should be done to accomplish this end as quickly as possible.

Mr. CALDER: There is no likelihood of conflict between the work done by the Department of Immigration and the activities of provincial bureaus which will be established under this law. Some time ago a conference of premiers of the various provinces was held at Ottawa, and this matter was discussed. No intimation was made by any of the premiers—all the provinces were represented—that this work should be undertaken by the Federal authorities. They all felt that the provincial authorities could handle the distribution of labour much better than any central body established at Ottawa, or than any bodies over which the central authority here would have control. In the past the Immigration Department has exercised only a certain amount of control over all labour bureaus established in Canada so far as the immigrant is concerned. That applies particularly to Western Canada. Immigration officers throughout the country have not interested themselves generally in the distribution of labour. The position taken by the member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is, I think, the proper one; that this work should be centralized in offices established by provincial or Federal authority—and it seems to me that the work should be controlled entirely by the provinces. A conference was also held at Ottawa at which all the labour organizations of Canada were represented.

Meetings were held on two occasions; this subject was thoroughly and exhaustively discussed, and the conclusion was reached that the provincial authorities could handle the work better than the Federal authorities. As I understand this Bill, it simply lays down the principle that means should be provided, by the giving of money grants to the provinces, for the establishing of these labour bureaus on a common basis. That is the main idea that runs through the Bill. Section 7 provides for an agreement between the Federal and the provincial authorities whereby that desired end may be brought about. Of course, the details of an agreement of that kind can be worked out only through the course of time. It took some two or three years to arrive at the basis on which our agricultural grants should be made, and to come to a determination satisfactory to all the provinces. We may expect the same thing here. Representatives of the Federal Government or the Department of Labour must go to the various provinces, study the conditions, and enter into agreements with them. As conditions vary in the different provinces, the details of the agreements may differ, but if both provincial and Federal authorities enter into the matter in the proper spirit, no difficulty will be experienced in making arrangements under which this work will be handled much more satisfactorily in the future. The member for South Oxford can rest assured that the Department of Immigration will make every possible arrangement to prevent overlapping of work or duplication of expenditure. As the provincial authorities have agreed that this work should be undertaken by them, we should make an arrangement whereby they shall be left in entire possession of the field, so that duplication or unnecessary expenditure may, as far as possible, be avoided.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The appropriations to be made under this Bill are to be a matter of agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments. As I understood the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), he alluded to the necessity of having some uniform rule. I wish we could have some further enlightenment upon that point. Why could not the rule as to the amount of the appropriation to be expended be uniform and be put into the Bill? Let me call attention to section 6:

> 6. The payments hereinbefore authorized shall, as to each province, be conditional upon agreement between the Minister and the government of the province as to the terms, conditions and purposes within the meaning of this Act upon and for which the payments are to be made and applied, and upon such agreement being approved by the Governor in Council.

The governing words of the section are those "conditions and purposes within the meaning of this Act." The conditions are very vague in the Bill itself. I wish my hon. friend would explain what he means by those agreements which are to be made between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. He said that after a few years a basis was found. If a basis has been found, surely we ought also to have a basis for the application of those appropriations.

Mr. CALDER: I am personally not in a position to give the information desired by the right hon. member, because I have not paid any attention to the details of any agreement which may be carried out, but I can quite realize that if it can be found practicable to do so, information along those lines should be given to the House. The House should understand what the basis of this agreement is to be. I have no doubt that there will be no difficulty at all in working out an agreement with all the provinces. The main purpose of the Bill is simply to provide a means whereby the provincial authorities will take over the control of existing labour bureaus or establish labour bureaus where they do not now exist. That will have to be done under certain conditions. If those conditions are complied with, then the money grants provided by this Bill will be forthcoming, but I am not in a position to state what those conditions should be, because I have not given any consideration to that phase of the subject.

Mr. CROTHERS: Section 6 provides that an agreement may be made subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The general conditions of the agreement are set forth in section 7:

> (a) That the offices shall endeavour to fill situations in all trades and for both male and female employees;

That is the whole object of the Bill, namely, to fill vacant situations.

> (b) That the offices shall make such returns and submit to such inspection as the minister may require.

Those are the two leading things to be contained in the agreement, the details of which will probably be arranged under the regulations, for which section 10 provides by stating that the minister may

make regulations for carrying into effect the objects of the Bill.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Will the minister tell us why he proposes to expend $50,000 this year, $100,000 next year, and $150,000 the following year? Why not reverse the amounts?

Mr. CROTHERS: We expect that the various provinces will be stimulated to establish larger numbers of those bureaus year after year, more next year than this year and more the year after next than next year.

Mr. PEDLOW: Has the minister any idea as to how much the various provinces are at present expending on this department?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not able to give that information.

Mr. PEDLOW: That information might be a basis from which to judge as to the amount to be spent in the first instance.

Mr. CROTHERS: We are guarded to this extent that we are to pay only an amount equal to one-half of what is expended by a province.

Mr. PEDLOW: It would be germane to the question to know how much the provinces are at present expending on this work. Then we would know whether $50,000 was or was not sufficient to carry on the work the first year.

Mr. CROTHERS: If it is too much, it will not be expended.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—money, how allotted:

Mr. CROTHERS: As there may be some doubt as to the meaning of the latter part of this section, I am going to move an amendment. The latter part of the section reads:

> But in no case shall the allotment to a province exceed the amount expended for the maintenance of employment offices by such province.

That might be interpreted to mean that we are to pay the whole sum expended by a province. Supposing a province had spent $20,000, then if we were to allot as much as it expends, it would mean we would allot the whole $20,000. I, therefore, wish to amend the section so as to make it plain that we are to pay only one-half of the total amount that is expended. I, therefore, move certain changes in the wording of the clause, which will make it read:

[Mr. Crothers.]

> But in no case shall the allotment to any province exceed one-half the amount expended for the maintenance of employment offices by such province.

Mr. FIELDING: There are matters of detail which we cannot expect the minister to give at present. The minister, however, has to make a start in appropriating money to a province. For instance, the sum of $50,000 is to be paid in one year, and there is a proviso that no province shall receive a sum greater than its own expenditure. If one province were to expend $50,000, under that rule, it might be entitled to take the whole appropriation, but, of course, that is not what is intended. The minister will find it necessary, at the beginning, to make an allotment to the provinces subject to the conditions he very properly imposes. My question is: On what basis will that allotment be made? Will it be by population?

Mr. CROTHERS: It was not considered well to base it on population, but rather on the amount of money expended.

Mr. FIELDING: If at the time the first allotment is made no moneys have been expended, you cannot go on that basis.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is impossible to determine at the beginning of the year how much each province is going to spend. At the end of the year they will be paid on the basis of the money they have expended, if there is enough of this $50,000 to go round, but in any case the amount each province gets will not exceed one-half of what they have expended.

Mr. FIELDING: The allotment will only be made at the close of the year?

Mr. CROTHERS: That will have to be so.

Mr. FIELDING: And the local governments will have no knowledge of how much they will get until the year closes.

Mr. CROTHERS: They will not know exactly.

Mr. FIELDING: Not even approximately.

Mr. CROTHERS: They will know how much we are going to divide up, but they will not know what the other provinces are going to expend.

Mr. FIELDING: They know that at the most they can only get one-half of their expenditure, but they also know they may not get one-tenth.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I do not think there are any labour bureaus in Prince Edward Island at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is my information.

Mr. READ: Is this the same old game of robbing the little province by the sea to feed up the fatted calf in other parts of the Dominion? This is a very important clause, and it certainly does not show how the money is to be distributed. I would suggest that the minister look into it further.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Would it not be advisable for the minister to advise each province that this law is being enacted, so that they may take advantage of it?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think it would be a good idea to send them a copy of the Bill.

Mr. DECHENE: In some provinces, employment offices may do a great deal of work at little expense. In Montreal, for instance, the employment offices are run on a very small expenditure, and the same applies to Quebec, and no doubt to many other places. Under the present basis of distribution a province which spent a large sum of money in establishing a large employment bureau might get more than it was fairly entitled to, and might be doing not half as much work as the other provinces that were running their bureaus at less expense. I do not think the present basis of distribution is fair. Why not distribute the money according to population? Then each province would know how much it was going to get.

Mr. CROTHERS: The condition my hon. friend is afraid of will be guarded against by the agreement that we shall make, and also by the inspection. We shall ascertain from each province the amount they expect to expend this year. We can guard in the agreement against any exorbitant expenditure such as paying the head officer of a bureau an extravagant salary. Then we shall have one or more inspectors going around the country to see that these agreements are carried out faithfully, just as the Department of Agriculture has inspectors seeing that the provinces carry out faithfully the matters set forth in the agreement with regard to agricultural assistance.

Mr. DECHENE: There are only two clauses which we know will be in the agreement, and they are mentioned in section 7 of the Bill. The agreement may be one thing in one province, and another thing in another province.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of the minister is a commendable one. He wants to encourage local governments to do this work under proper supervision, but I am afraid the local governments will not know how much they are going to get, and consequently, the encouragement the minister intends to give them will not be effective. They would not know until the end of the year how much their expenditure was going to be; they would know that at the most they could not get more than half of what they expended. They know how much they are not going to get, but not how much they are going to get, because the $50,000 has to be distributed amongst all the provinces. I heartily concur in the object of the minister, but I am a little afraid this Bill will not give the encouragement to local governments which he desires.

Mr. CALDER: What the hon. gentleman states is perfectly true. The position, however, is this: At the conference in Ottawa, the provincial premiers felt that the time had come when labour bureaus should be under provincial control and not under the control of private individuals or corporations, and they intimated to us very clearly that they intended to embark upon that policy. I will go further than that and say that they never asked us for any assistance at all, but proposed to do this as a matter of policy in the interests of their own people. They felt that the labour situation in Canada was such at the present time, and would likely continue for some time to come, that it was absolutely necessary for them to undertake this work. Now for the purpose of endeavouring to have all these labour bureaus established as far as possible on a common basis, and to have them working along the same lines, we thought it advisable to make provision whereby we could give them a grant, and we hope as a result to attain some measure of control over them with the object of co-ordinating the work. One of the things we expect to accomplish is to receive frequent reports from the provincial bureaus, in order that we may have reliable information in Ottawa at all times with reference to labour conditions in the various provinces, and as to the manner in which these bureaus are meeting the conditions as they arise. I am quite sure that, in the working out of the details of this arrangement, means will be created whereby frequent reports will be made by the provinces, so that we will hear at all times of the situation as it develops in the provinces. What the hon. gentleman has said is very true, that at this time the provinces cannot know what sum of money they would require to help

them out in this work. I think, after the proposed scheme operates for a year or so, the law may require amendment, but it seems to me that until the Act is in actual operation for at least a year, we will not know what the provinces require. They will have to establish bureaus in order to ascertain what their expenditures are, and the details of these agreements can then be worked out. It seems to me that all we can do at the present time is simply to adopt the general scheme, in the hope that, if the necessity arises, we will get the measure in better shape after it has been in operation for some time.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is there any serious objection to allotting the money according to population?

Mr. FIELDING: If the local governments are prepared to do this work out of their own good will, and do not attach any importance to the provincial grant, then the view of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization is right, but if the local governments are attaching importance to the federal grant then there is much uncertainty as to the amount which the Dominion is to give. My hon. friend (Mr. Calder) and I have been members of local governments and we know that these local governments are at no time indifferent to a federal grant.

Mr. CALDER: I did not say the provincial governments would be indifferent to receiving a grant, but when we had the matter under consideration they did not ask for a grant. It seems to me, if we are going to devise any plan whereby the labour bureaus will be established, as far as practicable upon a common basis and the federal authorities are to have the right of at least, some supervision over it, and if we are to ask them to furnish us with information, about the only way we can do it is by means of a grant. We cannot compel them to do it. We can lay down conditions that they will not obtain the grant unless they are prepared to do so and so.

Mr. FIELDING: That is reasonable.

Mr. CALDER: This is only a small grant; $50,000 will not go far in paying for the administration of the bureaus throughout the length and breadth of Canada. One of the main purposes of giving the grant is to place us in a position whereby we will be able to exercise some supervision over the work of these labour bureaus, and at the same time endeavouring to establish them upon a common basis.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. CAHILL: It would seem to me that the objection of my hon. friend might be overcome by stating just what amount each province would expect to get each year on the census basis. If it would amount to about $7,500 for each million people in the country, the province having two million could expect to get $15,000 this year and no more, and the province that did not avail itself of the generosity of this Government would not receive anything this year. In that way there would be an inducement to our friends in Prince Edward Island to establish such a bureau. After the first year the amount of the grant might be based on the understanding that other provinces were not in need of the money, and the grant to a particular province which required the money would be greater if these other provinces did not apply for it. If all the provinces apply for it, the province which receives, say, $15,000 this year might only receive half that amount next year. If we might limit the amount, and make it definite, it would be an inducement to the other provinces to establish the bureaus because they would be able to get this grant from the Dominion Government, provided they complied with the conditions, and I think each province might be limited to a certain amount.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I do not think the proposition to give according to population would be advisable, because the needs of the province depend sometimes on the centres of population. Montreal is a large centre for employees. Employees are sent from Montreal to different parts of the country outside the province, and Quebec may have to contribute more than another province and therefore Quebec should receive a larger proportion from the Federal Government. This is given as an encouragement to the provinces which may have a much larger population. After taking everything into consideration, I think the principle laid down by the hon. minister is a good one.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Archambault) is not taking into consideration the fact that if a province did not spend any money itself, it would not receive any. Consequently, the argument would not apply to that province. In Prince Edward Island, while we have not a regular governmental bureau, the people have been doing some work along these lines, but in a voluntary way. Last year I had the honour of being president of the Prince County branch of the National Service League, and we had a labour bu-

reau connected with that league. Other people were doing the work voluntarily. They were paying their expenses, working for nothing and finding everything, and they were doing it to help win the war. But if the Dominion Government is going to set aside $50,000, why not set aside, in the way suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) an amount pro rata to the population, and if the provinces do not use it, they will not receive it from the Dominion. Then there would be that much more left for the other provinces. I think that our people will have a labour bureau, because the labour situation with us is more acute than in any other province of the Dominion at the present time.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—payments conditional upon agreement between minister and province and approval.

Mr. CAHILL: Perhaps the ministers are prepared now to give an answer to the question which was asked regarding section 5. Do they not think it would be advisable to work it out on some basis not to exceed a definite sum each year for each province? I think this allotment should be made on a percentage basis to the provinces and a definite sum stated for the first year.

If you pay one province this year $40,000, and then next year all the other provinces take advantage of this opportunity, the province that received the $40,000 this year, would only get $10,000 or $12,000 next year. If you put it on a percentage basis, according to the population of each province, you will be able to determine what each province will get if it earns it. If it does not earn it, it will not get the grant. As pointed out by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, that province will not expect to get any grant this year. Next year, if it gets in line, it will get a grant, but it will not know whether it is going to get any part of this expenditure because it may have to be extended to the other provinces.

Mr. CROTHERS: There is nothing to prevent the province of Prince Edward Island from getting a portion of this grant this very year. They can get it by doing something in the next two or three months to earn a portion of this grant. If you put it on the basis of population you might have one or two provinces doing nothing, and, of course, getting nothing. A proportion of this sum in that event would not go to encouraging the establishment of these bureaus. We would hold it here and it would not be used as we desire it to be used. We want to encourage the establishment of bureaus and we want to encourage it according to the work done in the various provinces. There is no probability that the condition suggested by my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Cahill) will exist because there are five provinces which are pushing forward now under legislation to extend their systems by establishing a greater number of bureaus.

Mr. BUTTS: I do not think the province of Nova Scotia has any such expenditure as that, and if that is so, where would the fifty per cent come in? I know there was no provision made for it in the estimates.

Mr. CROTHERS: My information is that there is no legislation in Nova Scotia establishing such bureaus as these.

Mr. BUTTS: Then where would your fifty per cent come in—fifty per cent of nothing is nothing.

On section 8—appointment of officers:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the minister made an estimate of the personnel which would be required for the carrying out of this Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not considered the matter in connection with submitting an estimate to this House. It is very difficult—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: All the more reason to consider it.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, it requires more consideration than I have yet given to it. This is a new departure, it will need a great deal of consideration and we will probably ask for a larger sum than will probably be expended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not a good reason but we will accept it all the same.

Mr CROTHERS: We want to be sure we have enough.

On section 10—regulations:

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is usual to have the regulations approved by the Governor in Council. In this case the minister is going to make them off his own bat. I have no doubt he will make them wisely but that is not according to custom.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no objection to that. I move that the following words be added to the end of that section:

Subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported as amended.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 64, to amend the Indian Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Will of Indian devising property to be approved; land devised or bequeathed to non-resident on the reserve to be sold:

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister kindly explain this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As the law stands now, an Indian cannot devise his interest in the band property to any other than a member of the band. It frequently happens that his very close relatives are members of another band. This Bill will enable an Indian to devise his interest in the band property to any one outside of the band, but when that happens the Superintendent General is empowered to sell the devised property and distribute the proceeds to the heirs.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Do I understand that an Indian will be able to devise his land to any other person, even if that person is not an Indian?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can devise in any way as set out in section 25 of the Indian Act. There is a restriction in that clause to the effect that the testator cannot devise or bequeath land in a reserve or any interest therein—unless to his daughter, sister or grandchildren—to any one not entitled to reside on such reserve. Consequently, his rights to bequeath are in no way restricted by this amendment. They are enlarged, but only to such extent as to enable him to bequeath to the same class of people, even though they do not reside in that reservation.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: They will have to be Indians, though?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The Superintendent General may sell the property devised to any other member of the reservation, and distribute the proceeds to whom it was bequeathed. That is to say, the heirs get it, but they do not get it in the form of land, because if they did they would have to go upon the reservation. They get it in the form of proceeds.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: No matter whether the heirs are white or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The law is not changed in that particular. There is no wider range given at all, except to the extent of enabling them to bequeath to heirs outside of the reserve. There is no change in the nature of the Act.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: It has been enlarged, because formerly, if I understand correctly, no devise or bequest could be made to any one not entitled to reside on the reserve?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: So it would have to be an Indian?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Under this change, the Indian will be able to leave his property to anybody, but such land will have to be sold, and the proceeds given to the heirs. Is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not made myself clear. The class of people to whom the Indian may devise is not altered at all.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that class defined in the Indian Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 25 of that Act reads as follows:

> Indians may devise or bequeath property of any kind in the same manner as other persons: Provided that no devise or bequest of land in a reserve or of any interest therein unless to the daughter, sister or grandchildren of the testator, shall be made to any one not entitled to reside on such reserve, and that no will purporting to dispose of land in a reserve or any interest therein shall be of any force or effect unless or until the will has been approved by the Superintendent General, and that if a will be disapproved by the Superintendent General the Indian making the will shall be deemed to have died intestate; and the Superintendent General may approve of a will generally and disallow any disposition thereby made of land in a reserve or of any interest in such land, in which case the will so approved shall have force and effect except so far as such disallowed disposition is concerned.

The only alteration made is this: that whereas under the present Act "no devise or bequest of land in a reserve or any interest therein unless to the daughter, sister or grandchildren of the testator, shall be made to any one not entitled to reside on such reserve"—that restriction is removed. He may bequeath to others even though

they do not reside on the reservation, provided, of course, that the will is approved by the Superintendent General. But if he does bequeath to others who do not reside on the reservation the land must be sold and the proceeds only go to the devisees.

Mr. MICHAUD: Where an Indian has married a white woman, and has died without heirs, is the wife entitled to any interest in the land belonging to the band? Supposing the members of the band tried to send her away from the land belonging to her husband, and she wished to remain, is she entitled to remain there or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has nothing to do with the amendment, but the law of the matter is covered by section 26 of the Act. If the hon. gentleman reads that section, which is a very long one, he will see what becomes of the property of an Indian who dies intestate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The object is to leave the reserve intact for the band?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and to give wider liberty of bequest.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—proof of assent to release or surrender.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Before whom was the oath formerly taken?

Mr. MEIGHEN: An attempt had been made to particularize; various additions were made from time to time, yet the provision seemed still to be insufficient, because many of the officials designated as persons before whom the oath could be taken were not within reach. We simply wish to provide an omnibus clause so that any one who can take affidavits in the province is competent to take an affidavit in this case. Notaries were not included in the list. We want the section simply to read: "Any person having authority to take affidavits and having jurisdiction within the place where the oath is administered."

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Indian may be summoned as witness:

Mr. MEIGHEN: In a certain investigation Indians were advised by some ingenious lawyer not to appear, and he made out a very strong case that they were not "persons" within the meaning of the Act. We wish to avoid lawyers' fees in any further cases of that kind.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—direction of expenditures of capital of band without consent:

Mr. LEMIEUX: The powers conferred by this section upon the Superintendent General appear to be very wide. As long as its deputy head is such a competent official as Mr. Scott, I have no objection, but we cannot always have Mr. Scott.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The powers go only to the extent of enabling the Superintendent General to arrange for the cultivation—not for the expropriation—of Indian lands for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I refer the hon. gentleman to the first subsection of this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That merely provides for the utilization of a share of the capital of the band for purposes looking to the improvement of the conditions of the band and their property, not to the taking away of any of their property.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that if the band feel that the money should be used in a certain way, that the Superintendent General, who is the guardian of these wards of the nation, may decide to follow another course. Of course, the Governor in Council would not do anything contrary to the interests of the band. But these are very wide powers. I should have no objection if Mr. Scott were eternal, but unfortunately he is not.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Under the old Act, no such action could be taken as is contemplated by this section without the consent of the band. The Superintendent General could not expend the capital money of the band without their consent, even for the cultivation of the land or the improvement of the reserve. To this first section, I think, there is no objection; but subsection 3 provides that the Superintendent General shall have the right to grant a lease of lands in the reserve to a third party. May this not lead to serious trouble between the Indians and such third party? The Indians might object very strongly to strangers going on their reserve, even with a lease from the Government, to cultivate their land. This is a very important change. Previously nothing of this kind could be done without the consent of the band.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The departmental officials do not anticipate that trouble. Still, the hon. gentleman has a very correct appreciation of the change that has been effected in the law. It is putting it out of the power of what one may call reaction-

ary or recalcitrant Indian bands to check their own progress by refusing consent to the utilization of their funds or vacant lands for their own advantage. The hon. gentleman is not quite right in his understanding that at present no such power in any respect is given to the Superintendent General. It is, in these two respects: For purposes, for example, of surveys or of drainage, the consent of the Band has already been dispensed with, or rather provision has been made that it may be dispensed with. We are simply extending that principle. It is necessary to do so now, particularly, in view of the production campaign that we have under way throughout the Indian Reserves of Western Canada. The Indian Reserves of Western Canada embrace very large areas of land far in excess of what they are utilizing now for productive purposes. We have well under way in that country a campaign for the utilization of those reserves, for stock raising, for grain production, and, for the present, of course, in many cases, merely for summer fallowing. But we do not want to have this campaign entirely at the mercy of the Indian bands themselves. We do not want to have those bands stand in our way and say to us: Notwithstanding the necessities of to-day, you must keep off all this vacant land unless we choose to give it up to you and ourselves forego the great privilege of roaming on it in its old, wild state. We want to be able to utilize that land in every case; but, of course, the policy of the department will be to get the consent of the band wherever possible, and to meet the bands in such spirit and with such methods as will not alienate their sympathies from their guardian, the Government of Canada. We do not anticipate that we shall come into very serious conflict with any band. It is only the more backward bands that offer any objections at all to the utilization of their land.

Mr. STACEY: In the case of a very large reserve in which the band has been reduced to very small numbers, is there any clause in the Bill making it possible for the department to appropriate a portion of their land—actually to take it out of their hands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, only to the extent of enabling us to lease it, paying them the fair rental value of it, less the value of the permanent improvements. The title is not taken away.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MOLLOY: The question of leasing Indian lands has just come up. On what terms are those lands leased? This is the first year in which the question of enormously increasing production has been discussed. Many persons have asked me for information in regard to the matter, and I have never received authoritative information. On what terms are the lands leased to actual settlers and stock raisers, and for what period of time are they leased? What goes with the lease as regards fencing? Will the department fence the land and charge a certain rental according to the number of head of cattle per acre?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot, for very obvious reasons, give the hon. member any information as to terms. The commissioner under whose supervision all this work in the West is being done is Mr. W. M. Graham, late inspector and agent at File Hills. Mr. Graham has been in the service of the Indian Department for between thirty and thirty-five years. He has made a most conspicuous success of his Indian settlement work and of his management of the agencies under his control. The Order in Council which gives him his powers is very wide. It necessarily was wide. It would otherwise have been impossible for us, at this end, with proper expedition to fix the terms in any individual case. Mr. Graham is given power to make leases himself on behalf of the department, subject, of course, to our approval. We depend upon him to get the best terms possible. We do not as yet know what terms he is able to secure. I have from him an intimation that, in respect of one reserve in which already there are existing rights, he is securing a per-head basis very substantially in excess of the per-head basis that we get from those who now have existing rights. It was his anticipation that he would get very substantial rentals in each case. It must, however, be kept in mind that his paramount object is to secure productive results, at the same time, of course, securing fair and adequate returns to the bands for the rental values of their lands.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I wish to commend the minister for this section in the Bill. In the very centre of the district which I represent there is a large Indian reserve, possibly the most productive section of that country, served with railways and having every market facility. I should like to see this provision go further so as to allow the minister to give those lands for cultivation purposes as well as for grazing, because at this time, when we require

so much production, lands adjacent to a market and a railway are much more advantageous for purposes of cultivation than those further back from business centres. I have listened to what the minister has said in regard to the powers of Mr. Graham. I have spoken to Mr. Graham in connection with his work in Western Canada. The only criticism I might make of his work there at the present time is that I am afraid he is going to get from the rental of those lands more money than they are worth. At a time when we need every effort put forth for the purpose of increasing the stock of this country as well as for the purpose of grain production, Mr. Graham, as I learned from my last conversation with him, is getting more for the grazing privileges of an Indian reserve than, in my judgment, the farmer can afford to pay. This, of course, is for the benefit of the Indians, and, from that point of view, no exception can be taken to it. I hope the minister will allow, or instruct, Mr. Graham to do all he can to lease this land on, say, a five-year term for the purpose of cultivation, because there are thousands of acres of land that are immediately adjacent to markets and that are lying absolutely idle and of no value whatever either to the Indian or to any one else.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Does not this provision include cultivation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was just going to say so. It includes provision for leasing for cultivation.

Mr. MICHAUD: Under the old Act, I understand, the Government and the Indian could lease a quantity of land for the term of one year for the purpose of cultivation. Under this Bill does the Government expect to make a lease for a term of one, two or three years?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is wrong. Previously we could lease for any term within the scope of the surrender obtained from the Indian band.

There was no limitation to one year, and similarly, there is no limitation now. I believe that the leases are being made for three years, and possibly in some cases five years, the intention being to cover at all events the period of great need caused by the war.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is the consent of the whole band required or only the consent of the owner of the part leased?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the man were the recognized owner of the part leased he alone would have to be dealt with, but if the property belonged to the band the consent of the band would have to be obtained in compliance with the Indian Act.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the department to make any provision for the Indians in cases where the larger part of the reservation is leased?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Indian is very fortunate; he has all he had before, and now in addition he has the rental for this land. I do not think we need waste any time in sympathy for the Indian, for I am pretty sure his interests will be looked after by the Commissioner.

Mr. CAHILL: The Indian has only got now what we left to him after confiscating what we wanted. Now we are proposing to take the balance of the rights we then reserved to him. The Indian may ask to be allowed to live on this land which he leases to the Government, but under this Act he will not be permitted to do so if the Government wish otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot agree with the hon. member that there has been any confiscation at all. I believe that the Indians of this country have been liberally and generously dealt with, and I believe it is the intention and spirit of the country to continue to treat them generously. That spirit is evidenced by this Act. Where the Indian does not cultivate his land we are providing that we may arrange for its cultivation, the title still remaining in the band. The Indian gets the benefit of that cultivation by way of rental.

Mr. CAHILL: But we are taking away his right of residence on the reserve.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no; we do not take that in any case.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Would it not be well to provide for cancelling the lease at the end of two years if the Indian decided to cultivate the land himself at the end of that time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would certainly have it in our power not to continue. We would be only too glad to have the Indian use this land if he would; production by him would be just as valuable as production by anybody else. But he will not cultivate this land, and we want to cultivate it; that is all. We shall not use it any longer than he shows a disinclination to cultivate the land himself.

Mr. PEDLOW: Suppose it is decided to lease an entire reservation, would the Indians still be allowed to trap and hunt over the reserve or would they have to leave the reserve entirely?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not provide for that. We provide only for leasing the uncultivated part. Of course, if there are no Indians on the reservation we might lease it all, but that is not what my hon. friend fears; he fears the Indians will be put off. They will never be put off under this Act, which only provides for leasing the unused areas.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Are these short-term leases?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it the intention under this Act to expropriate the land that is not being cultivated and lease it to other parties who will use it for grain growing or grazing purposes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The intention is to lease it without expropriation.

Mr. PEDLOW: It is practically the same thing. Then what becomes of the Indian?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He gets the benefit of all the cultivation that he has heretofore undertaken and the benefit of all the land that he has been using for grazing, and all the other benefits coming to the Indian under the law. Now we are providing an additional benefit by giving value to what had no value to him before.

Mr. PEDLOW: But will the Indian be allowed to trap and hunt if the entire reservation is taken? If not, where will he go?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will still leave him enough to trap on, but even if we did not thirty bushels of wheat to the acre is a lot better than a few squirrels caught by the Indian.

Mr. MOLLOY: Did I understand the minister to say that the land would be leased for the purpose of raising grain as well as stock?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MOLLOY: I am not going to raise any objection, but I must say that it is a great mistake to allow this land to be used for the raising of grain. Those of us who have lived any length of time in the West know very well that the moment you rent your land to a tenant, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he leaves the land in a poorer condition than when he took possession. There are millions of acres in the West which the man who is anxious to farm can get by paying a small homestead fee and complying with the requirements as to residence and cultivation, and it becomes his own at the end of three years. What will happen in this case is this: Syndicates, large and small, will come to the Government or to Mr. Graham and will lease the pick of the whole country. They will not farm the land, but they will mine it, and when grain goes down after the war they will leave the land in a worthless condition. We all know that the price of grain will fall after the war, but just how soon we do not know. The price of grain will certainly fall before the price of stock; that is conceded by every man in the grain or stock-raising business that I have met. But if this land were used for raising stock its value would increase and it would also help in bringing down the price of meat, and the price of meat, let me say, is going to remain high longer than the price of grain. Let me repeat: Syndicates will pick out the best of this land, will mine it as long as they can get $2.21 a bushel for wheat, and then when the price goes down to 40c. a bushel—that is the price I raised wheat for years ago, but we do not expect it will ever get down to that level again—or even 90c. or $1 a bushel, these men will leave the land in a filthy, worthless condition to be taken by some homesteader with a few dollars, who will spend two or three years fallowing it back into shape.

Mr. COWAN: The hon. gentleman does not understand the commissioner as well as I do, or he would not have made the statement which he has made. I have known the commissioner for thirty years, and I may say there is not a more competent officer. He will never permit any company, syndicate or individual to use the lands in any such manner as the hon. gentleman suggests. One reason why I support the Bill which the minister has brought in is because it gives Mr. Graham so much latitude. I know that the interests of the country and of the Indians will be properly looked after in his hands, and if there should happen to be any using of these lands in the manner suggested, he will quickly take the necessary steps to terminate the lease. I have been over a good many of the Indian reserves, and I know something about the hundreds of acres of land lying idle. I know that if any lease is terminated at any time for any cause hundreds of farmers would be only too glad

to take the lease and work the farm successfully. It is all very well to say you should give all this land over to stock-raising. If the land were suited for it, that proposition would be perfectly good, but unfortunately, there are millions of acres of land in Western Canada in which grain raising is exclusively indicated and where stock raising would not be a success. A great deal of this land is of that nature. Therefore, I say, it is a perfectly proper thing to-day to give a free hand to Mr. Graham, and let him use the land for grain raising, if it can be so used, and use such parts for stock raising that are as suitable. I have no hesitation in saying that this whole question of handling the Indian reserves is very properly placed in the hands of the Indian Commissioner, Mr. Graham, and it will be properly looked after.

Mr. MOLLOY: I did not say anything regarding Mr. Graham, I know him by reputation but not personally, and I may say no better officer is in the employ of the country than Mr. Graham, but that does not affect what I said in regard to the renting of the land. He cannot control every man who uses that land. What would happen if he died? Somebody would have to take his place, and perhaps we would not get as good a man as Mr. Graham. Another point is that this land could not be used for stock raising, because a great deal of it is only adapted for grain raising. Any land that will raise grain will raise stock, but a great deal of land that will raise stock will not raise grain.

Mr. HENDERS: I have the honour to represent a constituency where there is a large-sized Indian reserve, and a number of the Indians on that reserve already own their land. The farmers adjacent to the land owned by these Indians are renting the land year after year and producing grain on it. I know further that that same reservation has a lot of the very best land in the country on it for grain purposes, but it is not suitable for stock raising because the water is not available. In order to raise stock your land must be adjacent to water, but you can grow wheat where you have not the opportunity of obtaining water. I have great pleasure in endorsing this measure.

Mr. J. F. REID: I congratulate the Minister of the Interior for going as far as he has gone. I know a great many Indian reserves. In the province in which I live thousands of acres are lying idle, and farmers having ranches alongside these reserves are only too glad to get leases of this land to raise grain and cattle. Perhaps there is a danger here that when we make an Indian a landlord and he rents out his land, he will sit back with his hands in his pockets and receive his rent, and it will tend to make him a little lazy. In regard to the land being polluted with noxious weeds, I do not think there need be any fear. That matter can be attended to. As to production, we have many Indian reserves in Saskatchewan lying quite close to our railway towns, and I am sure this measure will greatly stimulate production. I am very much in sympathy with the amendment to the Act.

Mr. CAHILL: If the only purpose of the Bill is to deal with vacant land, there are thousands and millions of acres of vacant land throughout the West owned by large corporations, and why we should take from the Indian his rights, where he is living on the land in his own way, to make way for settlers or renters, and leave to the large corporations their lands which they are holding for profit, is a mystery to me. I think if we are going to do any confiscating of land for the benefit of the white man, you should take the white man's land.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Under subsection 3, when these lands are rented or leased, is there provision for a tender?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not necessarily, because there would not be time to tender in every case.

Mr. J. F. REID: I do not wish to be misunderstood, and I may say I am not in favour of confiscating the Indian land, because I know by the last returns the Indian population is increasing, and there may be a day when the Indians will require all the land. But leasing and confiscating are different propositions.

Mr. CAHILL: It depends on how long you lease the land for.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Where people are living a couple of thousand miles away from these Indian reserves, it is natural for them to say that these reserves should be left untouched. We must remember, however, that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of the best agricultural lands in the Dominion in the Indian reserves in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, withheld from agricultural development. There are only a few thousand Indians, and if every Indian on the reserve would work day and

night it would be absolutely impossible for him to cultivate more than a small fraction of these lands. In regard to raising stock on all these lands, the Indians would be unable to do it. They would not be able to finance themselves. Some criticism has been made of the production of grain. Some lands are not suitable for growing grain and some are suitable only for that purpose. If a man can farm successfully in any part of the Dominion, he can do so on the lands of those Indian reserves. In the early days when they were set apart, they were not accessible by railway. In the southern portion of Alberta there is the Stony Indian reserve, through which the railway now passes. The railway runs within five miles of the Sarcee reserve. It also passes right on the edge of the Blackfoot reserve, in which there are some of the finest agricultural lands in Canada. The Blood reserve at Cardston is in close proximity to the railway.

If a man can farm and make a success of it in Alberta he can certainly be successful on any of these reserves. It is hindering the development of the country to have this land withheld from cultivation. What affects the West affects every other part of Canada. I am sure that what is being done by the Government this year in opening up portions of these reserves will assist very materially in increasing the output of grain in these three western provinces. I think this amendment is entitled to the support of every member of the House, there being no question of the confiscation of Indian lands in it.

Mr. DAVIS: May I make reference to one part of the section that has not yet been referred to? This discussion, so far, has been based upon the question of leasing, but if I apprehend the rest of this section, it goes to this extent that the commissioner may speculate with the funds of the band to the extent of making improvements. If there are proceeds from such improvements, the band is ahead of the game, but if he has had the success that I have had as a lawyer in speculating in farming, makes a botch of it and loses money, the band would be out that much. I think this part of the section might more seriously concern the House than what we have been discussing as to leases. I am not much concerned about leases because they will bring in something, but when it comes to making improvements at the expense of the band it is something that must be considered because the band deserves the protection of this House.

Mr. HENDERS: Lest I should be misunderstood in regard to the remarks I made, I desire to put myself right. I would be the last one to interfere with the rights of the Indian in connection with his land. The remarks I made were not with the intention of doing the Indian an injury, but of conferring a positive benefit upon him. I want to follow up with this further remark, that I think that a considerable amount of the land held by Indians and ostensibly farmed by them is now in such a condition of filth, because of foul weeds and bad seeds, that it is impossible for them to work it. If this land gets into the hands of good, practical farmers, it will be put in a better state of cultivation and it will therefore be an advantage to the Indian rather than otherwise.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) is rather apprehensive. There is no idea of speculating with the Indian fund. Subsection 2 provides that the capital fund of the band may be used for the improvement of the Indians' property. There is no intention of going further than that. Already we can do that for purposes of drainage, surveys, etc. The Indian is the ward of the Government still. The presumption of the law is that he has not the capacity to decide as to what is for his ultimate benefit in the same degree as has his guardian, the Government of Canada. Consequently, it has been affirmed that the fund of the band should be, and can be, used, with or without his consent, for the purposes I have named. This only goes to the extent of extending the principle further and enabling us to use the funds of the band for the purpose of making improvements to the Indians' property. That is all, and that clearly appears by subsection 2. In subsection 3, we have provided that we may lease and cultivate unused land. It may be that the hon. gentleman fears that, if we cultivate it, we may not cultivate it to advantage, that is to say, that we may lose money. But the Indian gets the fair rental value of the land. We are not speculating with his property; we give him the fair rental value. Consequently, the Indian cannot complain; and the country cannot complain because this is an attempt on a sound basis to increase production; and I do not think, therefore, that the House should further hesitate.

9 p.m.

Mr. Du TREMBLAY: I do not think the people of the country would complain so

much if provision were made for tenders. As my hon. friend from Neepawa (Mr. Davis) pointed out a minute ago, you could speculate with this land. Some friend of the Government may get some of this land. I think it is bad policy to depart from the tender system, and I do not think that the reason given by the minister a minute ago, that he had no time to do what was suggested, is a good reason. If there is no time this year, this land should only be rented for one year. The rights of the Indians should not be interfered with unless there is grave reason for so doing. This is a drastic measure, and the reason for it given by the minister is not sufficient.

Mr. MOLLOY: Mr. Chairman, I have not the fear that some of my hon. friends have that the Indian will be interfered with. I believe, as the minister states, that the Indian will be better taken care of under some such system as this than he will be if he is left entirely to his own resources. I come now to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), who swung all around and about what I said and then had to come back and admit the truth of my statement, that if you rented this land to first-class; practical farmers, it would be very much better. I would say, take all the Indian lands, leave the Indians enough for purposes of habitation, and pay them a rent for what you take. If you are going to rent land, if you are going to do it in a hurry, and if you are going to do it without tender—and it was done without advertisement only two weeks ago—you are going to see Jim, Jack and the other fellow take it up while the prices of wheat and all grains are high, and then desert it, with the result that the country will be the loser. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay) when he says that the minister should rent the land for one year. I do not think that is fair. Take, for instance, the case of a stock man. He probably takes a section of land, he buys up 500 sheep, puts them on the land and if it were proposed to put him off the land at the end of the year it would not be fair. Neither would it be fair to a man who is entirely a grain grower and who, with the best of intentions, would start in and buy up horses, tractors, binders and other things, if he were only allowed to keep the land for one year. The minister and the department should take every precaution, as I am sure they will, to protect the people as well as the Indian. He should protect the neighbours of the people who are farming these lands as well as the people who are on the lands and, of course, the people of the country generally. I am satisfied that as far as Mr. Graham is able to do it, the work will be well done, but Mr. Graham is not infallible by any means any more than the rest of us. I am not opposing this measure but I am trying to improve it. It is a good move. The Indian, on the whole, will be better off; but, at the same time, let us see that the Indian, the department, and the people, are given every protection. There is no need of rushing into a thing and making a botch of it. If we are going to take it up let us do it right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to tendering, I am sure that Mr. Graham would call for tenders in every case where there is time and where the circumstances permit. There are large reserves where there are certain rights already, where it may be found well to lease a certain permit or privilege over a certain section of it, or perhaps found well to rent part of it for grazing, and so on. Under conditions of that sort, it does not appear to me that tendering is possible. It may be that some of the land will be leased to friends of the Government. In that very prosperous and intelligent country from which we from the West come they are all friendly to the Government, so that it is a contingency we cannot avoid. But it will be leased honestly all the same. I know there is a great deal in what the hon. member says, that land temporarily leased for cultivation and thereafter abandoned is very likely to deteriorate through weeds. That consideration has prevented us leasing school lands, and I have had to stand a good deal of abuse of the opposite kind to that to which I have been subjected to-night because we refused for that reason to lease school lands. But in this case the lands leased are those over which we have a system and machinery of direct supervision. We have an agent at every reserve, with sufficient power in his hands to supervise the leasehold, and if it should be that the land should be under cultivation for a time, and then no longer under cultivation, at least we will have the benefit of the fencing in the meantime, and then we can apply the method of farming which the hon. gentleman suggests; we can put the cattle on after that, because the fences are there, and they will take care of the weed situation in very little time.

Mr. J. F. REID: I would like to ask in regard to the leasing of Indian reserve land to farmers who will crop this land.

Will it be possible for the land so leased to come under the municipal law of the different provinces, so that the machinery of the municipal law will have effect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That question is more than ordinarily difficult. My impression is it would not come under the provincial law.

Mr. J. F. REID: Would it not be better if it did?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not answer very well, because I do not know what the provincial law is in the province referred to by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. F. REID: In all municipalities in Saskatchewan there is a weed inspector who looks after noxious weeds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think these leases will be subject to that law.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will it be the policy of the Government to have the land cultivated under the direction of the Superintendent General with the money of the Indian band when no lease is granted? The Government will have that authority under subsection 2 of section 4. The Superintendent General is authorized to expend the capital moneys of the band for the purpose of cultivating or improving the land, even without the consent of the band. I think there is danger of the condition arising referred to by the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis). If the operations are not successful financially, the Indians will be the losers as a result of that expenditure. The Superintendent General himself could have the land cultivated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly. But the Act provides that if we do, we give the Indian the fair rental value of the land leased, less such of the moneys as have gone into permanent improvements, of which, of course, he gets the benefit.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Not under subsection 2.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, under subsection 3.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Yes, but under subsection 2 the expenditure of the capital moneys of the band is authorized for the purpose of improving or cultivating the land. There is no provision that the Indian shall receive nothing. Of course, he will receive something if the operations are successful, but if they are not he will lose as a result of the expenditure of that money.

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the purpose to expend the capital moneys on anything except permanent improvements, and the Act provides that these shall be only for such purposes as may be considered reasonable and proper. Then subsection 3 clearly indicates that the purpose of the expenditure of the capital funds is for permanent improvements only. In case we use the land, we pay a fair value.

Mr. CAHILL: If I may be permitted I would like to ask the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) what he thinks might become of the Indians on the Sarcee reserve when this Bill comes into force? About how much of the reserve is under cultivation at the present time?

Mr. TWEEDIE: The effect of this Bill will certainly be that the capital fund of the Sarcee Indians will be increased, because thousands of acres in that reservation which are not under cultivation, which are not being used for grazing purposes, and which are not producing one single cent to the Indians, will then be producing revenue. Under this system the Indians are bound to receive some money, and if the Government follows the policy of leasing the land to independent tenants, then the Indians receive that money without the expenditure of one single cent, and the general revenue of their capital fund will be increased to the extent of these rentals. On the other hand, if the Government spend money on the cultivation of the land, the Indians then will be in the same position, I take it, as an independent farmer, and if a profit is made out of the crop, as the Sarcee Indians made last year and the year before in raising grain, then their capital fund will be increased to that extent. It is a profit-making transaction from almost every angle from which you look at it. There is this possibility, that, if they invest their money in seed grain or build a fence, they get no revenue from the fence other than the protection of their crop. If there should be a frost, or hail, or a drought, there will be no crop, and they will lose the cost of their seed grain, and they will have put in their own services and their own energy, which will be lost to them, just as would be the case with any other farmers under similar conditions.

Mr. CAHILL: But will the Indian of the Sarcee reserve be satisfied? There is only a small acreage on that reserve under cultivation. The greater part is partially fenced, very poorly fenced, part of it. But the whole of it is fenced now.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: The reserve contains something in the neighbourhood of 70,000 acres. Will the Indians be satisfied that they are being treated fairly? Will they accept the conditions we are laying down, or are they dissatisfied?

Mr. TWEEDIE: Well, the Indian may be satisfied and he may not. My personal view with regard to the Indian is that he is the ward of the Government, and being a ward he is bound to accept the treatment given him. The treatment of the Indian should be the very best that can be offered him under the circumstances. But it seems to me that it is no part of the treatment of the Indian to allow thousands of acres of land to stay out of cultivation and not put to use for grazing purposes. It seems to me that the position of the Indian as a ward is almost the position of any other ward, and that the guardian of that ward is bound to exercise his judgment, as the Minister of the Interior points out, in the best interest of the ward. When we produce revenue for the benefit of the Indians themselves out of land which is now lying idle, I think that is the treatment which should be accorded to the Indians; and I believe it to be the duty of this Government to make use of the Indian lands for the benefit of the Indians themselves.

Mr. PEDLOW: It seems to me that this enactment is designed for the purpose of benefiting farmers whose land adjoins Indian reserves. It is not reasonable that an inroad should be made on Indian reserve lands in the West until the other lands throughout that country have been taken up. There is something in connection with this enactment which does not seem square to the Indians. The Indians are the wards of Canada, and deserve every consideration at our hands. I think that we should not too hastily approve this legislation.

Mr. MOLLOY: I have heard it stated outside the House that the department fences the land and then leases it to a rancher, who puts on the land so many head of cattle per acre. Does the department fence the land and then lease it, or does it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is usually provided in the lease that the lessee shall fence, but under section 90 of the Act, as amended by this amendment, the department has power to fence and to charge the cost to capital account as permanent improvement. The cultivation could then be done and rental paid to the band on a fair value basis. In order to make it clear that no capital fund shall be used except for permanent improvement, I move:

That after the word "in" in the sixth line of section 4 there be inserted the words "subsection 1 of."

Subsection 1 clearly sets out that the improvements shall be permanent.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The Government are doing the right thing in protecting not only the general public, but their wards as well. But the Government have other landed wards who own, control, and hold out of use large tracts of land in Western Canada —I mean the big interests. What is the Government going to do about them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We feel that they are quite capable of taking care of themselves.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 5—taxation of dogs, protection of sheep:

Mr. MEIGHEN: The object of this clause is a very useful, though not a very lofty one. It is to provide for the curtailment of the privileges of Indian dogs. The Superintendent General is empowered to make by-laws for the taxation, control and destruction of dogs and for the protection of sheep; and such by-laws may be applied to such reserves or parts thereof as from time to time the Superintendent General may direct. For many years complaints have been made of the depredations of Indian dogs, particularly in the destruction of sheep. We have had no way of dealing with the matter. The Indians had power to make by-laws which would be ratified, if necessary, by the Governor in Council; but the Indian is very sensitive on the subject, and does not move very rapidly along the path of civilization in this respect. We want to take care of this dog question.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: No penalty has been provided?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the penalty can be fixed under the by-law.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—enfranchisement of Indians:

Mr. ARTHURS: Does this apply to all Indians in Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ARTHURS: Certain bands of Indians in Ontario have large capital funds under their control. In many cases the Indians are farming outside of the reserves, and have been, perhaps by common consent, allowed to vote. I understand that, according to legal terms, the word "may" means "shall," and I have no doubt that if this clause is passed and comes to their attention, many of these Indians will ask for and be entitled to receive their share of the capital funds. I do not think it is in the interests of the country that these shares should be paid to them, especially in cases where the amounts are large. The Superintendent General knows the cases which I have in mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing obligatory on the Superintendent General. The Indian must not only be willing to surrender his interests and receive his share of the capital funds, but he must make application to be enfranchised; he must have ceased to follow the Indian mode of life, and, most important of all, he must satisfy the Superintendent General that he is self-supporting and fit to be enfranchised. Similar provision was made in the Act heretofore, but it was hedged around by this restraint: that before an Indian could have the privilege of establishing his right to enfranchisement he had to be a landed Indian. That is to say, he had to be in possession of a share of the landed estate of the band. There developed a great number of cases. I have in my hand a long list of Indians who are self-supporting, who follow various lines of life, being druggists, constables, professional singers, actors, missionaries, religious teachers, and so forth, but who, having no landed interest in the reserve, cannot come within the provisions of the Act, and therefore cannot be raised to the status of citizens. This provision is to remove that restraint.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—illegal celebrations:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the minister tell us what those illegal celebrations are which are prohibited by this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 149 of the Indian Act says:

> Every Indian or other person who engages in, or assists in celebrating or encourages either directly or indirectly another to celebrate any Indian festival, dance or other ceremony of which the giving away or paying or giving back of money, goods or articles of any sort forms a part, or is a feature, whether such gift of money, goods or articles takes place, before, at or after the celebration of the same, or who engages or assists in any celebration or dance of which the wounding or mutilation of the dead or living body of any human being or animal forms a part or is a feature, is guilty of an indictable offence.

We simply make this an offence subject to proceeding by summary conviction, in order to avoid the expense of proceeding by indictment.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, amendments read the second time and concurred in.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. A. Crerar (Minister of Agriculture), Bill No. 55, to amend the Meats and Canned Foods Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—establishment:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is the difference between this and the old Act?

Mr. CRERAR: This clause, as it stands in the present Act, reads as follows:

> "Establishment" means any abattoir, packing house, or other premises in which such animals are slaughtered, or in which any parts thereof or products thereof, or fish, or fruit, or vegetables, are prepared for food for export or are stored for export.

The amendment to this section is the addition of the following words after the word "vegetables":

> Or any food or food product which may be named by the Governor in Council.

making the clause read as follows:

> "Establishment" means any abattoir, packing house, or other premises in which such animals are slaughtered, or in which any parts thereof or products thereof, or fish, or fruit, or vegetables, or any food or food product which may be named by the Governor in Council, are prepared for food for export or are stored for export.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is the idea of the amendment?

Mr. NESBITT: Why does the minister confine the provisions to export?

Mr. CRERAR: The amendment is simply an enlargement of the scope of the clause. It provides that any food or food product which may be named by the Governor in Council may be added to those foods enumerated in the clause as it originally stood.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I presume this refers to "boiled dinners" and that sort of thing. Canned mixed-food is exported by several factories, and I presume this refers particularly to them. Mixed food put up

in cans is what is called " boiled dinners." Does not the minister know about that?

Mr. CRERAR: I believe the clause could be used to cover that.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister, I understand, says that this is an amendment to the Act, and the Act already provides for places for the preparation of food for home consumption. This amendment applies only to places in which food is prepared for export.

Mr. CRERAR: The Meat and Canned Foods Act was intended to apply only to the foods enumerated that were intended for export or for interprovincial trade. I think the point to which the hon. gentleman refers is covered by municipal and provincial inspection, that is, in relation to foods that are manufactured, say, at the point in which they are consumed. This Act does not apply to such foods, but if such foods are shipped either for export or for interprovincial trade, it does apply to them.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Exports or imports of uninspected articles:

Mr. CRERAR: I may explain that at present the regulations apply only to exported foods; they do not cover imported foods of a similar character. Their purpose, I am told, when originally passed, was to set a standard for Canadian articles exported to foreign markets, in order that we might establish a reputation abroad. But there is this curious anomaly, that there are no similar restrictions on foods imported into Canada, with the result that foods can be imported into this country without any supervision as to their quality. We are now asking for power so that the department may require proper certification of the foods imported into Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS: Who will carry out this inspection, and where will it be done?

Mr. CRERAR: It is intended to have the customs officials do it. When the goods are entered for import into Canada these officials will see that the proper certificates are attached.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Is the certificate furnished by the American or by the Canadian inspector?

Mr. CRERAR: The certification will have to be satisfactory to the Veterinary Director General or to the Minister of Agriculture, who may accept certification of United States Government officials as to the wholesomeness of the foods manufactured in that country.

Mr. NESBITT: There has been a good deal of talk, and I have no doubt the minister has heard something of it, about the quality of the canned fruit and vegetables put up by our canners for the army. Is there any inspection of these factories at the present time by the Dominion Government? If there is no inspection, there certainly should be.

Mr. CRERAR: There is an inspection by the officials of the Department of Agriculture. The inspector is not located permanently at the point of manufacture, but he can drop in at any hour of any day and examine the goods in the process of manufacture. The British authorities have instituted a very rigid system of inspection of all canned goods for shipment abroad for army purposes. The other day, when we were discussing the resolution on which this Bill is founded, reference was made by an hon. member to a case at Belleville. Curiously enough, I have received a letter from this manufacturer, who had seen the reference to his factory in the newspapers. I have confirmed by inquiry the following, taken from this letter:

> The facts are that all the vegetables manufactured in Canada for the British, French and United States Governments are rigidly inspected first by the Milton Hersey Company, whose headquarters are in Montreal, and who have a very highly trained staff of officials. They place in every factory where these goods are manufactured one or more inspectors sufficient to examine every pound of vegetables before they are manufactured, also during the processing, and after they are manufactured and packed. They stamp every package and every case and every sack in which these goods are shipped or transferred from the manufacturing sub-station to the central packing depot, and nothing can be delivered without the above regulation. The bills of lading and invoices have also to be all stamped by these officials. Then 20 per cent. of the invoice is withheld by the British War Office until the goods reach destination and have passed through a rigid examination and chemical analysis in France, which usually takes about four months after the goods are shipped from Canada, before we receive our pay.

That is the inspection that is carried on by the British Government officials of articles for army purposes. In addition to that, the officials of the Department of Agriculture carry on an inspection which is intended to cover all goods for export.

Mr. NESBITT: The reason I asked was that there was a gentleman here the other day who had a very interesting story to tell about some of these packing houses, and I think he is going to make it public some

of these days; it will certainly be interesting to the members and to the minister, and I have no doubt his story is correct. He was accusing the factories of putting up stuff that was not fit to pack.

Mr .CRERAR: I have not, as full an acquaintance with this inspection as I intend to have when I am a little longer in the department. While the inspection is not as perfect as it would be if an inspector were located permanently in each factory to inspect every ounce of vegetable entering into the manufacture of these foods, nevertheless I think it is sufficient to afford a pretty fair check on their quality.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is the department taking any measures for inspecting small factories? There are quite a number of these small factories all over the Dominion, particularly in my province, putting up such foods as I mentioned a few minutes ago—"boiled dinners," which is a mixture of vegetables and meat, a well-balanced ration. These factories are up against very grave difficulties because they are not large enough to be entitled to an inspector. The Government provides that there must be an output of $50,000 or $60,000 worth of goods before an inspector will be appointed for the district. The result is that the small factories are put out of business by not being able to secure inspection. Has the Government received correspondence on that subject, and are they going to take measures to overcome that difficulty, and enable the small factories to compete with the big industry?

Mr. CRERAR: I will look into the point. I am not aware that we have had any correspondence on the subject; I shall make inquiry concerning it. I want to point out, however, that this inspection does not govern in regard to goods consumed in the province where they are manufactured. It concerns only factories which are manufacturing goods for export, or interprovincial trade, and such factories, if they are down in the province the hon. gentleman comes from, have the same facilities for inspection as other factories in other parts of the country.

Section agreed to.

On Section 17—False marking as to name.

Mr. McMASTER: Is there provision in the law for marking the true weight and contents of packages? Subsection 2 provides that no false information concerning the contents of a package should be given.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

I notice on many packages coming from the United States, the words: "This package contains so many ounces," or so many pounds, "exclusive of the package." It seems to me perhaps a rather wise provision to insert, in order that the public may be protected and know that they get what they are paying for.

Mr. CRERAR: Before replying directly to the question, I may say that the only change in this section is the provision that it shall apply to imports as well as exports. There is no provision, as far as I know, for marking on the label the exact weight of the contents of the can. The section merely provides that no package shall be marked with any label, brand or mark which will falsely represent the contents.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it not the intention to apply the inspection to food for local consumption under the Act? I think it would be a wise provision.

Mr. CRERAR: No. This Act is intended to apply to goods manufactured for export or interprovincial trade. The regulation as to the purity of the goods manufactured for local consumption is left to the municipal or provincial authorities, and they have charge of the enforcement of the Adulteration Act, which provides the necessary machinery for protection in the case the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I think the hon. minister is perhaps not quite correct about the Meat Act applying to goods for provincial use. I think the three Maritime Provinces are included in one section. You can export a carcass of pork which has not been inspected from one part of the Maritime Provinces to another, but you cannot export it to Quebec or Ontario.

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. gentleman may be right, but I cannot say definitely.

Mr. J. F. REID: I wish to draw the hon. minister's attention to subsection 2, which reads:

(2) No package containing any article subject to inspection under this Act shall be marked with any label, brand or mark which falsely represents the quantity or weight or contents of such package.

In the West we get a very large quantity of canned tomatoes, and, as far as I know, they come very largely if not altogether from somewhere in Ontario. I do not believe we get any from Prince Edward Island. I have not noticed the stamp on the brand, but we certainly get a large quantity of water and a very small quan-

tity of tomatoes in these cans. I hope this measure will apply to canned tomatoes.

Mr. SPINNEY: Is this Bill intended to cover all the fish products, as well as other food?

Mr. CRERAR: I understand, under legislation passed last year or the year previous, that the same provision applies to fish products, but the administration of that part of the Act is under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Section 17 applies to all fish.

Mr. CRERAR: It applies to fish but that is under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, and temporary Customs buildings and rentals, $3,890,000.

Hon. A. L. SIFTON (Minister of Customs): The amount of these estimates is exactly the same as last year. There has been a transfer of $25,000 from one column to another but the total is the same.

Mr. McMASTER: The cost of collecting the customs revenue has been raised very considerably during the last six years, not merely taken as a whole, but pro rata. I would be glad to know if the minister has any hope to hold out to us that it will not require so much to raise the revenue as has hitherto been found necessary.

Mr. SIFTON: I have shown evidence of not intending to raise the amount by only asking for the same amount as was voted last year. I have hopes that by a rearrangement of some of the work I may be able to make the relative amount, comparing it with the work that is done, less than it has been at some times in the past.

Mr. McMASTER: In the county that I know most about, it cost about twice as much the year before last to raise the customs revenue as it did during the year 1911-12. I never heard that the officers were over-worked. I remember having the figures for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916, before me and they showed that there were about twice as many officers, and that about twice as large an amount in salaries was paid during that year as in 1911-12. I draw the attention of the minister to this fact because we are in hopes that in this era of economy we may see a very substantial improvement. I think there is room for it in certain parts of the country.

Mr. SIFTON: I will take great pleasure in looking into the conditions existing in my hon. friend's county to ascertain if there is the extravagance of which he complains. It does not go through the whole service, because in looking over the lists of salaries I do not think they are at all commensurate with the amount of work done. But if anything of that kind is found to exist in my hon. friend's county, I will try and see that the customs officers in that county shall be kept down to a reasonable rate if he insists upon it.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want the minister to labour under any misunderstanding. I am not complaining so much about the rate of salary that is paid as the fact that it takes now about nine men to do the work that five did before, and although the nine men belong to the party that used to be called the Conservative party and the five who formerly occupied these positions belonged to the Liberal party, I do not think that the difference in intelligence would account for the fact that it takes nine men now to do the work that five did before.

Mr. SIFTON: Are the five still there?

Mr. McMASTER: No, the five disappeared, of course.

Mr. DUFF: In the minister's reply to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) he left the impression that this extravagance in the customs service was confined to one county in the Dominion.

Mr. SIFTON: All I said was that that was the first case that I had heard of.

Mr. DUFF: I think that perhaps every other member representing a constituency in this Dominion would say the same thing as the hon. member for Brome does. I do not wish to criticize the minister, because he has only been in charge of the department for a few months, but if he will investigate the work of the department at the different customs ports in all parts of Canada he will find that the service is overmanned and that hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved. I would ask the minister to make an investigation during the coming summer, and I venture to say

he will find a great many customs offices where there are twice as many men employed as are necessary to do the work.

Mr. EDWARDS: I doubt very much the accuracy of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Duff), who has just taken his seat, and by the hon. member for Brome. It may be that there are certain localities where the salaries paid in proportion to the revenue collected are greater than they were a year or two ago, but, without having the figures before me at the present moment, I venture the assertion that during the last fiscal year, taking the Dominion over, it costs less per dollar, or per hundred dollars of revenue for collecting than it did in previous years. I doubt if the hon. member for Brome can substantiate the statement that the cost pro rata is greater than it was a year or two ago. My information is that, taking the country generally, it cost less in the last fiscal year to collect the customs revenue than it has cost in any year for a number of years back.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want to leave the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) under any wrong impression as to what I did say. I was not comparing the cost of collecting the revenue in the fiscal year before last with what it cost two or three years ago. I was comparing it with the fiscal year 1911-12. I have not the figures under my hand as to what it cost to maintain the customs house in the county which I have the honour to represent, but I know that I am close to the exact, literal truth when I say that the number of customs house officers in that county was doubled and that the salaries were about one hundred per cent more than they were during the fiscal year 1911-12. I remember looking into the matter during the last campaign. That is the matter that I was bringing to the attention of the minister. I do not believe that there is greater human depravity in Brome than elsewhere, I am sure that the condition is widespread and that the customs has grown to be an overmanned service. I do not believe that under the former Administration, which was in power in 1911-12, the custom houses were in any degree undermanned, but I believe that there have been increases which have not been necessary, and I think this is a matter for the Minister of Customs to look into.

10 p.m.

Mr. SIFTON: I certainly will do so.

Mr. TWEEDIE: If the hon. member for Brome has any complaint to make in regard to the number of customs houses in his constituency, I would ask the minister to close some of them, and open some additional offices out in Alberta. We have a great shortage of them throughout that province, and I have not noticed any great extravagance on the part of the minister as evidenced by any desire to open up even the necessary customs houses in that province. There is one point there, one of the busiest industrial centres we have, Drumheller, a large coal mining centre, and to clear their goods the people have to go to Saskatoon or to Calgary. The minister might close up some of the Brome customs houses and apply the money so saved to the opening of a custom house at that point in Alberta. Another matter in which I do not think the Minister of Customs in this Government, or the late Government, could be charged with extravagance is the manner in which they have paid the employees of that department, and this remark applies equally to employees in all branches of the public service. There are many clerks working in the custom house in Calgary for a salary which is not commensurate with the services they render, or in keeping with conditions under which they have to live at the present time. We find some working for $50, $60, or $75 per month, and a married man cannot possibly maintain himself and his family comfortably on the wages which, in some instances, they receive. I think it is the duty of the Government in that department, and all other branches of the service, to increase the wages of the civil servants to a point where they can live decently and comfortably. I realize as much as does any member in this House that we must administer the affairs of the country economically, but I do not believe it is fair to the civil servants in the Dominion that we should practise economy at their expense in an endeavour in some degree to finance the heavy burden which is placed upon the country. Many men leave the Civil Service to receive wages twenty-five, thirty and even fifty per cent higher than they got from the Government. My view has always been that the Government should pay wages equivalent to those paid for similar service elsewhere, and by that means they would get as good a class of men as private individuals or corporations obtain for service in their various lines of business. I know of no reason why the civil servant is not entitled to the remuneration which his service commands, and he should not be discriminated against simply because he is working for the Government. I trust that the Minister of Cus-

toms will take this matter up, and give an increase of wages to all the employees of his department throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Then there is another condition to which I wish to call the attention of the minister and the Government; that is, the question of the permanent service. At the outbreak of the war we had a great many men leaving the service to go to the front, their places being filled by substitutes. The Government has undertaken to hold their positions for these men when they return from the front. But the point is this: that a substitute who is not on the permanent list is doing the work. Some have been working for three or four years, and not being on the permanent list they are consequently not entitled to an annual increase in wages or salary. While I would not want to see any man put on the permanent list to displace a man who has gone to the front, I think that, while a man is rendering service to his country in the Civil Service he should be entitled, meanwhile, to the benefit of all the conditions enjoyed by the man he is replacing. In other words, if there is an annual increase of $100 a year coming to the permanent man, the substitute should get an annual increase, and if there are other conditions to which the permanent man is entitled, the benefit should likewise go to the substitute. If the Government will take up this question and give these substitutes the annual increase which would normally go to the permanent civil servant, and give civil servants a general increase of salary all over this country, they will do something to which the civil servants are entitled.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice in Volume IV of the Auditor General's Report, ZZ p. 142, there is the following item:

Collectors of Customs, Quebec: customs duties $166,957.82.

This evidently represents sums paid by the Department of Militia to the Customs Department on goods brought into the country. Immediately following that item I see another, as follows:

Colley & Scott, Quebec: customs charges, $18,108.82.

This firm, I understand, are customs brokers who have charged the Government the sum I have just mentioned for passing these entries for the Militia Department. I understand that in the year previous the amount they received was something over $12,000. I would like to know why it is that the Government is paying out these very large sums of money to brokers for passing the entries from one department to the other. This work, I think, might reasonably have been done by young men in the employ either of the Customs Department or of the Militia Department. But that outsiders should receive the large sum of $18,108.82 for what is practically a mere matter of bookkeeping, from one department to another, taking the money from one pocket and putting it into another, on the face seems to be wasteful extravagance.

Mr. SIFTON: The payment was made by the Militia Department, not by the Customs Department. I have no knowledge in regard to it.

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand it, the sum of $166,957.82 is supposed to be received by the Customs Department from the Militia Department.

Mr. SIFTON: Certainly.

Mr. JACOBS: That is a most extraordinary thing. The Government is doing business with itself. Why the Department of Militia should pay to the Department of Customs this sum, I fail to understand. It may be argued that it is a matter of bookkeeping. But why a firm of customs brokers should come in at this psychological juncture and take out of the coffers of this country over $18,000 surpasses my understanding. It may be that, for the purpose of reference, it is necessary that the Militia Department should pay to the Customs Department certain sums of money. We are not "in" anything, and we are not "out" anything. But why customs brokers should receive $18,000 for this, certainly seems to me a matter which requires an explanation.

Mr. SIFTON: That is quite possible, Mr. Chairman, but not from the Customs Department. We did not pay it. I have not any idea why the Militia Department paid it. The Minister of Militia would possibly know.

Mr. JACOBS: That is not the point I am making, Mr. Chairman. The point is: why should one department pay any money to the other department at all? The entries could be made in the books. That does not concern me.

Mr. SIFTON: I think probably the hon. member is right, that the actual money did not pass into the customs at Quebec. Duties that are chargeable to departments of Government are charged in that way. It is

quite likely that the Militia Department gave the Customs Department a cheque on the Receiver General, but no money was actually paid.

Mr. JACOBS: That being the case, why do we pay over $18,000 to customs brokers for passing the entry?

Mr. SIFTON: That is a point that I do not know anything about.

Mr. JACOBS: We are here for information.

Mr. SIFTON: The hon. gentleman cannot expect me to give information about everything that is done by the Departments of Militia and Public Works. If they paid out $18,000 that they should not have paid out, I have no doubt that they will explain it. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. FIELDING: Some years ago all departments were supposed to receive free of duty any goods which they required. It was thought that some abuses had arisen under that system. I do not say that they had arisen; at any rate, it was thought that the system was capable of abuse, and in a revision of the tariff for which I was in some measure responsible, provision was made that all departments should account to the Customs Department for duty on goods imported. As to the brokerage, I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Attention has been drawn to the fact that $18,000 was paid to customs brokers—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The minister has already stated that this payment was made by the Militia Department. It is entered in the report of the Auditor General in connection with militia expenditures, and I do not think that hon. gentlemen are in order in bringing the matter before the committee at this stage.

Mr. SIFTON: I am willing to give all the information I can, and anything that I do not know I am willing to make a guess at for the purpose of giving information. I do not know anything about this, however, and it would not be worth the while even trying to guess.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I wish to draw attention to a fallacy in the argument of the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in connection with the cost of collecting customs duties. The cost of collecting customs duties should not now be as large in proportion to the amount collected as it was when goods were very much cheaper. The fact that customs receipts are large is due in part to the increase in the price of goods, not entirely to the proportion of a larger quantity of goods. Most of the duties are ad valorem—few of them are specific duties —consequently, the higher value of the goods the greater the amount of the revenue. But it takes the same amount of clerical work to collect that revenue, whether it is less or more; consequently my hon. friend's argument is not absolutely sound.

Mr. EDWARDS: I admit the soundness of my hon. friend's argument, but I suppose he will admit, on the other hand, that we should take into consideration also, in arriving at the proportion of cost, the higher salaries paid.

Mr. JACOBS: In view of the fact that it cost $18,000 to put through customs entries the duty on which amounted to $166,000, would it not be well to consider the advisability of reverting to the old system referred to by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)? The various departments of the Government would not then be compelled to pay these large sums by way of brokerage charges.

Mr. FIELDING: The change in the system simply required that the Customs Department should receive, say, from the Railway Department, ordinary payments for duty. As to what the Railway Department does regarding brokerage charges, that is quite another matter.

Mr. SIFTON: I shall make inquiry, and if, as the hon. gentleman suggests, there are a large number of similar items, I will recommend very strongly to the Government that a change be made in one respect or in the other.

Mr. PEDLOW: What is the revenue at the port of Renfrew?

Mr. SIFTON: That will be found in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PEDLOW: The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has said that customs officers in some parts of the country are overpaid.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say that customs officers were overpaid; I said that in some customs offices there were more officers than the work required.

Mr. PEDLOW: I accept my hon. friend's correction; he says that some of the customs offices are overmanned. But the customs office at Renfrew is not overmanned,

and, in my judgment, the collector of customs there is underpaid. His present salary is not in proportion to the revenue received at that port and to the salary which he received five or six years ago.

Mr. SIFTON: I shall be glad at any time to give the hon. member all the information he requires with regard to that or any other port in which he is interested. He is right in regard to quite a number of ports. Business has increased much more largely in some places than in others, and in some places no advances have been made in payments to officers. A number of things of that kind come up in a department like this, having regard to the fact that our country is growing all the time, and it will be necessary to make a constant effort to keep them on a fair basis. So long as I remain in charge of this department I shall make that effort. I do not expect to be entirely successful in all respects; that would be difficult in a country like Canada, which is spread over so large a territory. In a number of places where the salaries paid appear to be high, the reason may be found in the fact that the officers there are engaged not only in the collection of revenue, but in the prevention of smuggling as well.

Mr. PEDLOW: I repeat that the salary of the customs collector at Renfrew is not at all in proportion to the revenue received at that port, the business of which has increased four or five times over during the last five or six years. A case of this kind deserves the consideration of the minister.

Mr. CHISHOLM: In my county there are two vacancies, and I wish to know the policy of the Government in respect to filling those vacancies.

Mr. SIFTON: It is very easy to answer that question. At the present time the policy of the Customs Department, in the case of a vacancy, is to send a memorandum in regard to it to the Civil Service Commission and to ask them to fill it. That is all the connection we have with the filling of vacancies anywhere in the Customs Department in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Was that policy followed in connection with the collectorship of customs in the port of Montreal?

Mr. SIFTON: No; that appointment was made the week before the present system was introduced.

[Mr. Pedlow.]

Mr. CHISHOLM: I wish to call the attention of the minister to a certain condition in my county. At Port Hastings the collector of customs died some months ago. He was a respectable old gentleman who had given satisfaction for the past twenty years. For the last two years he had been an invalid, and his son did the work of the office. One would suppose that the son would have been allowed to remain in the office until a permanent successor was appointed, because he had been in the office for nearly two years, and was managing it very well. It is surprising, however, that inside of a month after the old gentleman's death this young man was dismissed and another man was appointed. The only qualification that this other man had was that he was a very active politician. He is a man of seventy years of age, a very fine gentleman, but he certainly does not possess any qualification for the office to the degree that the young man has grown from experience. If it is the policy of the department to exercise patronage as in the past, I have, of course, no fault to find with the appointment.

Mr. PARENT: What year did that happen?

Mr. CHISHOLM: About a month ago. If it is the policy of the department to do away with patronage, they are, so far as the port of Hastings is concerned, going the wrong way about the matter. I cannot see why this man was appointed, not permanently, I presume, and why this young man, who had the experience and who was the only support of a widowed mother, was dismissed.

Mr. EDWARDS: How old is the young man?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Twenty-four or twenty-five.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is he healthy?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why is he not overseas?

Mr. CHISHOLM: He is probably medically unfit for service or exempted for some reason.

Mr. SIFTON: This particular appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission. I have no reason in the world for thinking they made this appointment because the man was a partisan. I do not know what motive actuated the Civil Service Commission, but they are entirely out-

side of political partisanship, and away above any such motives as that.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I really can scarcely accept that explanation. I have been too long in this House not to know a little about these things, and I would respectfully ask the minister to be good enough to look into this particular case. If it is the policy of this department to exercise patronage, to follow the course that has been pursued in the past, I am not finding fault; but if they pretend to get rid of patronage, and if at the same time they stand behind the Civil Service Commission and charge that commission with doing these acts, and still expect the people to look upon their policy as that of attempting to get rid of patronage, they are making a mistake, they are simply fooling with the matter. In this particular case, it is clear that this man was appointed for no other reason than that he was an active politician; I care not who appointed him, that is immaterial to me. I know the facts. I know he was appointed simply because he was an opponent of mine. I find no fault with him for that. So far as his qualifications are concerned, it would not reasonably be expected that a man of seventy years of age would, in an office of that kind, give as much satisfaction as a bright young man who had at least two years' experience in the office. For that reason I would respectfully ask the minister to be a little serious about this case, because I want to be able to tell my people why this appointment was made. I am telling the people of my constituency that the new Government that is now in power is supposed to have destroyed patronage for all time.

Mr. SIFTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am endeavouring to get them to believe that, although it is very hard for me to do so; I have a serious task upon my hands. If I am going to be met by such conduct as this, I think possibly I had better give up the endeavour. In the meantime, I shall await the minister's investigation of this case, and possibly I shall be able to go back to my constituency and continue the work I have been doing during the past month—viz., writing my people that this Government is doing away with patronage.

Mr. SIFTON: So far as that is concerned I was perfectly serious, and I would not for a moment make a remark, either humorously or otherwise that would prevent the hon. gentleman from carrying on the good work he has started in the education of the people who have sent him here. I do not think he could devote his time between sessions to anything better than to educating his people along the line he has mentioned.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Help me along.

Mr. SIFTON. So far as this particular appointment is concerned, I gave the hon. member all the information I had. I have not the slightest idea as to the name of the man who has been given the position. I do know the appointment was not recommended by me; it was not recommended by anybody connected with the Customs Department, and it was made on the sole responsibility of the Civil Service Commission. Since the passage of the Order in Council which was laid upon the table of the House a few weeks ago, I have made to the Civil Service Commission of this country no recommendations in respect to a single appointment in the Customs Department, and I do not intend to do so. I have not seen one gentleman connected with the Civil Service Commission, and, except socially, I do not expect to do so.

Mr. DUFF: The Minister of Customs wants good men appointed to the Customs Department in this country; but when he washes his hands of the appointments by throwing the whole burden upon the Civil Service Commission sitting at Ottawa, that is not quite fair to the country. I do not know whether the minister is in a position to give us the information, but I should like to know how the Civil Service Commission, sitting in the city of Ottawa, can secure sufficient information to appoint a competent collector of customs for the port of Port Hastings, Nova Scotia.

Mr. SIFTON: That would really be a matter for them to decide themselves. If under the old system I were going to appoint a collector of customs for Port Hastings, Nova Scotia, I would make inquiry from the men whom I happened to know who live in that neighbourhood and who were most competent to express a proper opinion. I would endeavour to get for the position of collector of customs the very best man of the available material in that neighbourhood and I would appoint him. I have no doubt in the world that the Civil Service Commission will go the same way about the matter, except that I presume they are going, as soon as they get the matter in proper working order, to hold examinations, which I probably would not have done.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I should like to know something about the examination. When is this examination going to be held, and how are the men who are anxious to secure this position or similar positions to know about this examination?

Mr. SIFTON: I did accidentally hear something in regard to that matter, and I am willing to give all the information I have. The Civil Service Commission are going to hold, at least twice a year, examinations in every reasonably large town in the Dominion of Canada. They will advertise those examinations considerably in advance so as to give everybody an opportunity of trying them. The Civil Service Commission have already started advertising for applicants for certain positions. I noticed the other day an advertisement for an Indian Agent and for other officials who were required. So far as I know they are going to make every effort to put the Civil Service in the best possible shape. I have no doubt that temporarily there will be trouble owing to the bulk of the work thus thrown upon them so suddenly, but I have no doubt also that they intend to work with the honest idea of putting the Service within as short a time as possible upon a basis where merit will be the sole requisite for office.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I notice that the building at the corner of Queen and Elgin streets, formerly the Grand Union Hotel, is now occupied by the Customs Department. Who is the owner of that building and what was the price paid for it?

Mr. SIFTON: I have not the remotest idea. These buildings are rented through the Public Works Department, not through the Customs. These are purely temporary premises. Any buildings in the nature of permanent premises are either built or rented by the Public Works Department.

Mr. MOLLOY: I understand that the old collector of customs at Emerson, in the county of Provencher, was dismissed a short time ago. Who took his place?

Mr. SIFTON: He was superannuated, I think. Nobody has been appointed in his place, but I have sent a man there temporarily from the Winnipeg office until the commission appoint a man; that is my recollection.

Salaries and travelling expenses of Inspectors of ports and of other officers on inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenses in connection with the Board of Customs, $410,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. SIFTON: It is largely made up of the statutory increases in connection with the inspectors. The travelling expenses have also increased considerably, one of the vessels mentioned in a subsequent item having been taken over compulsorily, and that has necessitated more expense in connection with other means of doing the same work.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Has the minister made any investigation as to whether it will be possible to reduce the number of his officers? In my riding a man was appointed after the election of 1911, and he has been drawing a salary ever since and is drawing it to-day, though he has nothing at all to do. If the minister wants his name I shall be pleased to send it to him in writing to-morrow.

Mr. SIFTON: If my hon. friend will mail it to me to-morrow I will look into the case with the greatest of pleasure. I have heard of a few odd cases of that kind, and as soon as this session is over I am calculating to devote a considerable time to looking into the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments with a view to eliminating useless expenditure—not to get rid of men if they are necessary, but to put them where they will do the most good.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: There is no question that the Customs officers are underpaid, and I would suggest to the minister that he eliminate all the unnecessary men in his department and use the money thereby saved to increase the wages of the men left in the service.

Miscellaneous—Printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, etc., for various ports of entry, express charges on samples, stationery and forms, legal expenses, premiums on guarantee bonds, and uniforms for Customs Officers, $180,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I want to draw to the attention of the minister a matter which probably he has noticed himself, and that is the way in which the flag is abused. Instead of being hauled down at sundown, flags are left up in all sorts of weather and often present a very tattered appearance, which does not add to the dignity of the nation, and also means a certain amount of waste. This goes on continually on public buildings. I have seen flags run up on the flagpole and allowed to stay there until practically blown to pieces; that is not

the way the national emblem should be treated.

Mr. SIFTON: It certainly should not. There is nothing, I think, better recognized than the fact that the flag should come down at sundown. That has been the custom for a great many years now, and I shall certainly take occasion to look into the matter.

Mr. MORPHY: Has the minister's attention been drawn to the very flimsy and inferior quality of the bunting in the flags? They frequently tear to pieces in one day in a big wind.

Mr. SIFTON: No, it has not.

To provide for expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and for preventive service, $75,000.

Mr. PARENT: What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. SIFTON: It is a decrease.

Mr. PARENT: What is the reason for the decrease?

Mr. SIFTON: Where the hon. gentleman shows so conclusively that he is in earnest in regard to this, and that he wants whatever is wrong on either side to be corrected, I am delighted to give him information. The decrease is because we cannot get the boat.

Salaries of officers and inspectors of Excise, and to provide for increase depending on the result of Excise examinations, $550,768.25.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not know whether I am in order, but it has struck me that perhaps the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn) has just come in in response to a telepathic call from the Minister of Customs.

Mr SIFTON: Oh, no, I would not make such a blunder as that. There is a decrease in this and other Excise items partially owing to the possibility of joining some of the offices in such a way as to decrease expense. I have not been able in connection with these estimates—I think it is best to admit it frankly—to make the changes that I would have been able to make if I had had a little more time since taking over the Department of Inland Revenue, temporarily at least. But there will be very considerable changes in the way of uniting numerous small offices for reasons of economy.

For extra duty-pay at large distilleries and other factories, $16,000.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are these distilleries in connection with the Imperial Munitions Board?

Mr. SIFTON: The distilleries are still in existence and doing work, and they have to be watched just the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX: More than ever.

Preventive Service Contingencies, $18,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What are these contingencies generally?

Mr. SIFTON: The expenses of all the preventive officers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Travelling expenses?

Mr. SIFTON: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should look over the last batch of appointments made by his immediate predecessor in office. Last year, before the elections, and before the Civil Service Act was amended, Mr. Sevigny made quite a number of appointments. I would like the hon. gentleman to comb the appointments as much as possible, because Mr. Sevigny gave very poor information to the House when he had to defend his estimates. I think my hon. friend, with his keen eye, will see to it that no officer who is not wanted for the public service will remain in it.

Mr. SIFTON: I will go further. Any one who is not needed will go.

Preventive Service Salaries, $130,000.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I have two other names which I will send to my hon. friend of preventive officers in his department drawing salaries and doing nothing.

Mr. McCREA: I am glad to hear the hon. minister say he is going to curtail expenses and that where men are not needed he will dispense with their services. In the customs at Sherbrooke there are three men, if not four, doing the work one man used to do prior to 1911, each of them getting more pay than the one who did the whole of the work in 1911. I do not think the service has increased in proportion to the increased assistance. I would be glad if the hon. minister would tell me how many men are connected with the customs service at Sherbrooke.

Mr. SIFTON: I could not tell you. They are all in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. McCREA: I think there are four men now doing the work.

Mr. SIFTON: It ought to be well done.

Mr. McCREA: What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and, as a rule, in such cases the work is not well done.

To provide for stamps, stationery, salaries, etc., in connection with War Tax, $75,000.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not know whether the stamping of cheques falls within the department of the Minister of Customs, but the matter is in the Estimates. In regard to the matter of stamps placed on cheques, would it not be well for the minister to suggest to the banking world of Canada that, instead of having stamps that have to be affixed to cheques by the customers, they should issue, as they do in the Old Country, books of cheques already stamped for the use of private persons? That would be a convenience to the public and I think the suggestion from the Minister of Customs might have some effect on the banking world.

Mr. SIFTON: A great deal of it is being done now by arrangement between the customers and the banks.

Mr. McMASTER: I have seen dividend cheques coming from large companies on stamped paper, but I have not seen banks giving them to their private customers.

Mr. SIFTON: I will be glad to draw the matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance, who does most of the business with the banking world. I have not much to do with the banks myself, and I do not know that they would take my advice.

Mr. McMASTER: The Finance Minister, being under obligations to the banks, is sometimes not in as good a position to deal with them as the Minister of Customs would be.

Mr. SIFTON: I do not owe them anything.

Mr. KENNEDY: I was not in the House when the question of overtime for customs men was discussed. Is there any increase for the men doing overtime?

Mr. SIFTON: No increase in this item. The item is in bulk. There has been some complaint in regard to the rate paid for overtime, but in most cases it appears to work out fairly evenly. There are some cases in which the work has been much more than it should have been, with the growth of business, and probably it is a little unfair to some, but the bulk of them are receiving fairly good treatment, as far as overtime is concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY: The only point I had in mind was in regard to the rate for overtime in the customs at our port, which is 30 cents an hour. The average man on the railroad as a labourer gets 40 to 45 cents an hour for overtime. When you consider the high cost of living, it is unfair that the man in the customs should be asked to work for 30 cents an hour when the railway labouring men get 40 to 45 cents.

Mr. SIFTON: On its face, it does not look right, but that statement does not cover all the circumstances of the case. The man may be working a couple of hours overtime, but he is drawing a salary of $1,000 a year for his work during the other hours of the day, during which time, perhaps, he is doing very little work. I do not say he is idle all the time, but there is part of the time he does not do very much. So that really, considering the work he does, he is not treated badly.

Mr. KENNEDY: The men at my port are busy most of the time.

Mr. KENNEDY: The men at my port are busy most of the time.

Mr. PEDLOW: Regarding inland revenue stamps, I would suggest that those stamps be used for that purpose and nothing else. I cannot understand how you can strike a balance as between the Post Office and Inland Revenue Departments, under the present system. I think it would be wise to keep these two departments entirely distinct and separate, and postage stamps should not be used for inland revenue purposes, nor on cheques. If you made a hard and fast rule of that kind you would be able to tell, at the end of the year, just what revenue you derive from the Post Office Department, and the revenue obtained from the Inland Revenue Department. Under the present system it is mere guess work.

Mr. SIFTON: No doubt in regard to that. That provision was put in the statute a year or so ago, and, in order to make a change, an amendment to the Act would be required. I have already brought that matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice, who is responsible for the Taxes Acts. The Department of Customs merely collects. The Finance Department arranges how much we are to collect, and all we have to do is to collect it. But the question raised has already been brought to attention, and I understand an Act may be introduced dealing with the matter.

Mr. EULER: In connection with the collection of customs, I should have asked a

question when the excise items were discussed. At what point does the collection of excise take place? Is it after the product has been completed and goes into storage in the distillery, or does the collection take place at the time that the product leaves the distillery and when it is sold?

Mr. SIFTON: Nearly all the large warehouses are bonded warehouses and when the product is manufactured it is placed in a bonded warehouse. The duty is only paid when it is taken out for sale. Of course, they can take it out for other purposes if they see fit and put it in another warehouse, but it is usually left until pretty nearly the time when it is required for sale or consumption.

Mr. EULER: Is the minister cognizant of the fact that in a certain distillery in Waterloo some of the product went out, not by the usual channels, but that about $10,000 worth of whiskey was actually stolen from that distillery? In that particular case was the department able to collect excise on the amount that was abstracted?

Mr. SIFTON: I have no knowledge of the case but there is no doubt that the distillery would have to pay the same duty on that stuff as if they had sold it themselves.

To pay collectors of customs for duty collected by them, $5,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What is that for?

Mr. SIFTON: This is an item that we shall probably be able to get along without in the future, when we amalgamate the small offices. It is put in for the purpose of saving money. There were places where a small amount of inland revenue work was done, and instead of paying a man especially for that work we paid collectors of customs ten per cent on the amount collected I think it is limited to $200. We do the same thing in the Customs Department in connection with the post office. Occasionally we pay a postmaster instead of appointing a customs officer to collect the revenue.

Provisional allowance of not more than $150 each to officers in Manitoba and west, $12,000.

Mr. TOBIN: Why this increase to officers in Manitoba and the West?

Mr. SIFTON: It is not an increase; it has been in for a number of years.

Mr. TOBIN: What is the reason for it?

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. SIFTON: The reason that it was put in was the very much larger cost of living in that neighbourhood at that time, and even yet, in connection with rent and various things of that kind. It is in all the departments practically. It only amounts to $12,000.

Mr. TOBIN: Generally speaking, the cost of living in Ontario and Quebec and other provinces is about as high as it is in the West. The minister should make this increase general.

Mr. SIFTON: Rents are not as high yet except in large cities.

Mr. TOBIN: Is it because of high living in the West?

Mr. SIFTON: In some cases.

Weights and measures, gas and electric light inspection,—rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, etc., for weights and measures, $90,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the minister continuing the policy of the department with reference to the metric system?

Mr. SIFTON: I have not really adopted any policy in connection with that yet.

Salaries of inspectors and assistant inspectors of gas and electricity, $85,000.

Mr. KENNEDY: I notice there is a decrease of $8,500 here. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. SIFTON: There are several decreases in connection with these Estimates. It was found that the officers were not absolutely essential. Occasonally one will even die to help us out of a hole.

Provisional allowance of not more than $150 each to officers in Manitoba and west, for gas and electric light, $4,000.

Mr. TOBIN: I cannot understand why the minister allowe this increase to men in the West and does not allow it to men in the East. You may have the high cost of living in the West, but the cost of living has increased in the East also.

Mr. SIFTON: This is not a new item and it is put in on account of the high cost of living. It has been in for ten or fifteen years.

Mr. TOBIN: I know, but we have a new Government and we expect it to improve upon the methods of the old Government.

Mr. SIFTON: You do not expect me to cut down the salaries of these underpaid officials?

Mr. TOBIN: No, we expect you to treat people all the same.

Mr. EULER: What is the object of making a special arrangement for inspectors in Manitoba—to provide for the higher cost of living in the West?

Mr. SIFTON: Yes.

Mr. EULER: I would respectfully submit that the cost of living in the East, certainly in Western Ontario is fully as high as it is in the West.

Mr. SIFTON: I am very sorry to hear that.

Mr. EULER: If anything I believe it is in favour of Manitoba to-day.

Export of electric power, $1,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the policy of my hon. friend with regard to the export of power? I see there is a great agitation around Toronto about the hydro-electric and other questions relating to electrical power. The last report of Mr. White, of the Conservation Commission, deals in a very interesting way with this subject. Mr. White says that one of the most effective weapons in Canada's hands, in case, for instance, the United States sought to put an embargo on coal, is our wealth of electrical power. Mr. White suggests that we should restrict the exportation of power and that the Government should take means to secure for the public benefit all the water powers on the river St. Lawrence. I said a word about that the other day to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) but he seemed to think that the question was dead and that it had died long ago. Well, I think he is labouring under a misapprehension.

Mr. CARVELL: I think my hon. friend must have misunderstood me if he thought I said it was dead. I said that he need not lie awake at nights if he thought we were going to give away Canadian rights.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad my hon. friend has not misunderstood me. At all events, I think the Government should be wide awake on this question. There are interests presently at work at Washington and Ottawa to secure the Long Sault water power. Take the case of Montreal—I think I gave the figures the other day in the House. We have splendid water powers which can be developed and which would give the industries of that city all the power required, and much more. I find that some of the power developed around Montreal is being exported to the United States to the detriment of Montreal industries. Now, there may be some other occasion when we can discuss this question further, but I wish simply to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and of his colleagues in the Government to the necessity of being very careful not to jeopardize the interests of Canada in those water powers, but to keep for ourselves this effective weapon in case it may be needed against, say, an embargo on coal.

Mr. MORPHY: From what point this power is exported? The item is for the export of electric power, and represents only a very small sum, but the principle should be considered by the House.

Mr. SIFTON: This is purely an item for the cost of operation of that particular branch. It has nothing to do with the power that is actually exported. All the power exported, so far as this department is concerned, is exported from the neighbourhood of Montreal. There is only the one permit, so far as I know. Does the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) know of any other?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is a portion of the Niagara power which is exported to the United States.

Mr. SIFTON: That is done by international agreement, and is a settled policy that this department could not interfere with.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that. But there was an agitation made by Buffalo interests to secure more of that power.

Mr. SIFTON: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And there have been many interviews between the federal authorities, the Buffalo interests and the Hydro Electric on that very question. The interests in the United States are looking for the opportunity to capture as much of our power as possible. That has some bearing on this item, although it does not bear exactly on the question of conservation, but the minister is indirectly connected with this subject.

Mr. CARVELL: As my hon. friend directed his remarks to myself, perhaps he will allow me one question, just to test him out. Suppose that some capitalist came along and said: We are willing to furnish all the money necessary to dam the St. Lawrence river at the Long Sault, and the United States will take its half of the power developed, and Canada will take its half, would my hon. friend have any ob-

jections to the United States getting its half under such conditions, or would he rather see the power going to waste rather than have any of it exported?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have not studied the plan which is proposed.

Mr. CARVELL: Neither have I. I am just asking the question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If we could not develop that power without constructing a dam which would infringe on American territory, then I would say that such a plan as proposed by my hon. friend would be the best agreement possible.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope my hon. friend will realize that you cannot construct a dam unless it extends across the river, and it must touch the American side and the Candian side. If you construct a dam, it is possible to have one half of the power developed on the American side, and one half on the Canadian side. Would my hon. friend look upon that as an international catastrophe, or as being of some benefit to both countries?

Sir SAM HUGHES: There are some places in the St. Lawrence river where a dam could be constructed between the Canadian side and an island, without interfering with navigation.

Mr. ROBB: When the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) asks that question, he should not address himself to this side of the House. The Minister of Public Works has been a long while in Parliament, and, no doubt, he remembers the time when we sat until the grey dawn discussing just such a question——

Mr. CARVELL: And the next day, and the next night as well.

Mr. ROBB: I think my hon. friend should have turned to his friend on the right (Sir Sam Hughes), who led the opposition to the very plan that has been mentioned.

Mr. CARVELL: I was only asking as a matter of information.

Mr. ROBB: I might remind the House and the Minister of Public Works that the very gentleman, who had opposed the development of power for exportation to the United States, had scarcely taken office until the government of which he was a member, immediately concluded a contract whereby permission was granted to the Cedar Rapids Power Company to export power to Massena, N. Y., and I am told that there is now 90,000 horsepower from the Cedar Rapids power-house on the St. Lawrence river, between Coteau and the Cedars, being exported to the United States to drive machinery at Massena, and the permission to export that power was given by the previous government which had in the Cabinet a gentleman who had fought a similar proposition advanced by the Government in 1909 or 1910.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. gentleman reminds me that I have been in the House a long time. I remember the occasion he refers to distinctly. There was a proposal —not a proposal, but a discussion—which arose out of some rather unimportant rights on the Canadian side, but the discussion developed along the line of damming the St. Lawrence river where it is an international stream. That is not the case at the Cedar Rapids. That is a purely Canadian water-power, and as a matter of policy the former Government decided to allow certain capitalists to develop that water-power and export a certain amount of power to the United States. That is a matter which is under the control of the Canadian Government. I do not know what the conditions are exactly, but it is our property, and the export can be discontinued if necessary. But I am coming back to the question that my hon. friend put up to me about the Long Sault.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course, if we have to dam partly on Canadian territory and partly on American territory, and if we can divide the resulting energy between Canada and the United States, certainly it is a good arrangement. But that is not the trouble. My hon. friend knows perfectly well what was the kernel of the whole question some years ago. I think that the men behind that scheme were mostly all Americans who wanted to get from the Government power to dam the St. Lawrence on both sides and to direct which way the power would go. That is where the objection was taken.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me one more question.

Mr. SIFTON: That has nothing to do with my estimates. I assure the hon. gentleman that so far as the export of power from this country to the United States is concerned, this Department will give special attention to the interests of Canadians first.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) whether he justifies the proposal he made some

years ago to dam the St. Lawrence at the Sault rapids, under which five per cent of the water would come to Canada and ninety-five per cent would go to the United States?

Mr. ROBB: I do not remember that I made any such proposal.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Sifton, the House adjourned at 11.21 p.m.

Wednesday, April 24, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council) presented the second report of the Select Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the Pension Board and Pension Regulations for disabled and other soldiers; recommending that it be given power to print its proceedings from day to day.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the report was concurred in.

VACANCY IN ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF GLENGARRY AND STORMONT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Glengarry and Stormont by the decease of John McMartin, Esquire.

I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the name of Mr. Nicholson (Algoma) be transferred from the Committee on Public Accounts to that of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; and that the name of Mr. Campbell be transferred from the Committee on Marine and Fisheries to that of Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Statement of amounts paid to newspapers, etc., on account of Victory Loan advertising.—Sir Robert Borden.

Copy of Order in Council P. C. 70/942—Allowance to chief examining officers at Canadian naval ports.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

Order in Council P. C. 950, establishment of the rank of warrant writer in the R. N. C. V. R.—Hon. Mr. Ballantyne.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

MR. HARRY C. DE WOLF.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Was there a gentleman employed by the Dominion Government at Ottawa, as an assistant to Mr. W. F. O'Connor in election work, named De Wolf (or De Wolfe)?
2. If so, what salary did he draw?
3. Is he still in the Government employ? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?
4. Has this gentleman, previous to his coming to Ottawa, any technical training fitting him for these positions?
5. What was his previous occupation?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, Harry C. DeWolf, as chief election clerk appointed and employed by the General Returning Officer pursuant to section 4 clause (b) of Part IV of the Dominion Elections Act.
2. $250 per month.
3. Yes, as secretary of the Canada Registration Board, salary $300 per month.
4. Yes, for many years chief clerk of an ocean transportation company, with control over a large administrative staff and accustomed to direct affairs of business.
5. Answered by No. 4.

BOLO PASHA.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the Government aware that in a report from Perley Morse & Co., Accountants, of 61 Broadway, New York, to Merton E. Lewis, Attorney General of New York State, it was disclosed that Bolo Pasha, who was sentenced to death in Paris for treason, had transferred the sum of $170,068.03 from his account in the Royal Bank of Canada to J. P. Morgan & Co.?
2. Has the Government taken any steps to investigate the dealings of the said Bolo Pasha with the said Bank, or with any person or persons in Canada?
3. If not, will such steps be taken?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: No.

MILITARY SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS WITH ALLIED NATIONS.

*Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Does the Government intend to enter into any agreement with allied nations such as Italy and Belgium, in order to conscript their subjects coming under Class A of the Military Service Act, 1917, and living in this country?
2. Does the Government intend to revise the medical examinations or exemptions of men of Class No. 1 before calling in for service Class No. 2 under the Military Service Act, 1917?

3. Does the Government intend to propose, at this session, an amendment to the Military Service Act, 1917, in order to bring under the law young men who have attained the age of twenty, since the coming into force of the said Act?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Information as to arrangements with Allied nations has already been given to the House, and the hon. member is referred to that information.

2. A board of medical review was appointed some weeks ago.

3. The Order in Council which has already been approved by the House is an answer to this portion of the question.

REFRIGERATOR COMMISSION.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR:

1. Is there a commission known as the Refrigeration Commission? If so, who are the members of it, and who is chairman?
2. What are the duties of this Commission?
3. Who appointed them?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The Government knows of no such commission.

DOUKHOBOR LANDS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government or any Member thereof been interviewed by, or on behalf of, J. A. M. Patriche and M. Kessicoff, regarding the sale of Doukhobor lands?
2. If so, has any understanding or agreement been reached, what are the terms thereof, and at what price per acre are the lands to be sold?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Dr. William Patrick and Mr. Cuzkoff interviewed the Minister of the Interior with regard to Doukhobor land matters and the purchase of such land.

2. No decision was arrived at. The matter is under investigation.

JAMES STARRATT MARSHALL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has there been since August, 1914, a person named Jas. Starratt Marshall, of Spa Springs, Annapolis County, in the Active Militia of Canada?
2. If not, when did he leave the service?
3. If so, when did he join the service, and what has been his occupation?
4. What amount has he received during the period in which he was employed?
5. Has the Government any information as to whether or not whilst in the service he carried on the work of laundryman either in his public or private capacity?
6. If in the former capacity what extra pay did he receive?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have not been able to locate this gentleman. If the hon. member will give me a little further information, I shall look into the matter again.

Question stands.

[Mr. Fontaine.]

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING.

Mr. McCREA:

1. What is the total amount paid by the Government since 1911 to the newspapers and other publications in Canada for advertising and other purposes, giving the amount for each year up to and including 1917?
2. What amount has been paid to each paper or publication each year separately?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information asked for in this question in respect of the years 1911 to 1916, both inclusive, will be found in the Auditor General's Report. The question, so far as 1917 is concerned, will stand as an order for return.

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

Mr. BALDWIN:

1. At the time the Government took over the Ross Rifle Factory, had the British Government stated that they were in a position to manufacture all the Lee-Enfield rifles needed?
2. If so, why did the Government then take over said factory?
3. What are the names of the persons selected to make the appraisal or valuation?
4. What experience had said appraisers in rifle factories or in rifle factory machinery values?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The British Government had, at the time of the taking over of the Ross Rifle factory, stated that it was in a position to supply Canadian troops with the necessary rifles.

2. For reasons fully given by the Government to Parliament at the time, February 2, 1917, and contained in an Order in Council then presented.

3. The following officers of the Canadian Appraisal Company, Ltd., St. John street, Montreal, were actually employed on the work of appraisal at Quebec: J. L. Moon, 120 Broadway, New York; F. S. Elson, 120 Broadway, New York; J. S. Bracken, Royal Bank Building, Toronto; F. W. Frickie, 155 Villeneuve street, Montreal; W. W. Seymour, 162 Mansfield street, Montreal; F. Addyman, Bordeaux, Quebec; M. H. Engh, C. Thompson, H. Robinson, J. McCarthy, K. F. McLean, W. I. Thomas, C. R. Smith, all of 17 St. John street, Montreal.

4. Sir Edward Kemp (then Minister of Militia and Defence) secured the services of the Canadian Appraisal Company owing to their knowledge and experience in appraisal work connected with large manufacturing concerns (including munition factories) in Canada and the United States.

LETHBRIDGE POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. PROULX:

Referring to the vacant position of postmaster at Lethbridge, Alta.—

1. In what newspapers is the Department inserting notices that this position is vacant?
2. What is the procedure to be followed in filling the position?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The department is not advertising.

2. The matter is being dealt with by the Civil Service Commission, which will follow its usual procedure.

PROHIBITION.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Prior to the General Election of December last did the President of the Council have an interview or interviews with Rev. Dr. Chown, Rev. Dr. Shearer, Rev. Ben Spence and certain other gentlemen regarding the question of temperance or Dominion-wide prohibition?
2. If so, did the President of the Council represent the Government at the said interview or interviews, and had he authority to act for the Government?
3. Was any understanding or agreement arrived at between the parties present at the said interview or interviews?
4. If so, was the said understanding or agreement to the effect that if the churches and organizations represented at the said interview or interviews would support the Union Government a measure of prohibition would be put in force after the election by the Union Government?
5. If the foregoing was not the understanding or agreement arrived at, what arrangement was made between the parties present at the said interview or interviews?
6. In any agreement or arrangement that was made did the President of the Council have the authority of the Government to enter into the same on behalf of the Government?
7. Was any other arrangement or agreement entered into between the President of the Council and the said gentlemen respecting any other measure of moral or social reform?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by question 1.

MR. J. H. LEWIS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has one J. H. Lewis been employed in the Stores Branch of the Post Office Department?
2. Was the said Lewis promoted or appointed to another position in the said Department within the last year?
3. If so, what is his new position, and what are the duties and salary attached thereto?
4. On whose recommendation was Mr. Lewis appointed to his new position, and what was his salary immediately prior to the change being made?
5. How often has Mr. Lewis been in New York since receiving his new appointment, and what was his business there?
6. Did Mr. Lewis meet a Dr. Harris in New York, and if so, did he transact any business with Dr. Harris?
7. Was Mr. Lewis formerly the leader of the Regimental Band of the Governor General's Foot Guards? If so, was he then known as a German?
8. Within the last 18 years how often did Mr. Lewis secure leave of absence to visit Germany?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. For the last 32 years.

2. Yes, Mr. Lewis was promoted to a higher position.

3. Purchasing Agent for the Postal Service of Canada. His duty is to take charge of all contracts for stores and supplies other than those obtained through the Government Printing Bureau and Stationery Office. Salary, $2,800.

4. On the recommendation of the Deputy Postmaster General. $2,700.

5. Mr. Lewis has not been in New York since taking over the duties of his position.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Mr. Lewis was leader of the regimental band of the Governor General's Foot Guards. Not to the department, nor has it any knowledge he was so known to any one. Mr. Lewis is a British subject. See Hansard, page 2944, July 4, 1917.

8. Once, in 1902.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS; PAYMENTS.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Have the judges who presided over the different Exemption Tribunals in the County of Drummond and Arthabaska received payment of their fees?
2. If not, why?
3. At what date can these officers expect to receive their fees?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: With the exception of G. T. Prefontaine, Tribunal No. 84, the accounts of the above counties have been paid. Mr. Prefontaine's account will be passed for payment as soon as received from the registrar.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Does the Government know whether the judges, clerks and other officers of Exemption Tribunals in the County of L'Assomption and Montcalm have yet been paid?
2. If not, why have these persons not been paid up to date?
3. When can they hope to be paid for their services?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: All tribunal accounts for the above counties have been paid.

RENTAL OF REGISTRAR'S OFFICES.

Mr. DELISLE:

What is the rent paid by the Government, (a) for the Registrar's Office in the Drummond Building, Montreal, and (b) for the Registrar's Office in the Chateau Frontenac, Quebec?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: (a) 7,480 square feet on rental at the rate of $1.10 per an-

num, which figures out approximately $685.65 per month; (b) This question was answered in Hansard of April 10, page 589.

CAPTAIN W. E. SCHNESTER.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. When did Captain W. E. Schnester, of Belleville, receive his commission, and what were his military qualifications therefor?
2. Was he ever overseas? If so, where and when, and how long did he remain overseas?
3. Did Captain Schnester ever take part in actual warfare? If so, was he wounded?
4. What were his duties in Canada, and at what rate per day was he paid?
5. How much was paid Captain Schnester up to April 20, 1918?
6. What is he doing now, and what is his present rate of pay?
7. Is Captain Schnester to be sent overseas? If not, why not?
8. Is Captain Schnester of German origin, and is he still wearing his uniform?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think there must be some mistake in the name, as we have been unable to find any record of it. If the correct name cannot be furnished, we will continue to make inquiries.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DENIS:

1. Upon whose recommendation was the Returning Officer for the County of Joliette, in the last Federal Election, appointed?
2. Were enumerators appointed in accordance with paragraph one, section forty-two, of the Dominion Elections Act, as amended by the War-time Elections Act of 1917?
3. If so, what are the names of the enumerators so appointed, when was the list of such enumerators sent, and to what person or persons was said list sent?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG:

1. What control has the Canadian Government over the operations of the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada, and what Department of the Government would exercise this control?
2. Has the Canadian Government any Officers or representatives on the Canadian Branch of the Imperial Royal Flying Corps? If so, what are their names, and what positions do they occupy?
3. Does the Canadian Government intend to take over all the offices, plant, and equipment, of the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada at an early date? If not, why not?
4. How many accidents and deaths have occurred in Canada, United States and Overseas among our flying men?
5. What is the nature of the investigations into these acidents, and where are the records kept?
6. Does the Government of Canada at the close of the war intend to establish and maintain a Canadian Flying Corps? If so, what preparations are under way, with this end in view?

[Mr. Doherty.]

7. How many Canadians and how many Americans have joined the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada?
8. How many mechanics are employed by the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada?
9. What amount of money has been expended in Canada by the Imperial Royal Flying Corps?
10. How many Canadian Officers who have seen air service overseas are in the employ of the Imperial Royal Flying Corps in Canada?

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING THE DOMINION'S ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for:

A copy of the correspondence and all papers generally exchanged between the Canadian Government, the Imperial authorities and certain portions of His Majesty's Dominions with a view to give effect to the conclusions of the Dominion Royal Commission.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some of the correspondence is confidential and cannot be brought down. Otherwise I have no objection.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What are the names and addresses of the different deputy returning officers, enumerators, janitors and lessees of polls in the election of December 17, 1917, in the County of L'Assomption and Montcalm?
2. What amount was paid to each of the above parties for his services in said election?
3. Are all these accounts paid?
4. If not, which are yet unpaid, and why have they not been settled?

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG:

1. What status have the Canadian recruits of the Royal Flying Corps in the Military affairs of Canada?
2. In the case of permanent injury or death of Canadians in the Royal Flying Corps in the discharge of their duties, what provision has been made to pension their dependents?
3. How many men came to Canada from England to establish training camps for the Royal Flying Corps; have any of these men returned to England? If so, how many have been replaced by Canadians?
4. What comparative results were obtained in training cadets at the training camps around Toronto and the camps located in Texas?
5. Did the Royal Flying Corps go to Texas and remain there at the expense of, and on the request of the United States Government?
6. Were the authorities of the Royal Flying Corps asked to give consideration to a location in British Columbia? If so, what was the nature of the request?
7. Is it not a fact that the weather conditions in Texas proved very unfavourable for flying corps training purposes?
8. What investigations of a technical character were made of the air conditions in Texas before selecting that place as a training ground for our airmen?

9. What investigations were made as to the atmospherical and climatical conditions in British Columbia regarding the locating of an air squadron training camp in that province?

10. Did the Imperial Munitions Board take option to lease a large area of land at Delta, near Vancouver, B.C., to establish winter training camps for the Canadian training squadrons of the Royal Flying Corps, and were tenders asked for materials, hangers, buildings, etc.? If so, why were these negotiations dropped?

11. How many deaths in the Royal Flying Corps training camps in Texas resulted from atmospherical conditions, which are unfavourable to the successful training of aviators?

12. Have any requests been made to the Canadian Government for assistance to the Royal Flying Corps either through appropriation or gifts of money for training machines? If so, what is the nature of these requests?

13. Where are the records kept of the causes of injury or illness of Canadian cadets and mechanics of the Royal Flying Corps?

14. Are the English-born drill sergeants exclusively employed in the training of Canadian cadets in the Royal Flying Corps in Canada?

15. What efforts have been made by the Canadian Government or individuals or organizations to develop and assist the Flying Corps in Canada, and has the Government extended any assistance to these individuals or organizations?

16. Has any part of the grant of $100 provided by Order in Council for each aviator trained in Canada to defray a part of the expense incurred in training been paid, or has any request for payment been made?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence and petitions passed between the Prime Minister and Civil Service Federation, concerning certain appointments made in the Post Office and Customs Departments since the 17th of December, 1917.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other papers exchanged between the Food Controller and the Winnipeg Civic Authorities concerning cold storage conditions at Winnipeg.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all papers concerning the Camp Borden expropriation.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a return showing the details of certain totals being the estimated cost of street sewers, etc., given on figures 29 and 30 placed between pages 96-97 of Rural Planning and Development written by Thomas Adams, being a report published by the Commission of Conservation dated 1917. The said totals being $35,584, $26,736, $20,748 and $23,533.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, papers, court proceedings and reports by the Honourable Justice Duff in reference to the investigation made by Judge Duff in the mattter of Jules Gobeil, of Baie St. Paul, against Magistrate A. Simard, of the said place.

RELEASE OF ROMEO BRAULT.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved:

For a copy of all papers, documents and correspondence exchanged between the Minister of Justice and officers of his department with one Romeo Brault, now detained at Burwash Farm, Ontario, or his representatives, relatives and attorneys, in order to obtain his release. Also a copy of all papers, documents and reports submitted to the Minister of Justice or his department from the military authorities in respect to the arrest and detention of said Romeo Brault.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to point out that by the well established practice of the House—the question has been up several times—it is not considered desirable that correspondence with regard to applications for the exercise of clemency under the Ticket-of-leave Act should be produced. Practically they are all considered to be of a confidential nature.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Dropped.

Motion dropped.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. KENNEDY:

For a return giving a copy of the various proposals submitted to the Government for the erection of a steel plate rolling mill in Canada, and the supply of 250,000 tons of steel plates for shipbuilding purposes in Canada.

Mr. COPP:

For a copy of all letters, petitions and communications received by the Acting Postmaster General or any official of his Department in reference to the closing of the Post Office at LeBlancville, in the County of Westmorland, New Brunswick.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all correspondence and documents exchanged between the Minister of Justice and his department and their representatives in Montreal in connection with obtaining the release on bail, and arranging bail and security for one, Charles, alias Ti-Noir Desjardins. Also a copy of all correspondence with the Minister of Justice and his department and their representatives in Montreal and elsewhere, and all other documents in connection with obtaining the release of and giving bail and security on behalf of the same man recently in Montreal.

ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ARREST OF A PRESUMED DESERTER.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to point out, for the consideration of the Prime Minister, an incident of a most serious nature which took place yesterday in Hull. It appears that some presumed members of the Federal Police have fired at a resident of that city, wounding him dangerously. I think it my duty, as representing that division, to call the Government's attention to the fact. I have met people who were witnesses of the

incident, and they assure me that the suspected deserter might have been easily arrested without any resort to firearms.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is quite proper the hon. member should address the question to the Government, but it is not in order that he should enter into any discussion.

Mr. FONTAINE (translation): Then, I shall only ask the Government whether they intend to enquire into this matter and to dismiss those policemen who were surely over-zealous on that occasion. A peaceable city though it be, Hull will not tolerate any useless blood-shedding.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The matter to which the hon. gentleman has called attention has not been reported to me as yet. No doubt the Minister of Justice will be able, either to-day or to-morrow, to make a statement with regard to it.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: As soon as I have complete data in this connection, I shall gladly communicate them to the House.

MILITARY SERVICE; LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon and Chateauguay): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the new regulations respecting the granting of leave of absence to men called up under the Military Service Act. Paragraph A of section 5 of Order in Council P.C. 919 makes certain provisions for exemption. There is great unrest, as no doubt the Government knows, throughout the country regarding farm labour, and I want to ask the Government with regard to the case of an only son of a widowed mother, who perhaps is tilling a farm of a hundred acres, and having perhaps twenty or thirty cows. Is it the intention of the Government to take the boy away from the farm?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That particular subject to which the hon. gentleman has directed attention has been discussed with the Minister of Militia and Defence, and we hope in a day or two to make an announcement on the subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest in this connection that the Minister of Militia will confer a favour on everybody inside and outside the House if he will, on some occasion, when going into Supply, explain these regulations. I have them in my possession, and I may say that I think they are very much involved. If we had a discussion perhaps we could elicit from the Government exactly what is meant by them.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to that, if there be any difficulty about understanding the regulations. The particular matter to which the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) has directed attention is one that requires consideration. I am not certain at the moment if there is anything else in regard to these regulations which would require to be considered further by the Government. However, there is no harm in having the discussion and making the position perfectly plain.

MILITARY SERVICE—MEN MEDICALLY UNFIT.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): Are the men in class D exempted under medical certificates obliged to report under the new Order in Council which has been passed? My reason for asking is that I received a letter from a mother who has a sick son who is away from home, and she wants to know whether she has to call him back to report when the order is issued, or whether the exemption of the Medical Board would be sufficient to justify him in not reporting to the registrar.

Major-General MEWBURN: Under that Order in Council the registrar has to notify the men between the ages of 20 and 22 to report. Those notices are only to be sent to the men who have been already examined and found in Category A. It was not the desire to call back the men already examined and found in a lower category. The idea was not, if possible, to have these men come up for rehearing. We are anxious to get only the men who are medically fit. If later on the emergency increases, it may be considered advisable to have another medical examination, but our intention is not to disturb any of those men who already hold a certificate as being medically unfit.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 64, to amend the Indian Act, was read the third time and passed.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty, Bill No. 65, to amend the Companies Act, was read a second time, and the House went into

committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Quebec notarial copies to be deemed originals; mortgage to include hypothec:

Mr. McMASTER: I notice that the Bill says that a duly certified notarial copy of any instrument executed in the province of Quebec " and preserved in the records of a notary public " shall be deemed to be an original document. When a notary dies his records are in the keeping of another notary or at a prothonotary's office. Perhaps it might be well to say " and preserved in the the records of a notary public of the province of Quebec, whether at his office, or at the court." There is a possibility that has not been provided for. In the event of the death of a notary in our province his records are no longer kept at his office, or at his successor's office, but are transferred to the prothonotary's office.

Mr. DOHERTY: I recognize the possibility of that happening, but it is not clear to me that the wording would not cover it. At all events there is no objection to making it absolutely clear. I think it would meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion if we amended the section. I therefore move that:

That section 1, subsection 69M, be amended by striking out the word "notarial" in the first line thereof and by adding after the word "Quebec" in the fourth line of the said sub-section, the following words "or in the office of the prothonotary of the Superior Court in any district of the said province".

Would that meet it?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that the only place where they would be deposited?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the only place where they would be deposited that I am aware of. There are provisions for what happens if they are absolutely destroyed. Then it would be a question of using a copy from the registrar. But I do not think that we need look forward to that. That is the only place I know of and I think the honourable gentleman would agree that where it was an original document it would be kept on record. But, inasmuch as we are providing for a case where certification would be by the prothonotary and not by the notary, it might perhaps be well to omit the word " notarial " before the word " copy " so that it would read:

A duly certified copy of any deed, mortgage, hypothec or other authentic instrument executed in the province of Quebec and preserved in the records of a notary public or in the office of the prothonotary—

Because there could otherwise be no daily certified copy unless it was certified by the notary. We would have to provide for certification by the prothonotary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I suggest that the object would be attained if the section were to read as follows:

A duly certified notarial copy of any deed, mortgage, hypothec or other authentic instrument executed in the province of Quebec.

The moment you get a duly certified copy admitted in a court of law, that is sufficient. If the notary is still living his signature gives authenticity but if he is dead the party who has it on record gives it authenticity and that is quite enough.

Mr. DOHERTY: While the usual notarial document is prepared en minute and filed in the office of the notary, it is not an unusual thing for notaries to prepare documens en brevêt. Then the original can be produced when it is needed. In dealing with these documents, it is usual for the original to be kept by the notary and produced when needed. If you make that a sufficient copy of any notarial document, I would be inclined to think that it would not cover those documents which are prepared en brevêt.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

NATURALIZATION ACT, 1914.

CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR IN FRENCH VERSION.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 66, to correct a clerical error in the French version of the Naturalization Act, 1914, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1:

The first seven lines of the French version of subsection one of section twelve of the Naturalisation Act, 1914, chapter forty-four of the statutes of 1914, are repealed and the following are substituted therefor:—

12. Lorsqu'une personne, étant sujet britannique, cesse de l'être par une déclaration d'extranéité ou autrement, tout enfant mineur de cette personne cesse en même temps d'être sujet britannique, sauf dans le cas où tel enfant ne devient pas, en vertu de la loi d'un autre pays, par le fait que telle personne a cessé d'être sujet britannique, naturalisé dans cet autre pays."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the minister read the Act as it is now?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps I had better read the English version, and after-

wards the French version, because it is a matter of having the translation correct. The English version reads:

> Where a person being a British subject ceases to be a British subject, whether by declaration of alienage or otherwise, every child of that person, being a minor, shall thereupon cease to be a British subject—

and this is the portion where, in the French version, the error occurs:

> —unless such child, on that person ceasing to be a British subject, does not become by the law of any other country naturalized in that country.

The French version as it now stands produces the opposite effect, as the translators agree, and it reads:

> Lorsqu'une personne étant sujet britannique cesse d'être sujet britannique soit par le fait d'une déclaration d'extranéité soit autrement chaque enfant mineur de cette personne cesse immédiatement d'être sujet britannique à moins que ledit enfant, par le fait que ladite personne cesse d'être sujet britannique, ne devienne de par la loi d'un autre pays, sujet naturalisé de ce pays.

Section agreed to and Bill reported.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 20, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Hay and Straw Inspection), was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Hay grades Eastern Provinces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This section re-enacts the grades as they at present exist in the eastern provinces, with one or two very slight changes which have been recommended by the Boards of Trade and by our inspector. The Bill as introduced will not be pressed through in its present form. All we propose to do is to establish grades of hay for the western provinces where there are now no legal grades, to re-arrange the present grades in the eastern provinces, and to make necessary provision for the inspection of hay. After carefully looking into the matter, we have come to the conclusion that it would not be advisable at present to provide for the compulsory inspection of hay throughout the Dominion. It is desirable, however, that legal grades should be established, so that people who wish to buy and sell by grades may do so—although they will not be debarred from buying and selling as usual.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There will be no compulsory inspection?

[Mr. Doherty.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. In the West during the last eight or ten years more or less dissatisfaction, confusion and loss have prevailed in such centres as Winnipeg and Vancouver, where a great deal of hay is bought and sold, because of there being no standard and no inspection. This difficulty will be remedied by the enactment of legal grades and the necessary provision for inspection. The present section is already embodied in existing legislation, with two exceptions: in paragraphs (d) and (f) the word "sound" has been substituted for "well cured".

Mr. BUREAU: Why has that been done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a technical matter with regard to which we accepted the best expert advice we could get.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says that this classification is made largely to accommodate the western provinces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, this classification is entirely for the eastern provinces. In a subsequent section we take up the grades for the western provinces.

Mr. BUREAU: The grades for Manitoba and the western provinces generally are different from those of the East?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. DAVIS: Should not paragraph (f) of this section provide that No. 1 clover mixed shall be at least one-half clover? If you provide that No. 1 clover mixed shall be at least one-half timothy, the grade might come under the class described in paragraph (c)—timothy with not more than one-third of clover.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it is probably safe to take the grades as they have been fixed by those who are chiefly interested in them. I am not an authority on grades of hay, timothy or clover; my hon. friend may be. These grades have been approved by our inspectors in Quebec and Toronto and by the Boards of Trade, to whom the proposed enactment was submitted, and included in the membership of which, I suppose, are hay dealers and purchasers. If any hon. gentlemen considers that better grades could be established I shall be very glad to take his suggestions into consideration.

4 p.m.

Mr. LANCTOT: By whom has this legislation been suggested—by the hay dealers, or the consumers? The provisions regarding the grading of hay would seem to be in ac-

cordance with the regulations of the American Hay Association. I have no fault to find with the grades which have been established, but I notice further on in the Bill that all persons who press hay for sale are obliged to have a license.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will be content to discuss the Bill section by section, I think we shall get along better.

Mr. LANCTOT: I note that provisions have been inserted with regard to damaged and heated hay. That kind of hay should not be put on the market at all, if the reputation of our farmers in the markets of United States and Europe is to be maintained. In recent years quite a large number of cars of hay have been heated in New York, Chicago and all over New England. I realize that hay pressed during a severe winter might reach New York during the hot season, and would be very materially changed as a result. In order to prevent these conditions, I think the law should go further and say that if hay is pressed during a very severe winter those who press the hay should be the losers. But if you attach a tag, as the law to-day requires, and put a name on it, the proper name should be. not that of the importer, but of the holder of the property on which the hay was pressed, so that you would have a man who was responsible. I shall take opportunity to discuss the matter again. Will the minister be good enough to tell me who asked for this legislation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This legislation was asked for and placed upon the Statute Book about fifteen years ago, and it has been upon the Statute Book since that time. My hon. friend may have heard me say that there have been repeated demands from the western provinces for grades for hay. The legislation is brought down at this time for the sake of adding that provision to the Act as it at present stands. In order to have all the sections in the Inspection and Sale Act refer to hay and straw together, the simple device has been taken of repealing the sections as they stand and enacting all those sections with regard to hay and straw together, so that you have the Act complete in itself and in short compass, instead of one portion of it being one Act and another portion of it as an amendment. Under this system of enactment all the legislation in regard to hay and straw will be together and complete.

Mr. LANCTOT: I understand that in the old law there was no provision in regard to the western provinces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. KAY: Is it the intention to compel the inspection of all hay?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I stated just a little while ago that was not compulsory. When we come to the section in reference to that, I shall explain the matter more fully.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Where and how will this inspection be made as to the percentage of clover? Will it be made before the hay is pressed or after? It is very important to know when the inspection has to be made. If you say that a certain percentage of timothy and a certain percentage of clover are allowed, if you are going to make the inspection after the hay is pressed, I do not understand how you will be able to make a proper inspection. Are you going to inspect it in the barn? It seems to be absurd to classify the hay if you do not make arrangements for determining what the percentages are.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will see that, under the old Act, the arrangements as to grades, and inspection upon those grades, have been proceeding in the Eastern provinces for the last fifteen or twenty years. There has been no compulsion that hay should or should not be inspected; but if an owner of hay sells his hay subject to grade and inspection, and if the purchaser buys it subject to that same grade and inspection, then there is provided an inspector who can inspect that hay. That hay will be inspected as arranged for or agreed upon between the seller and the buyer. It may be inspected in the barn and the certificate given as it is being baled, or it may be inspected after it has been baled. Quantities of hay are now inspected after being baled. It may be a little more difficult, but the inspector is a man who understands his work, and who is able to give his opinion as to the grade of the hay either in bale or loose.

Mr. SEXSMITH: According to that, a man has to depend upon his own judgment as to what grade his hay is or ask for an inspector after it is pressed. If he has a quantity of hay to press, and he thinks that it will grade No. 1, but he is not perfectly certain, he has to run the risk of being liable to a penalty or have an inspector come and inspect the hay.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Or have the inspector inspect the hay when it is brought into the market as it sometimes is, loose.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I was thinking of pressed hay. I do not think the inspection will have much to do with loose hay, because, so far as loose hay is concerned, the buyer and the seller usually come together and the buyer sees what he is getting. I do not see how you are going to inspect properly the baled hay. Clause (b) reads:

No. 1 Timothy shall be timothy with not more than one-eighth of clover or other tame grasses mixed, of good colour, sound and well cured;

Who is going to be the judge as to the percentages? Then clause (c) reads:

No. 2 Timothy shall be timothy with not more than one-third of clover or other tame grasses mixed, of good colour, sound and well cured;

It seems to me this puts the whole question of pressing and marketing hay in a state of chaos, unless you are going to have inspectors who will be willing and ready to go out at the beck and call of every farmer throughout the Dominion. Who is going to pay the expense of this inspection? It is all very well to be setting grades on hay, but the number of grades of hay may be legion. In this section we have eleven grades mentioned. Who is to determine these grades? The farmer is running the risk of having a penalty imposed upon him if he should press two or three tons of hay before the inspector arrives.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not see that it is putting the farmer under a penalty. My hon. friend has been living under this inspection law for the last fifteen or twenty years. This is the law now. He will still be under the same law, whether he objects to the passage of this Bill or not. It is up to the purchaser and the seller, who wish to buy and sell respectively on proper grades, to get the inspection. It is up to the inspector to make the inspection as required. The payment is by fee of so much per ton. At the present time the fee is twenty cents per ton. Under this Bill I am taking the power to have the fee for inspection made by order of the Governor in Council, because sometimes twenty-five cents per ton would be too high, and sometimes ten cents would be too low. The expense is largely due to the locality and to the quality of hay which is inspected in a locality. Most of this inspection, I imagine, is made by traders and dealers who are buying hay to sell upon the market, either according to grade or otherwise. If according to grade, they will take the best means in their power to have a thorough inspection made at the most convenient place, and the inspector will be paid for his inspection by fee according to the quantity of hay he inspects. A man who buys hay from a seller who is selling by grade will buy, say, No. 1, or No. 2, or No. 3, according to the inspector's certificate. If it has the inspector's certificate, the buyer, if he can rely upon the inspector, has his guarantee that he is buying the kind of hay he has agreed to buy, and so far as the inspection is concerned, his guarantor is the inspector. My hon. friend is not running up against anything new. We are simply making the application a little wider.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Then I do not see any necessity for the Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are extending the provisions to the Prairie Provinces so that they may have the same advantages the eastern provinces have had up to the present time. This clause has been repealed and is being re-enacted so that we may have all the clauses with respect to hay and straw in compact form.

Mr. SEXSMITH: It follows, then, that the Act has not been very satisfactory in the past.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That does not follow at all.

Mr. MOLLOY: Would not the hay be sold like we sell our wheat in the West? In my opinion the proper way to inspect the hay would be both before pressing and after, although I can understand there are very many difficulties in the way. First of all it would be expensive; a greater number of inspectors would be required. The grower of the hay should be allowed to ask for an inspection as well as the dealer in hay.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS: Reverting to the point I raised a few moments ago, paragraph (e) provides that No. 1 Timothy Clover Mixed shall be timothy and clover mixed with at least one-half timothy and the remainder good clover, of good colour and sound. Now that might be 99 per cent timothy. With any admixture of timothy it will pass as No. 1 Clover Mixed. Furthermore, a mixture of timothy and clover could be classified under No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3 Timothy, or No. 1 Clover Mixed. It seems to me that where the word "timothy" occurs the sec-

ond time in paragraph (f) the word clover was meant.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will look into that, and if there was a mistake in the printing I will have it corrected.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Who provides the inspection?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not making any change in that respect; the inspectors will be provided under the Act as at present. For instance, in Montreal or any other large city the Board of Trade appoints a committee to examine candidates for inspectors, who, after certification, are appointed by Order in Council. The inspectors are paid by fees. Where there is no Board of Trade the Governor in Council has the power to name any district and give that district authority to have an inspection and an inspector. The inspection is not compulsory, but it enables those who wish to buy and sell according to grade and under inspection to do so.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there any appeal from the inspector in case he has not graded the hay properly?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no appeal under the Act, but there are methods of reinspection.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It might be possible for an inspector to compel a man selling hay to stand in with him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He probably would not do that often.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not after he was caught. I might point out a little more clearly what I had in mind. When I was in South Africa a ship arrived in port with an officer of the Department of Agriculture on board and a very fine cargo of Canadian hay. The hay had been inspected— I do not say officially—but when part of it was unloaded it was found to contain stone and sand and things of that kind. A similar thing occurred during the present war and I presume that in both these cases the hay was sold subject to inspection. Suppose a dealer sells hay to a purchaser as grade No. 1 when it is not grade No. 1. What redress has the purchaser?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He has the redress that any one has against a person who has committed a fraud on him.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Suppose it was not a very bad case of fraud, and that the inspector had simply graded it as No. 1 when it was really No. 2?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the loss was not sufficiently serious to justify the purchaser in taking proceedings, he would not take proceedings.

Sir SAM HUGHES: But if he had suffered a serious loss, who would he proceed against? The inspector or the seller?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Where stones and things like that were put in hay, a conviction could be secured against the person who committed the fraud. But if it is simply a mistake in the grading of the hay, if the inspector does not give the grade called for—

Sir SAM HUGHES: But suppose he does give that grade, and the farmer finds the inspector was wrong. That occurs very often.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a matter that can be met by reinspection.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Suppose a farmer presses a carload of hay and decides in his own mind what grade it is, and does not have it inspected. It is shipped to Toronto and then found not up to standard.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the farmer decides on the grade in his own mind, that is not official at all. To make it official, the inspector has to affix his certificate, and if he does not affix that certificate to the car that was shipped to Toronto we will say that hay is not of the grade the farmer thought it was. It is not the idea which the farmer or the producer has with respect to his product, but the judgment of the inspector that counts, and the grade is based upon his inspection.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Suppose a man sells a hundred tons of hay that has been inspected and he is compelled to pile it up at the station exposed to all kinds of weather, before he can get delivery. In a week or ten days the hay may depreciate in value, but yet it would be sold as No. 1 or No. 2 grade, according as the inspector determined. I was passing by a station the other day and saw a hundred tons of pressed hay piled up in the open, and the rain had been falling on it for a week or ten days. That hay had the inspector's certificate on it as Class 1 Timothy. After remaining a week in the open air, and being shipped to its destination, it would be very much depreciated in value, but still it must be sold as Class 1 Timothy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Let us follow that out. In the first place, the farmer has not

lost anything. He has sold his hay as of a certain grade and got his money. The dealer has piled up the hay, as the hon. gentleman stated. He lets it stay out there until it begins to rot, and then it is forwarded to the man to whom it has been sold, or to the market in which it has been sold. When it reaches there it is rotten, and under grade. The man to whom this has been forwarded as grade so and so can, under the Inspection Act, apply for a reinspection.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Is there a provision in the law for that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. You can call for reinspection before the properly constituted authorities.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Where it has been once inspected, it might be piled up and allowed to become rotten, and, of course, would depreciate in value a good deal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The dealer takes a great risk in that respect.

Mr. SEXSMITH: He sends it out in small lots and many people buy it. I am talking in the interests of the consumer. I know people who bought hay this year as of a certain grade, and after opening up the package they found it was practically of no use, although the outside looked all right.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the consumer looks at that hay, and sees that it is not No. 1 Timothy, he can apply for an inspection, and the inspector will report as to whether the hay has been damaged.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Under what clause?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Under the general Act you can ask for an inspection.

Mr. SEXSMITH: That would be asking for a re-inspection, because it had already been inspected and a certificate put on it. In transit it may become damaged, but it must be sold according to the grade given it on inspection.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are dozens of things that may be sold under inspection, and this is on an exact parallel with other goods. If damage takes place in transit, the damage falls on that person, under the contract, in whose charge the goods are during transit, and if it is the dealer he must protect himself by seeing his goods are kept in good condition when forwarded.

Mr. LEDUC: The minister said there should not be any appeal from the judgment of the inspector. I may say I have had an experience in this inspection. I think there should be an appeal from the decision of any of the inspectors who are inspecting the goods of any kind. A farmer has No. 1 hay on his farm, and it is supposed to be graduated when it is sold, but supposing, the farmer is dealing with a man not absolutely scrupulous, that man may say, that when the hay reached its destination it was really No. 2 although classed as No. 1." If there is no appeal from that judgment, in what position would the farmer be? I desire to point out an example in the case of meat inspection. I know for a fact that a few years ago, one of the inspectors appointed by the Federal Government in Montreal inspected a load of hogs at the east end abattoir. Twenty-five hogs were confiscated. We asked to be allowed to appeal, but the inspector said there could be no appeal. We took a veterinary surgeon, made an inspection, and found only three hogs should have been confiscated. If there were no appeal from that judgment, the dealer or the purchaser would be the loser in the matter. At any rate we came to Ottawa and asked for justice, and we got justice from the Minister of Agriculture. This inspector has been dismissed from his job because he did not know what he was doing. I think an appeal should be allowed from the judgment of any inspector, in order to ascertain whether he performs his duties properly. If I were to appoint an inspector I should make provision for an appeal from his judgment in the inspection of any goods whatever.

Mr. NESBITT: I presume the minister does not intend to interfere with the sale of pressed hay as carried on in the market.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not in any way. It is not interfered with now, and I am not interfering with it.

Mr. NESBITT: It is proposed to make every person who presses hay take out a license.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I made the statement that I did not intend to press that portion of the Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: Taking the illustration of my hon. friend (Mr. Sexsmith), the buyer brings in a quantity of hay, and on account of lack of transportation, or lack of accommodation on the railways, he has to pile it up at the station, from which he expects to ship it. If it deteriorated, it would be a great loss to the dealer and not through any fault of his. The Bill does not provide for anything of that kind.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. NESBITT: There is no clause protecting him against any loss he should not be forced to suffer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not see that he should not be forced to pay it. If you contract to deliver to me either hay, wheat or anything else of a certain grade or quality, you are bound to deliver that to me, and if anything takes place between where you sell it and the place where you deliver it which diminishes the quality of the article, you have to bear the loss. There cannot be any provision by which we can indemnify either you or your carrier who is under contract with you, if he fails to protect the goods in transit. You have your remedy against the carrier if you have a contract with him. You certainly could not make the buyer indemnify you for loss resulting from your own carelessness or the carelessness of the carrier.

Mr. MORPHY: Do I understand the minister to say he is not going to enforce the clauses in relation to the issuance of licenses?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. MORPHY: I have had some experience in regard to this matter. Last fall men travelled through the riding which I have the honour to represent, buying hay and making contracts to press it. A very large number of farmers contracted that their hay was to be pressed at a certain date, and these men made the contract, paid a sum of money and bound the farmers to sell them a certain number of tons. They ran riot over a large territory, making these contracts to purchase, take delivery and press the hay at so much a ton. When the time came for delivery, these men could not be found. The farmer, in good faith, had sold his hay to men who introduced themselves by name from the lower part of the province, in the neighbourhood of the county of Essex. A letter was written to them and attempts were made to get them by telephone but the result was that the hay was left upon the farmers' hands in dozens and dozens of cases. As a protection to the farming community against unfair dealing of that kind a license should be required. I think the Government should take control of men who are going to deal in that way so that the Government itself would know to whom they were issuing licenses. Irresponsible persons, rather than pay the license fee, would remain out of the business and the farmers' rights and interests would be reasonably protected. I am sorry to hear the minister say that he is going to drop that provision. What harm could be done by insisting that a license shall be taken out by a man who wants to deal in that way? It would be a protection against fraud if such persons were licensed. Not only should these men be licensed but I think a clause should be put in the Act penalizing a man for failure to carry out his contracts in so far as that can be done. I appreciate the difficulty. It might be a matter of contract, but where this Government is regulating the sale, pressing and moving of hay, and the dealings of persons with the farming community, I think there is a duty cast upon them to see what kind of men are allowed to run riot at any time of the year through the country. A license imposed upon these people would improve the personnel and make them more careful in their dealings with farmers.

Mr. NESBITT: A man who presses hay is usually like a man who operates a thresher; he simply presses the hay. He has no interest in the hay but he gets so much a ton for pressing it. That is why I object to that sort of a man being forced to take out a license before he can be allowed to do his ordinary day's work. Why should we penalize him? If the hay is not up to standard the farmer should have to see that it is up to standard and not the poor devil who presses it.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman has quite misunderstood me. These men undertook to provide for the whole thing; they were to supply the presses and do the pressing and everything.

Mr. EDWARDS: If you undertake to keep track of every man who bargains with a farmer for his hay, pays him a small amount on the hay with the intention of pressing it later on and then never shows up, I suppose you might carry that a little farther and penalize the man who pays $5 down upon a horse but never intends to buy and never comes back to complete the purchase. I presume the whole object of this is to protect the public against fraud, but the fewer regulations you have in regard to doing business the better. Regulations are only advisable when they are required to protect the public, and I cannot see where there is any protection to the public in licensing a man to press hay. Therefore, I must take an opposite view from that which my hon. friend has taken. I am very glad that that clause has been dropped out

of the Bill, because I do not think that the forcing of a man to take out a license to press hay is going to protect either the man who presses the hay or the man who buys it. Inspection may protect them. The man who is engaged in buying hay in large quantities visits the various farms in the country at a time when he can form a judgment of the crop which has been produced on that or the other farm. He sees a pretty fine crop of hay. The farmer has, perhaps, fifty or one hundred tons. He forms his judgment of the class or quality of the crop and he says to the farmer: "I will give you so much per ton for your hay and you press it," or "I will give you so much per ton and I will get a man to press it." That is the way the bargain is usually made. At a convenient time the presser comes round. It may be some man who lives right in the neighbourhood who has a press at his disposal. With regard to inspecting hay, I do not know how you are going to do that satisfactorily when the hay is already pressed into the bales. I do not know how you are going to form an accurate idea of the grade of hay throughout the bale. Must the inspector be on hand when the hay is being pressed? If you require that it strikes me that it would be utterly impossible unless you flood the country with hay inspectors. There is another matter I want to ask the minister about, and that comes under section 340f.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I must rule that the discussion for the last twenty minutes has been absolutely out of order. We have been considering this Bill clause by clause, but hon. members are anticipating by discussing a later clause. If the committee will allow us to adopt the clause under discussion we can proceed with some regularity.

Mr. EDWARDS: May I ask what clause that is?

The CHAIRMAN: 340.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was under the impression that the discussion had taken a general course in regard to the Bill as a whole, therefore I referred to that particular clause. However, I will wait until that clause is reached.

On section 340a—standard weights for hay and straw in Quebec:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is exactly the same clause as is in the law now. It was repealed and it is now re-enacted for the purpose, as I explained before, of getting these clauses all together.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does this only apply to one province?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It only applies to Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why is that?

Mr. DENIS: This applies only to the province of Quebec. It reproduces section 342 of the old Act, and we are perfectly satisfied with it in Quebec.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend from Frontenac asks why this only applies to the province of Quebec. It has only been asked for in that province. Very little straw is inspected or sold under inspection. This formed a portion of the old Act.

On subsection 340b—Hay grades Western Provinces and Northwest Territories—Cultivated grasses, wild grasses, no grade rejected:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to make an explanation as to how these grades have been arrived at. There have been, as I have said, no legal grades in the western provinces, including British Columbia, but since 1905 there has been more or less agitation to have grades established and inspectors made available, so that if people wished to purchase and sell upon grade there should be the legal grade, and inspection provided therefor. These grades were arrived at in this way: First by correspondence by the department with people interested in the West. After that had been carried on for several years and more or less information had been gathered, an officer of my department made a tour through the West, going as far as British Columbia, and took up the matter with the Department of Agriculture in each province. Information was thus gained personally, and an opportunity afforded the officer of the department to discuss the matter with those who probably understood most about it in these different provinces. Communications were also had with boards of trade, with people in the hay trade, and so on. To make a long story short, the grades established by the Bill have been agreed upon and approved by all the provinces through their Departments of Agriculture. Personally, I am no authority on grades of hay, more especially of western hay, and we have to arrive at decisions as best we can. I repeat that there is to be no compulsion in the matter. We are merely making it possible that the pur-

chaser or the contractor shall have the opportunity of protecting himself in all arrangements which they have made between themselves for the sale and purchase of hay, that there shall be a grade established upon which decisions shall be based, and that there shall be an inspector with authority to say to what grade the hay offered for sale belongs.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not know whether the minister has done it intentionally or not, but I call his attention to the fact that one of the most common grasses grown in Ontario, and more or less in the Dominion, has been omitted from the list of grades in all the provinces, namely, what is known as Canadian blue grass. I do not see it mentioned in the Bill, and possibly the minister is classing it as a non-commercial hay. It is, however, a very valuable hay and thousands of tons are grown in Ontario. It is a grass that grows on sod that has never been ploughed, and it is to be found in all river bottoms, and so on. It grows from year to year without any re-seeding, and is to be found on all the lawns in our Canadian cities. The Kentucky blue grass, grown farther south, sometimes fetches a higher price on the market, but the Canadian blue grass is very good fodder for cattle, horses or sheep.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is it a tame grass?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is very tame. You can walk right up to it and it will not run away.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is tame grass it is provided for in the Bill.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is as tame as can be, but I do not think it is enumerated in any of the grades established by the Bill, and I was wondering if the minister has purposely omitted it, and classed it as a non-merchantable hay, or whether it has escaped his attention, as there are thousands of tons of blue grass grown in the province of Ontario, at any rate, and I think more or less throughout Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am familiar with blue grass, and can recognize it when I see it, but I am entirely guiltless of any intention of depreciating this grass by not naming it in the Bill. However, the Bill has been prepared by those who are supposed to be authorities on the subject, and I would venture a leap at the explanation that the hon. gentleman may find it if he looks more carefully amongst tame grasses. It may be that blue grass comes in that category, as my hon. friend has assured me it is perfectly tame.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have looked through the Bill and have failed to find Canadian blue grass enumerated.

Mr. HENDERS: I would ask the hon. gentleman to define the distinction between Kentucky blue grass and Canadian blue grass and red top?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is a very different grass as I understand it.

Mr. BOYCE: Did you ever see it grown upon an extra good farm?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Not upon an extra good farm, but I have seen it grown on the best land in a good many parts of Ontario, and there is no doubt it is a very good hay when it is properly cured. Very large quantities of it are grown in our part of the province.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have a very great regard for my hon. friend from Brantford, who is a particular friend of mine, but I advise him not to get into any controversy with these farmers around him as to what blue joint grass it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do some farming myself and have grown blue grass, and I have had it foisted on me for timothy. A quantity of blue grass was shipped to a dealer who refused it on the ground that it was not timothy. I took it over and my man fed it to the cattle and sheep during the winter without waste and with as good results as if the stock had been fed with timothy. This blue grass was grown in our part of Ontario.

Mr. HENDERS: Blue-joint, redtop and Kentucky blue grass are in the same classification, and in our province are considered as good as timothy for feed purposes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Are they cousins, brothers or sisters?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But the seeds are different; if a dealer tries to sell redtop seeds for blue grass seeds, he will get into trouble. Blue grass is certainly one of the most merchantable of all seeds; it is used on lawns in Ottawa and in other cities throughout Canada, and the minister should not rule it out as being unmerchantable hay.

Mr. BLAKE: Why does the provision for the grading of hay in the West differ from the provisions in respect to the East?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The qualities are different in the two sections of the country.

Mr. SEXSMITH: Blue grass, as I understand it, is tame grass. There is as much difference between blue-joint and blue grass as there is between day and night. Blue-joint, as we have known it in Ontario, grows in the very lowest marshes, and there is a great deal of difference between the analysis made at Guelph of the blue-joint and that made of timothy and other kinds of hay. Blue-joint will not grow on anything but marshy ground. Red-top and bluetop are somewhat similar, but the varieties differ greatly. The kind the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke about comes under the heading of tame grass; a great deal of it is raised in the vicinity of Toronto and it is considered to be a valuable hay. It does not grow so long as timothy grass and weighs very much heavier to the bulk, but for seed purposes it does not come far behind timothy. It is being produced and sold in large quantities in Ontario.

Mr. STACEY: I would commend to the minister the advisability of amending paragraph III to provide that it shall not be lawful, under the provisions of this Act, to offer for sale, (a) no grade
5 p.m. hay; (b) rejected hay. The sale of such hay as is classified in this Bill as "no grade," or "rejected," is a means of spreading noxious weeds. Moreover, when it is damp and unfit for storing, it is of no use for feeding purposes. I submit that such hay as is described in paragraph (b)—containing more than twenty-five per cent of foxtail or spear grass, hay heated or containing must or mould or otherwise damaged—should not be sold on the market. What the producer gets for this hay is "found money." It may be worth a little as manure, but it is absolutely of no use as nutriment for live-stock and should not be placed on the market. We have sufficient grades in paragraphs I and II to meet all the requirements of the producer, and he should not be encouraged to put on the market such stuff as is described in III.

Mr. HAY: To forbid the sale of no grade hay at a time when feed is scarce would work a hardship on stock men and others. "No grade" hay means hay that is damp or unfit for storage; but this hay may be very good for feeding stock. Rejected hay also may be used to advantage at times when feed is scarce. This is an important

[Mr. Blake.]

Bill, particularly as it relates to some portions of Manitoba, and we should be careful before we adopt rules and regulations. Will inspectors be appointed throughout the Dominion?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The provisions of the Bill makes the appointment of inspectors possible in districts where they are needed or asked for. The inspectors are to be appointed by the Governor in Council on examination and certification by Boards of Trade, who appoint committees qualified to conduct such examinations.

Mr. HAY: Are the inspectors to be paid salaries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. HAY: Who will pay the fees?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The fees will be paid by the person—dealer, farmer or buyer—who asks for the inspection. In most cases I suppose the fees will be paid by dealers who are anxious to get grades and, on the basis of those grades, to make contracts with purchasers.

Mr. HAY: Will the inspectors have the power to compel farmers to have their hay graded?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not at all. The farmer can sell just as he pleases.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Replying to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stacey), who spoke about making it impossible to sell hay of no grade, I say that would be a terrible mistake. We in the East are perfectly satisfied with the grades that the minister has given us, and this is none too soon for the passage of this legislation. Hay that is classified as "of no grade," or "rejected," may be worth a good deal for certain things, such as for bedding, or for the feeding of sheep, as they pick out the good amongst it. It would be a very great hardship if a clause were inserted in the Bill making it impossible to sell rejected hay. As long as such hay is properly represented as rejected hay, there is no reason why it should not be sold. The principle of the Bill is, I understand, that the minister is making grades, so that when a man buys hay, he buys it by grade and he knows what he is getting.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He buys by grade if he wishes to do so. I might, perhaps, shorten discussion a little by replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Stacey). The purpose of this Bill is to facilitate purchases and sales along certain lines by the arrangement of grades and inspection thereon. The Bill

does not pretend to say that a man shall not sell, and I do not think it would be pertinent to append to this Bill a prohibition against the sale of any commodity that the farmer might have to sell. I do not think we could go that far.

Mr. STACEY: I thank the minister for his explanation. Would it not be possible then to omit hay of "no grade" altogether?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will take any system of grades and inspection, take grain for instance, he will find that anything which is raised and which is in any way serviceable, should, from the point of view of economy, be put to some use. The grading by the inspector is to single out and put its proper classification, so far as nomenclature can do it, upon all grain that is raised. Then the purchaser can protect himself. If he says: "For purposes that are useful to me, I should like to have that rejected hay or grain," it is pretty hard to say to him: you shall not buy it; or to say to the seller: you shall not sell it. Of course, if the hay or grain is poisonous or deleterious, that is a different matter, and it would come under a different kind of legislation from hay or grain legislation.

Mr. ROBB: I understood the minister to say that inspectors would be appointed from time to time and for different places as the demand was made for them. This opens the door for an additional army of civil servants travelling about the country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to correct my hon. friend. It does not open up any field for civil servants at all. These men are appointed in the most independent way in which they can possibly be appointed, at the same time, having them work in conjunction with a Government Act. If, for instance, the district of Montreal comes to the conclusion that its purchases and sales of hay make it desirable that an inspector shall be appointed there, the matter is put on the broadest possible non-partisan basis. Montreal has a Board of Trade. That Board of Trade, if applications are made to them by anybody, not necessarily the Government, for inspectors for the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of hay, then the Board of Trade appoints a committee of its members who thoroughly understand the hay trade. That committee advertises, and any persons who wish to qualify as inspectors of hay, get a certificate after they pass a satisfactory examination from the Board of Trade. Then the Government, by Order in Council, makes each of those persons an inspector. The inspector gets together an organization and arranges for fees for every ton of hay that he inspects. He pockets the fee and he looks after his own expenses. In the city of Montreal to-day the inspector appoints his own helpers; he pays all his own expenses; he receives what fees are collected, and out of those he pays his help and receives for himself the benefit of what is left over. So far as you can get away from the civil servants and the putting on of an army of semi-dependents on the Government, that is got away from in this Hay Inspection and Sale Act. It is as far removed from what you can call patronage as you could possibly get it. At the same time it is necessary to have some Government supervision which will give power to the inspector to inspect and to collect his fees and which will also hold over him dismissal or whatever penalty wrong conduct upon his part would rightly bring upon him.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has placed the matter in a different light from the impression he created, at least in my mind, in his answer to a question from his own side of the House. I was not objecting to the way in which the men are to be appointed. What I objected to was the policy, as I inferred from the minister's previous answer, that inspectors would be appointed wherever there was a demand for them. I can understand that in a large city, like Montreal or Toronto, inspectors are desirable, but I inferred from the minister's previous answer that inspectors might be sent out to inspect the hay in the fields. I think the minister left that impression on the committee.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did not mean to.

Mr. ROBB: In my judgment, the provisions of section 340, as to standard grades and weights and the manner in which hay shall be pressed, are very desirable, and they have been asked for for a number of years by men in that business. This objection has been raised by them from time to time: We go about buying hay; we know good hay; we go into a man's barn, look at the hay and decide whether it is No. 1 or No. 2 and buy it on the basis of what our judgment tells us the hay grades; we arrange for the man to press it, and then the hay is shipped to New England points. Perhaps such a dealer is buying from forty or fifty or

sixty different men. Eventually a complaint comes back from the New England purchaser that some of the hay was stuffed; that it was not good all the way through. The dealer has no way of tracing that hay back to the farmer from whom it was purchased. All the protection necessary for the hay dealer, so far as export is concerned, is a provision by which the hay can be traced back to the man who pressed it.

Mr. BOYCE: I am in favour of this Bill. I have been raising and selling hay for the past thirty or forty years and I have never had any trouble yet, but I certainly agree there is need for inspection. Without inspection I would not be sure that the hay I was shipping to Montreal or Toronto would meet with the requirements. There is a great difference in hay, even in cull hay taken from our best meadows. We shall always have this low grade hay, partly on account of weather conditions. One hon. gentleman has referred to red top. Now our whole idea in farming in the section where I live is good seed, good cultivation, and haying and harvesting under the very best conditions, and where these requirements are met there will be very little trouble. I do not think it would be wise to cut out this low grade hay altogether because it is better than straw to enable a man to run over the winter. I repeat, I think inspection is a good idea, and I am therefore in favour of the Bill.

Mr. DENIS: This is a new law with regard to straw.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is a new grade for straw.

Mr. DENIS: No. 1 straw is not mentioned. Is there no such thing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have never been able to find it. That is the very question I put to my officers, and they say there is no No. 1 straw.

Mr. LANCTOT: I would point out that white straw is often worth 50 cents more than straw damaged by rain on the field. If the straw is to be used for bedding it makes no difference what colour it it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Referring to clause 340D, I am informed that number fourteen standard gauge annealed steel wire is the very lowest quality that can safely be used for baling, but as this clause stands no better quality could be used, and therefore I beg to move that after the word "be" in line 12 the words "of a strength and quality not below" be inserted.

[Mr. Robb.]

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I understood the minister to say that it was only in the large centres where there was a Board of Trade that inspectors were appointed. In that case many districts would be unable to get an inspection at all, and the inspection would have to take place at the point of delivery in the large centres.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What I intended to say was that where there was no Board of Trade the Governor in Council could name a district and similar provisions could be made for the examination and appointment of an inspector. But even where that is not done, an individual who thinks it is of moment to have an inspection, can send for the nearest inspector and have him come out. There are inspectors now in Toronto, Montreal and Kingston.

Mr. SEXSMITH: I suppose it is the intention to dismiss all the inspectors at present engaged.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have no such intention. Why should we dismiss them?

Mr. SEXSMITH: I thought you would have them properly appointed under the new regulations.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They have been working under the very same regulations that we are enacting this afternoon.

Mr. SEXSMITH: They were appointed by the Board of Trade.

Mr. DENIS: Paragraph 340D says:

> All inspecting officers shall where necessary enter in their books their detailed reasons for grading any particular bale or bales of hay or straw.

Now, I am relying upon these words "where necessary." It has been said already, if I understand aright, that there will be no appeal from the judgment of the inspector.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I qualified that statement afterwards by saying that any person not satisfied with the inspection might ask for and get reinspection, but there is no higher appeal board.

Mr. DENIS: Is it understood, if the second inspection does not agree with the first, there will be nothing else to do but go to a court of justice? What will be the value of the testimony of these inspectors before a court of law? For instance, suppose that hay has been inspected the first time, and one of the parties interested is not satisfied with the judgment of the inspector, and goes before a court, what

will be the preference of the judge? Will the testimony of the inspector be considered as better than the testimony of other witnesses who are not inspectors, or is the inspector to be regarded as an ordinary witness? The Act does not provide for this, but I think it should not be overlooked.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have two answers to the question. In the first place, this system of inspection has been used more largely in Toronto and Montreal districts and portions of Quebec than anywhere else in Canada. So far as the department knows it has worked satisfactorily. Some differences like that may have occurred, but they have been settled in some way or another. At any rate, they have not formed the subject of complaints to the department, and it has not been considered necessary to establish a higher court or tribunal to deal with the cases. That is probably the best answer I can give to my hon. friend, because it is the answer of experience. As to what evidence the court would most rely upon, I would not like to venture an opinion. The court itself would decide. I am quite sure, however, that no practical difficulties have arisen as yet to justify the formation of a court of appeal. Of course a difference might arise—probably most of the differences would arise—in this way, that since the first inspection something had taken place which altered the grade of the product appreciably, so that it was not as good as before. The first inspector called in to make a reinspection would see whether or not the deterioration had taken place, and the purchaser would have his remedy against the contractor who agreed to deliver so much of such and such a grade. That would have to be delivered, or the purchaser would have his remedy.

Mr. DENIS: We cannot expect that these inspectors' testimony and opinion will be sustained by a court of justice, in opposition to all other witnesses. Consequently I start with the proposition that the inspector is merely a very competent non-partisan witness, and, on account of his position, his testimony should have great weight; but, on the other hand, it should not be regarded as conclusive. I find objection to the words "where necessary," because it leaves the matter altogether in the hands of the inspector. When is the inspector going to enter in his book his detailed reasons for grading any particular hay, and when is he not going to enter in his book those reasons? This would be left entirely in the hands of the inspector, and he would have an absolute discretion. I am now dealing with the case of an honest inspector and I will come to the dishonest inspector later if necessary. An honest inspector who is negligent thinks it is not necessary to take notes when he inspects the hay. Then comes the trial before a court of justice. The Government inspector, upon whom the seller or the dealer, or the party requiring him, will depend, appears in court and when called upon to give his reasons will say: "I have taken no notes and have made no entry in my books, because I did not deem it necessary, and according to the law I was not obliged to." I say the dealer who has been employing this inspector is not receiving sufficient protection, and, moreover, I always object to a provision like this in an Act, because it leaves too much to the discretion of the inspector. Why not say: "Mr. Inspector, you are paid so much a ton to inspect the hay; you will have books, and you will enter in the books the reasons why you are grading that hay No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3." It seems to me that would be of service to the dealers generally.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite understand the point that my hon. friend makes. The discretion is entirely with the inspector in this case. When he thinks it is necessary he has to give reasons in detailed form why he classed the product as a certain grade. The inspector has a quantity of hay to inspect, and inspects it, and everything is clear. He has not the least doubt in his mind as to what grade it is, and he puts that grade on it, and gives no further thought to it. Then he has to deal with other quantities of hay, and has to bestow a great deal of care on the matter, and is a little bit puzzled as to just what grade he should make it to protect himself. Where there is a doubt in his mind the inspector will put down the detailed reasons why he placed such and such a grade on that hay. That provision was in the preceding Act, and is in all our Inspection Acts. The object is firstly to protect the man himself, in case he is at all in doubt as to what grade he should mark on the hay, and secondly to prevent a lot of unnecessary trouble in putting down details as to grades as to which he has no doubt after his inspection. On the other hand, it may be too much to ask that the inspector shall always mark down the details of his examination. If there

is no doubt about the grade he will not have to do very much writing. If the inspection is somewhat involved, he will have to do a little more writing in marking down the details, and it is fair that he should be asked to give his reasons for deciding on a certain grade. I discussed that with the officers of the department and they gave me as the reason about what I have given to my hon. friend.

Mr. DENIS: I would like to suggest that these words "where necessary" should be struck out, but, of course, I bow to the minister if he thinks better not to do it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will take a note of my hon. friend's suggestion and before the Bill goes through I will look into it a little more.

Mr. DENIS: The word "detailed" might also be struck out. If we strike out "where necessary" and also "detailed" it will read:

All inspecting officers shall enter in their books their reasons for grading any particular bale or bales of hay or straw.

That would not give the inspector much trouble. It would be done only to a limited extent, and a man could write the few lines necessary to state his reasons in two or three minutes. It now takes about two years in Montreal before you can proceed with a case in court. An inspector may be inspecting thousands of tons of hay, and if he is called in a case two years afterwards his record will be available and it will enable him to give much better testimony. I might take this opportunity of giving to the committee my humble opinion with regard to paragraph 6 of this section, which reads as follows:

All hay or straw facing doorway must be representative of the contents of the whole car.

If I understand that aright, it means that, the car being opened, the inspector will look at the hay which faces the opening of the car and it is required that this shall be representative of the quality of all the hay that is in the car.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is evidently the meaning, but this does not preclude at the same time the inspector from satisfying himself that it is representative of what is in the car.

Mr. DENIS: It seems to be imperative, unless I am construing the sentence wrongly, because it says "must be representative."

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is more in the way of a caution to the loader of the hay that he shall not impose, or try to impose, upon the inspector and the ultimate buyer by putting in the doorway the top layer, so to speak, or the best of the hay. It shall be fairly representative of all. This is not an essential clause but it is a reminder to the packer or loader of the hay, and at the same time the seller of it, that he shall not attempt to impose upon the inspector or the prospective buyer by misrepresenting in the doorway the quality of the general cargo.

Mr. DENIS: This clause seems to me to be imperative. If it is not imperative I would humbly suggest to the minister that he change the form of the clause because, as I read it, it is imperative. It says "must be representative." When the inspector inspects the hay he will form his judgment of the quality on the hay facing the doorway and I do not think anybody can ask him to go farther than that. When the inspector is brought before a court of justice to give evidence as to the quality of the hay he inspected, he will say: "According to law I have examined all the hay facing the doorway and I have not gone any farther." Then, supposing other witnesses come forward and say: "We have examined the hay facing the doorway and we have also examined the whole car" and it happens that for some particular reason the hay facing the doorway is not exactly of the same quality, would the evidence of these other witnesses be accepted being contrary to the testimony of the inspector, because the law says that what is going to be the proof is the hay facing the doorway and nothing else? As the clause now reads the inspection of the hay at the doorway would be the proof because the hay at the doorway would be the only part of the car that could be examined. My objections to this provision are twofold. In the first place, there is an injustice to the seller because, for some reason or other, during transportation, the hay at the doorway may suffer damage through no fault of the seller and it would be an injustice to him if this construction were given to the clause. On the other hand it might be an injustice to the buyer because, if the seller wanted to act fraudulently, he might place at the doorway hay of a better quality than that in the rest of the car. The minister has explained that this paragraph must not be taken too strictly but I would humbly suggest a different wording.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: With reference to the clause which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Denis) has just taken exception to, and which is clause 340d, as I would read it, the purpose is to give the inspector the privilege of grading one particular bale, or ten particular bales, or whatever the number may be in a shipment, differently from the whole consignment. If he does grade a few particular bales differently from the majority of bales in the shipment, he must then, of necessity, enter the grading and the reasons in a book. If it is found to be necessary to grade a particular number of bales of hay differently from the rest of the shipment he must make a record and give the reasons why he has placed a different grade on a number of bales from that which has been placed on the whole shipment. That is the way I would read that section.

Mr. READ: The section really has no reference to the inspector. Is it really not the man who loads the hay that it has reference to? What has the inspector to do with loading a car of hay? Evidently the object of the departmental officers who have advised the minister is to prevent fraud in the selling of a carload of hay by taking a man down and showing him the car when the door is opened. When the door of the car is opened the hay that is in sight is supposed to represent the contents of the car. The inspector has nothing to do with that. The only thing I see wrong in connection with the subsection is that it is put in the wrong section. It should be in a separate section altogether. I do not think it has anything to do with the question of inspection.

Mr. GERVAIS (translation): Mr. Chairman, I believe, that on the whole, clause 340d fairly meets the views of those engaged in the hay business. Paragraph 7 which reads as follows:

All inspecting officers shall where necessary enter in their books their detailed reasons for grading any particular bale or bales of hay or straw.

might be completed by adding to it that a statement of the grounds on which the finding is based shall be given to the purchaser. It is evident that the legislator's intention was to have the inspector state in writing his reasons for rejecting one or more bales of hay or straw. Why should not the inspector be obliged to give the purchaser a statement of his reasons for grading such hay or straw as he has done. That could be effected by adding to this clause: "and a copy of his finding shall be delivered to the purchaser." The latter would retain that copy, which would be preferable, I think, to the present system under which the inspector enters in a book the reasons for his grading, whereas this book may be destroyed or lost and there would then be no trace left of his decision or of the grounds thereof. I believe clause 6 is correct. It is a fact that pressed hay is rather sold on its appearance; it would be foolish to think of buyers cutting the bales open to see whether the grade is the same inside as it is on the outside. I therefore repeat that clause 6 is right in providing that the bales of hay or straw in the rows facing the doorway of the car must be representative of the contents of the whole car. I also believe that clause 1 might be adopted if it provided that in cases where bales of hay or straw of inferior grade are found in the shipment, such bales should be marked in a special manner, set aside by the inspector, and the reasons for which the inspector had thus marked those bales should be entered in his book and a copy of the said finding delivered to the buyer. I think that if this clause were modified in that sense, it would be a sufficient protection and that it might pass as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boivin) (translation): Does the hon. member offer an amendment?

Mr. GERVAIS (translation): No, it is simply as a matter of suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boivin) (translation): Then it is not in the form of an amendment?

Mr. GERVAIS (translation): No, a suggestion, merely.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) bases his objection to paragraph 6 of subsection 340D, which reads:

All hay or straw facing doorway must be representative of the contents of the whole car.

The minister himself will see that that provision is of no great importance, because hay is not inspected by a man opening the doors and taking a look at it. The inspector goes and cuts the bales open in different parts of the car, and that is the procedure upon which he bases his inspection. Therefore, the appearance of a carload as it presents itself when a man opens the door has nothing at all to do with the inspection of it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the paragraph is so worded as to give the impression that a glance through the doorway will afford a fair idea of the whole of the contents of the

car so that the inspector, when he visits the car, shall merely inspect what is facing the doorway, and then consider that he has done his duty, that officer may be misled. I quite see that an inspection is not a proper one unless the inspector gets at the average quality of the contents of the car—

Mr. ROBB: Unless he cuts the bales open.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And he cannot determine that by looking through the doorway and making up his mind by what he sees from there. I cannot see what good purpose that paragraph represents; it does not seem to me that it strengthens the Act in any way, but that it may have the effect of causing a less rigid and thorough inspection than would otherwise take place. When inspecting a car of grain, that grain must be examined in different parts of the car, and the same thing should be done in the case of a car of hay. One cannot make up one's mind as to the quality of a car of grain or hay simply from looking at what faces the doorway. I also sympathize a good deal with what my hon. friend has stated with reference to the first clause. I do not see any particular reason why, after the inspector makes an inspection, he shall not enter into his books shortly the reasons why he adopts a particular grade. It may be unnecessary when there is no room for doubt, but on the other hand if this requirment is made a part of the Act it will probably make the inspector more careful in his inspection, and in the grade which he adopts, if a record is required at the time, which record may afterwards come up in the decision of any trouble that arises. I have therefore no objection to cutting out the words "where necessary," or "detailed," although I would rather maintain the word "detailed" because any reason is not much of a reason unless it is detailed. I would, therefore, be agreeable to cutting out the words first mentioned, and also the whole of paragraph 6, unless some one who knows more about the subject than I do thinks that this would be detrimental to the efficient operation of the Act. Accordingly I move that subsection 340D be further amended by striking out in the first line thereof the words, "where necessary" and the last two lines of the said subsection.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 340E—License required for pressing hay and straw for sale.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know whether it is worth while spending very much time about this. For the proper protection of the consumer—and after all that is what we are looking for, because the seller will look after himself—there is no doubt that a thorough system of license and inspection, added to grading, is the proper thing to do. But when one comes to look into the matter, one appreciates the difficulties that have to be overcome. For example, inspectors will be needed wherever hay is pressed, and a good many of them. The licensing requirement is not a difficult matter and for statistical purposes would be very beneficial, nor is the license fee important. But if you make inspection compulsory and require the appointment of inspectors wherever hay pressing is done, then you will add very largely I think to the costs of the exchanges or the transfers in this respect. Therefore, I think this year we might go only so far as to arrange the grades and let the Act run for a while in that respect. Perhaps later when we have experience of this law we may get a step further towards that ideal position where the consumer should be absolutely protected from frauds, in the shape of bad weights and bad grades.

Susbection 340E stricken from the Bill.

On subsection 340F—Bales to be tagged showing weight, etc.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move that this subsection also be struck out.

Mr. ROBB: Now the minister is taking away the whole real object of the Bill—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In one respect.

Mr. ROBB: Because, as I pointed out, a man may be shipping five or ten cars of hay that he has bought on his own judgment, to different people in the New England states, and he may receive a complaint that five of these cars were plugged. This is the only method he has of tracing that plugged hay and finding out who loaded it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend sees the other difficulty, does he not?

Mr. ROBB: What is the other difficulty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If you provide that every man who presses hay must have it inspected and tagged with the name, weight and grade, you are under the necessity of sending an inspector with every presser who goes about the country, and of paying that inspector. If this plan were followed, the expense would be multiplied, and on the whole I do not think that we should proceed in this way at present.

The idea is one which I have already spoken of and which my hon. friend would evidently like to see incorporated in the Bill, but this year I do not think we are able to carry it through.

Mr. DENIS: I think some plan should be provided by which the name of the person who pressed or shipped the hay might be readily ascertained. Perhaps this could be accomplished by providing that the label should bear the name of the seller or of the presser rather than the number of his license. In any case, I suggest that some scheme be adopted under which a buyer of hay in the United States or elsewhere may be able to say: this particular bale of hay was bought from so-and-so. If this could be brought about, justice would be done both to seller and to buyer.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DENIS: There is a great deal of good in this Bill, and, in fact, we have accepted the principle of it. I am afraid, if section 340F is struck out altogether, we shall, to a great extent, lose the benefit of the Bill. I therefore move that section 340F be replaced by the following:

340F. Every seller of hay or straw in Canada shall affix to every bale of hay or straw sold or offered for sale a tag, having thereon, plainly written and legible, the name of the seller and the weight of the bale.

This amendment does not go as far as the section drafted, but it retains the provision that on each bale of hay or straw there shall be the name of the man from whom it comes and the weight of the bale.

Mr. BLAKE: If these two clauses are struck out, the usefulness of the Bill ceases. The manner of issuing the license is very important, and the man who packs the hay should be entrusted with the power of grading it. He is there all the time the hay is being pressed, and he can very easily grade it satisfactorily. If he attempts to put the grade down too low, the farmer will attend to that. If there should be added to this Bill a section penalizing the packer if he gives too high a grade, any difficulty in this section would be overcome. If the name of the packer or his license number, and the name of the man who produced the hay and sold it, were on the tag, there would be something by which to trace the hay should there be any packing of straw or other objectionable material. These two sections 340E and 340F, are the crux of the Bill, and the usefulness of the measure depends upon their retention according to the suggested amendment.

Mr. GERVAIS (translation): Mr. Chairman, I fully concur in the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis). I look upon this clause as being so essential, that the Bill, to my mind, would be absolutely groundless without it, and the provision embodied in the Revised Statutes of 1906 would be clear enough by having added to it this particular clause with respect to identification.

The traders complain, and rightly so, of the fact that the hay cannot be identified after it is pressed, sold in big lots, and exported, and I know pertinently that the packers, confident that the stuff mixed up in the pressed hay will not be discovered, will go to the length of mixing with it a variety of things, such as husk, waste taken from the barn-floor or under the press, and so on. The best means to protect the trader, the good hay producer and the good hay seller, is to have an identification mark.

The owner of the pressed hay is a responsible man as a general rule, and the trader may reach him; so may the middleman, the big exporter as well as the trader.

Should this clause not carry—the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce seemed inclined to withdraw clause 340F a moment ago—I think the Bill will be groundless and we might as well withdraw it and be left with the provisions of 1906.

I come from a county where large quantities of hay are produced, and I may say that most of the leading hay producers in my county would have their hay identified and their packing recognized. They are not afraid that their goods be identified, but they want them labelled some way or other, and at the lowest possible cost.

I say, again, that I fully approve of the amendment submitted by my honourable colleague from Joliette, and I believe that this clause should be added to the Bill or that the Bill itself should be withdrawn in its entirety.

Mr. MAYRAND (Maskinongé) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I fully concur in all the remarks presented by the honourable member for Berthier and by the honourable member for Joliette, save one. The preparation, especially under the present circumstances, of an identification mark, is somewhat costly, and we are in war time. Why not have the hay labelled as in the

past, by means of a pasteboard ticket introduced under the bales, and which is not lost at the time the goods are shipped?

Why should we oblige the farmers to pay twenty-five cents on every ton of pressed hay to give them exactly what they had before? Moreover, the offering of these tags will entail a certain amount of work, at whatever season of the year it is done. It seems to me that we should retain the label we had before, giving the name of the producer selling the hay and heartily endorse the remarks just made by the hon. member for Berthier.

Mr. DENIS: My hon. friend says that the tag should not be expensive and I have drafted my amendment to ensure that. I have used the word "tag" which, I understand, means any label. If the word "tag" means anything other than label, it might be replaced by the word "label".

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can quite see the necessity of retaining those two sections, if the Bill is to be worked out completely on the basis upon which it was framed. Unless we have compulsory inspection I do not see what good the proposed amendment would do. It is proposed to license every one who presses hay for sale in Canada or for export. There are a great many people pressing hay—a great many farmers, and a great many professional pressers each serving his district. What protection would it afford simply to have the name of the person who pressed the hay and the weight of the hay? There would be no grading at all. It is impossible for everyone who presses hay to be his own judge of the grade of his hay, or otherwise we should have a different grade for every person who presses, and consequently not having any official grade, there would be no authoritative standard, and you would have no redress. If John Jones, a farmer, presses his hay and affixes his name to it, that does not fix the grade; it simply indicates his idea of the grade it ought to be; that is really not a system of grading at all. It would not suffice in any court of law or be an authoritative grade on which purchase and sale could take place. So, unless you have an inspector to do the grading you get no redress by going so far. When you know that the hay you buy in Montreal or anywhere else was pressed in some district in Quebec, all you have is the empty satisfaction of knowing that although the hay is not up to standard it was pressed by such and such a person.

[Mr. Mayrand.]

Mr. DENIS: It is the name of the owner, not of the presser, that I propose to have on the bale?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That does not make it any better. Suppose we license every man who presses a single ton of hay, and make him put his name on it and the weight. Then some one suggests that he should also state the grade. What grade? The owner may think it is No. 1 or No. 2 or No. 3 or No. 4; that is simply his personal opinion. The last person to determine the grade is the man who owns the product to be sold. What kind of grades would you have in the grain trade if you allowed every grain producer to fix his own grade? It would not be official at all; it would be the interested party who fixed the grade, and the marking would be of no value whatever as part of a plan of grading. The mere fact of knowing that a load of hay that did not come up to your expectations was pressed in a certain district by a certain man gives you no redress. But if this House will stand by a system which will license every man who presses hay and make him affix his name and the weight and the grade—the grade to be fixed by a competent inspector—you will have a system which will protect the consumer, but which I think would be very burdensome to carry out all over the country. That is the reason why I abandoned for this year my project of having every hay presser licensed and of having every ton of hay tagged, not only with the name of the presser, but with the weight and the grade as well. By fixing a system of grades, with a chance for inspection all through the country, we are taking a step forward from the position we are in to-day. If I could take the whole step, and do it without overburdening the trade, I would gladly do it; but I am doubtful if I should be justified in trying to go that far this year. I therefore ask the House to take this one step in advance and by-and-by we can take another step.

Mr. ROBB: The minister brings in a Bill to regulate the inspection and control of hay and straw, the Bill gets its second reading and goes into committee, and now the minister is asking us to strike out the only clause in the Bill which will protect the shipper of hay and enable him to trace back to the presser any irregularities. He built up a case of John Jones, a farmer pressing hay, and asked what good it would be to know who pressed that hay if it was found unsatisfactory when it got to market. But unless you have such a provision as the

minister himself put into the Bill in the first place, how are you going to trace back any two or three cars that may be unsatisfactory in a shipment of five or ten cars? If the minister is going to strike out this provision, we may as well drop the whole Bill.

Mr. LANCTOT: I understand the minister to say that grading by the farmers would be of no use either to the dealer or to the farmer himself, and I quite agree, but we all know that hay is being graded at the present time. I have been in the trade for the last twenty-five years. I buy hay from farmers—generally so much for the whole lot—and I sell it again to others according to the grade. If we know the name of the man who pressed hay that should not have been pressed, or who mixed hay that should not have been mixed that certainly would be an advantage, especially at this time when many hay dealers in Canada are suffering on account of the heating of the hay. If the information I received from a man who has war contracts with the Department of Agriculture is correct, many cars of hay were rejected at the wharf on account of heating. You can easily see how this would happen when it took trains five or six weeks to go from Canada to New York during the recent bad snow storms. If no precautions are taken by the farmers the hay is bound to arrive in bad condition, and in order to prevent that we ask that the name of the farmer who presses the hay be affixed to his product. If he is caught once he will take care not to be caught again.

Mr. BLAKE: I desire to propose an amendment to section 340E of the Act which will read as follows:

—said presser to grade said hay or straw, and for failing to do so be liable on conviction to a fine of not more than twenty dollars.

I am satisfied that will meet the case and will prevent any danger of improper grading. I think the man who sees the hay when it is being pressed, if he is accustomed to handling hay, will be as capable of judging the quality of the hay as any inspector.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot submit the amendment of the hon. gentleman to the House. He proposes to amend section 340E of the Act. That section was struck out by the unanimous consent of the committee this afternoon.

Mr. BLAKE: Then make my amendment to section 340F.

The CHAIRMAN: I am quite willing to propose the amendment in that shape. but there is an amendment before the committee, and when that is disposed of we will take up the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE: It might be put as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Not in committee.

Mr. MAYRAND (Maskinonge) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I entirely concur in the statements of the hon. member from Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot). He told the House that an enormous quantity of hay is likely to rot.

By the way, the House will perhaps allow me to point out the usual conditions of the hay trade in our country places. The hay dealers vie with each other as to who will buy the crop beforehand, caring little for the quality. They have no worse enemies than themselves and they are to a large extent responsible for the poor hay which is marketed.

I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and before long, I am sure, that trade will show a great improvement and the quality of the hay which will be offered for sale will show a marked improvement. On the other hand, there is no denying the fact that hay dealers must mend their ways, cease competing with each other and look after the quality of the hay which they put on the market.

Mr. DENIS: I wish to close this debate with a few more explanations. When I proposed my amendment I meant that the owner of the hay should be required to put his name on the bale, and I feel that this method will afford means of redress in case the hay is not in proper condition when pressed. Some of my colleagues have mentioned the fact that it is just possible, not only possible but it often happens—and as a lawyer I have had cases of this kind more than once—that hay will be pressed in bad condition. If the hay is pressed in cold weather, say in the month of November or December, it will not rot at the time it is pressed, but it will freeze and may keep for two or three months in good condition and present a fairly good appearence until the next spring, as the hay traders know; but when that hay is transported to the United States or some southern country, and during transit the temperature becomes milder, then the hay will heat and rot. I have known of several cases where hay was sent by a dealer in the province of

Quebec to the United States, say in January, and it was found, two or three weeks afterwards to be spoiled, because it had been pressed in bad condition. The experts who open up the bales can find out if the hay has deteriorated on account of being pressed in bad order, or because of exposure to snow or rain while the hay was in transit. If it be found that a man shipped hay which had a latent defect, then the man who receives the hay can get redress. Consequently, I think, if the amendment were carried, it would enable a man who buys hay at any time during the year to ship that hay anywhere, and if it turned out that the hay had been pressed in bad condition, he would have the right to go to the man from whom he bought it and say: "I bought your hay, and paid for it, and I am entitled to get my money back, because the hay you sold me had in itself a latent defect; which gives me a recourse at law against you." I propose the amendment with the object of preventing the clause as first drafted passing the House. I believe, right or wrong, that compulsory inspection of hay, with a license system, would be altogether too complicated and costly. Consequently, I am proposing this as a half-way measure, and if it be not accepted, I will withdraw it, and consent that the clause be struck out altogether.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite appreciate my hon. friend's idea. I take his statement to mean that if this is to be coupled with a compulsory inspection it would be so burdensome he would rather the clause should not pass. That is true. I cannot follow my hon. friend in his reasoning with reference to redress, or ground for redress, he would have under the circumstances mentioned. The farmer raises the hay and presses it. My hon. friend says that if it is pressed in certain times it is liable to have a concealed or latent defect, which, months after, would become apparent under certain circumstances. If my hon. friend wishes to propose an efficacious remedy he must prescribe by law the conditions under which, and the time at which, the farmer must press the hay, and must forbid the pressing of it at any other time, because if the hay is not pressed at the right time the fault in it is hidden, to break out afterwards and destroy the quality of the hay. My hon. friend is looking after the interests of the dealer. I think the dealer is quite able to look after himself. The dealer buys the hay, and the farmer himself cannot fix a grade upon the hay. The dealer has to protect himself by having the hay inspected, and if the hay inspects up to certain grades the dealer knows what he is buying. But what protection has he against the farmer in regard to whom there is no law prescribing the exact time and conditions under which he shall press the hay? What redress has he against the farmer who does not give any grade because he is not able to make a grade, and who consequently enters into no contract as to the quality of the hay he is selling, but simply presses his hay and sells it? The dealer can protect himself by saying to the farmer: "I will have that hay inspected first. If it goes up to a certain grade I will give you so much." That would be a protection to the dealer.

I do not see how you have any recourse against the farmer who is not obligated as to the conditions under which he shall press his hay and has no power to fix the grade under which he contracts to sell that hay. Consequently, I do not see that there is any redress in that respect. It is for the dealer to see that the hay he buys, perhaps to sell again, shall be inspected and that he shall get the grade for which he pays. After he buys the hay, it is for the seller to see that he delivers that same kind and quality of hay to the man to whom he contracts to sell. If I could see that it adds to the guarantee or certainty of the dealer getting what he supposed he was getting I would think that it would be well to have this amendment, but that does not appear to me to be the case. To put it briefly again, it is simply this: Here is your consumer whom we are first to protect. The consumer contracts to buy hay of a certain grade at a certain price. The dealer in hay, the seller, contracts to give him that hay of a certain grade at a certain price. The dealer has to go somewhere to get his hay. He goes to the farmer to see if he can get the grade he wants. He can get the grade he wants by having the inspector inspect the hay and fix the grade. Then the bargain is struck. I would like to meet my hon. friend if possible, but I cannot see how the amendment is going to affect the question in the way in which he thinks it will. There are only two things to be done. One is to make the system of grades and inspection compulsory all the way through, and the other is to fix your grades, appoint your inspectors and have the hay graded by the inspectors, and then the dealer and purchaser alike can protect themselves. The farmer does not contract to sell any parti-

cular grade of hay. There is his hay, and he asks a price according to the grade, the dealer gets an inspection, the grade is established and fixed, and consequently the contract is made.

Mr. McKENZIE: The point under discussion is a very nice one. I have always admired the certainty and authoritative style of the minister (Sir George Foster). On most questions he is positive, certain and authoritative. I would like to remind him, now that he is sitting between two very eminent lawyers, that he is dealing with a very intricate question of law. There is just one fallacy in his whole argument and that is that a man who sells any article, particularly an article of food for man or beast, contracts to sell a merchantable article. It will not do for him to sell, for instance, butter, looking nice on the outside, in a regulation keg or box, of the proper weight, colour, taste and everything all right as far as the eye can see, although that tub of butter is not merchantable. It is a common-law principle that the man who sells that tub of butter undertakes that he is selling a merchantable commodity fit for the purpose for which he is selling it. If the man's name is on the tub and it turns out that the butter is not merchantable, although it looks all right, or if it turns out not to have been put up in such a way as to stand the journey for which it was intended, not properly salted, or not properly coopered, there is recourse against him. What the hon. gentleman sitting around me want is that the man who sells a tub of butter shall put his name on it so that he may be held responsible. Applying that to the bale of hay, it is quite true that there is no time of the year specified when this man must press his hay; he can press it when he likes. But he must know that he is bound to press a merchantable article. If he presses it in a rainstorm, he must know that he is not pressing a merchantable article and that he is not putting it in the car in a condition to stand the journey. If he puts his name on it he takes that responsibility. It is no hardship to him to be required to put his name on that article. That is all that is required by this very simple amendment. Perhaps it would have been better to have gone farther, but I fully agree with the minister that the conditions should be made as simple as possible, and that it is not well to be piling up burdens on the farmer, or any other person who is working in connection with production. The burden should be as light as possible, but it is no great burden to ask a man who puts any commodity on the market to take the responsibility of attaching his name to it. If any person comes back on him that person assumes the burden of proving that the goods do not come up to the standard.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is purely a question of indentification?

Mr. McKENZIE: Largely.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not understand why the purchaser cannot identify it himself by putting a mark upon it.

Mr. DENIS: I come from a county where there is a great deal of hay being traded in, and this is the way it is done: The purchaser will buy hay from Mr. A, Mr. B, Mr. C, Mr. D, Mr. E, and so on—perhaps ten different persons. After he has bought the hay he leaves it until he gets cars. He does not get cars when he wants them. When he gets a few cars he goes out into the country and says: "Mr. A, will you bring me your hay to-morrow, or as soon as you can?" But he is not going to advise one person only, because it would not give him enough hay to load the cars at his disposal. Therefore, Mr. A, Mr. B, Mr. C, Mr. D, and Mr. E, will be called upon to load hay. Mr. A will load a car, Mr. B will load another car, and so on. But, when Mr. A is through loading, the car is only half filled and the purchaser takes the hay of Mr. B to complete the loading of that car. Another instance: Supposing Mr. A has three or four different grades of hay. The buyer will be loading the same grade of hay on the same car. He may have twenty bales of hay from Mr. A to load on that car, twenty bales from Mr. B, twenty bales from Mr. C and so on. For it is up to the buyer to assort the hay when he loads the cars. Generally a buyer purchases a whole lot of hay, as was stated here this afternoon. A farmer has, say, three grades of hay, and may sell grade No. 1 to one man, grade No. 2 to another man, and so on. But this very seldom happens; generally the farmer will sell his hay at so much per ton for the lot. The dealer buys the hay at a medium price and then assorts it to please himself, and the buyer under those conditions is forced to mix up hay which he bought from several persons. It will often happen that one complete carload will be loaded by one man. In such a case there is no possible mistake; but when two, three or four men load hay on the same car then the hay is mixed. If the name of the owner or farmer is on each

bale and it happens that some of the hay rots, the bales can be opened up and it can be ascertained whose hay it was that was not pressed in good condition. To a certain extent it is like mixing bad apples with good apples. The bad hay will rot the good hay after a certain time, and the whole lot will be heated and injured; but if the whole consignment is not destroyed it can be ascertained to whom the bales that were injured belong.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not very familiar with the intricacies of the trade, or of the Bill, but it seems to me that if the purpose is purely to secure identification, the purchaser can put his mark on each bale of hay just as he can put his mark on a barrel of apples that he purchased from any person, and which did not happen to bear any mark that otherwise would identify it. If it is simply identification that is aimed at, it would appear that the purchaser can secure that identification himself if he desires to do so.

Mr. DENIS: If the purchaser placed the mark himself the point would not be so strong as it would be in the case of the seller marking his own name, for he could say: "I marked my name on such and such a bale, and this, or that, is not my hay." But how could a purchaser who is loading hay on cars and doing it in a hurry meet the requirement of himself placing the marks? For it takes some time to do this He would have to hire a lot of men with tags, and these men would write on the tags—what? The name of Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones. These tags would have to be placed on the bales of hay and in so doing the men engaged in that work might make mistakes. It seems very much more simple that the owner himself, while pressing his hay, should put his own name on the bale and so that he could say: "Here is my merchandise, now I can guarantee it."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What guarantee does he give?

Mr. DENIS: He guarantees that the hay has been pressed in good condition, and kept in good condition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He does if he enters into a contract, not otherwise.

Mr. DENIS: That is the general guarantee of law. These provisions are not in the interest of the buyer any more than they are in the interest of the seller; I think the provisions are equally as useful to them both. But I am urging it more for the farmer's sake than for the sake of the trader. I am speaking for the farmers of my constituency and of the surrounding constituencies who produce a tremendous lot of hay, and I think, from what I have heard, they would be quite satisfied with the provisions I have suggested. It is just the same as a person who wanted to buy Maclaren's cheese; if he were shown a package which did not bear Maclaren's name he would not buy it. In the same manner the seller or producer is interested in having his name marked on the hay, and the man who buys that hay and finds out he has not been deceived—that the hay was just as was represented by the seller—will go back to the same farmer the year after when he wants to purchase a further quantity, and say to him: "The hay you sold me was correctly sold, it was equal to the representations which you made, consequently I can rely upon you." There have been complaints and disputes repeatedly between the seller and the buyer in regard to hay. A man will purchase hay and then find out that a few bales, or a certain quantity of it, is not what it should be, and yet he can not discover whose hay it is that he received in bad condition. All these things happen, and we have seen any amount of disputes about them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In such cases the hay is bought without inspection.

Mr. DENIS: Generally, in the country, the farmers do not have their hay inspected. It is very unwise for a man to sell his hay on grade. A man thinks he has a certain grade, and then the inspector comes along and decides it is another grade altogether. The method of trading pursued is something like this: "Here, Mr. Buyer, is my hay in the barn. Examine it, fix a grade yourself, and tell me what price you are going to give me for the whole thing." That is the way the hay is sold, and it is a very much simpler and surer method for the farmer than having an inspector come to examine the hay and grade it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have had a pretty long discussion over this provision, and I am quite willing to take into consideration what my hon. friends have so tenaciously put forward. Probably it would be just as well if the Committee rose now and reported progress. We will leave the matter over for another day, and if there is any way in which we can meet to some extent the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Denis) has in view, we will see what can be done towards meeting it. If not, we will complete consideration of the Bill. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MAYRAND: Mr. Chairman, I——

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but the rules of the House are very severe. A motion that the Committee rise is not debatable. If the hon. minister will withdraw the motion, the hon. gentleman may proceed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The subject can be discussed just as well when we again go into Committee.

Progress reported.

REPORT OF EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I beg to submit the annual report of the Editorial Committee on Governmental Printing, which was asked for the other day.

DANGER FROM EXPLOSION OF MUNITIONS.

Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Before going into Committee of Supply, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very urgent matter touching the safety of the public, and the avoidance of disaster through the explosion of munitions. I am informed that several fires have occurred at the plant of the Canadian Explosives Company at McMasterville in the county of Vercheres, where tons of t.n.t. are stored. On February 5 I wrote the following letter to the Minister of Militia:

Dear Sir,

I have been informed by several citizens of Beloeil, county of Vercheres, that since about a month, fires have started in the plant of Canadian Explosives, McMasterville. One of these fires was only stopped at about five feet from a large mass of t.n.t., another one caused an explosion a few days ago, which will probably result in death of two men.

I understand there is enough explosive in that plant to cause a disaster similar to the one of Halifax. The lives of the citizens are in danger.

Will you be kind enough to point these facts to your inspector of munitions plants and see that the regulations are observed.

I received the following answer from the Imperial Munitions Board:

Your letter of February 5th, addressed to the Minister of Militia, has been referred to this Board.

The Board has no connection with the plant at Beloeil, and no contracts with the Canadian Explosives, Limited, for the production of t.n.t. at that point. We are informed that the Company is producing t.n.t. for the United States Government.

About a week ago I put on the Order Paper the following questions:

1. Who is in charge of inspection, for the Government, of ammunition manufacture?

2. Who has charge of the inspection of the Canadian Explosives Company at Beloeil?

3. How many times since the 1st January, 1917, has the said company's establishment been inspected, and what are the dates of said inspections?

4. Is the Government aware that fires recently broke out in the said establishment and were extinguished only a few feet from storage containing t.n.t?

To which the following answers were given:

1. The Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition at Quebec.

2. No official of the Department of Militia and Defence is charged with the inspection of the Canadian Explosives' premises at Beloeil.

An examiner (under the jurisdiction of the Chief Inspector of Arms and Ammunition) is stationed at Beloeil for the purpose of inspecting such supplies of ammunition and explosives as may be ordered by this department from time to time.

3. The Government has no information.

4. No.

It may be added that the inspection of ammunition and explosives for the Imperial Government is carried out by representatives of the Imperial Ministry of Munitions of England, who are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Militia and Defence.

I understand from this answer that when munition plants are not manufacturing for the Dominion Government, there is no inspecion. I should like to be informed by the Government with regard to
9 p.m. that matter, because if disaster occurs it will be too late to pass regulations for inspection. Does the Government intend to have this plant inspected in order that the safety of the public may be ensured? I understand that a very large quantity of t.n.t., which is a dangerous explosive, is stored at Beloeil.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not sure whether the hon. gentleman gave notice to the Minister of Militia that he intended to bring this matter up. Whether he did or not, it happens that the Minister of Militia is not here, and no other member of the Government who is present is familiar with the circumstances. I shall be very glad, however, to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia and to ask him to reply to my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That will be satisfactory.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Works—Ottawa Parliament building—restoration—The plans for the said building

and the method to be adopted for securing the reconstruction thereof to be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee appointed by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, $1,500,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the present state of this work, and when may we expect to be reinstated in the new building?

Mr. CARVELL: A week ago I invited the members of the House to visit and inspect these works, and I am very glad that a great many availed themselves of the opportunity and are thereby as familiar with the real state of the work as I am. Generally speaking, the structure of the building is about completed, excepting the main tower and six smaller towers, the steel of which has already been erected. The remainder of the work yet to be done is in the nature of finishing up. The plan of the new building is very different from the old. Along the front, from the outside, it looks about the same, but that is the only respect in which the plan is the same as that of the old building. I had hoped up to the last month or two that it would be possible to have the building completed so that it would be ready for occupation during the next session of Parliament, but I am afraid that that will be a physical impossibility. Two buildings, practically complete in themselves, occupy the sites of the old House of Commons and Senate chambers; these, for purposes of designation, are called office blocks. They comprise most of the three upper storeys of the building, the remaining part of that space consisting of rooms for committees and other general purposes. These office blocks are lighted on both sides from very wide wells, and will embrace, I think, eighty-four offices, each about ten by twenty feet. We anticipate that these will be completed by 1st November, and while it may seem like sacrilege, I confess that we intend to occupy this part of the building, when it is completed, by such members of the Civil Service as can be put in them. This course is being taken because the amount which we are paying for rent in Ottawa is simply terrible, and it is only good business to utilize every foot of space that is at all available. The building is being constructed by a committee, of which I happen to be chairman, by virtue of my office. All purchases are being made by tender and contract.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who are the other members of the committee?

Mr. CARVELL: From the Senate: Sir James Lougheed, Hon. Robert Watson and Hon. G. D. Robertson; from the Commons: Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, Dr. Reid, Mr. Calder and myself. I think that is all. The system followed is practically this: A board consisting of the two architects and the deputy minister meets from time to time and decides upon what is required in the immediate future. It then makes a recommendation to the Parliamentary Committee, asking the right to call for tenders. Advertisements calling for tenders are inserted in a number of the leading newspapers, wherever it is thought it will be necessary, and when the tenders are opened they are examined by the technical officers. A report is made to the committee, and the committee decide upon the letting of the contracts. Contracts have recently been let for the heating, the plumbing, the ventilation, the heating plant, the wiring, and the conduits. What I call the heating plant is the boilers and automatic stokers. Tenders have been called for for steel casements for the windows. That matter has not been finally decided. Tenders have also been opened for the furnishing of panel boards, switch boards, transformers and electrical supplies. Those have not yet been decided. I can only assure the House that every dollar that is being expended in that building is passing under the strictest scrutiny of the Parliamentary Committee, and the lowest tender is in every case being accepted, unless the very strongest reason can be given to the contrary. We have not accepted the lowest tender in every case, but if we have not, it is because there were reasons so potent that the ordinary man would not have accepted the lowest tender. The amount spent up to date would be in the vicinity of $3,000,000, or perhaps a little less; it was $2,700,000 some two or three months ago. It would be pretty hard to form an estimate of what it will take to finish the building, but it will run to at least $5,000,000, and possibly a little more, depending to some extent upon the character of the inside decorations. The House, I think, will agree with me that if we are going to finish the building we should finish it properly. If we come to the conclusion that, on account of the financial situation, we cannot put in the proper decorations, we should not put in decorations at all. It is the intention to finish the building as expeditiously as possible, making it more than a building for commercial purposes, a building that to some extent will be suitable for the capital of the Dominion of Canada. Some portions of it may be con-

sidered as a work of art. The public will agree, I am sure, if we are erecting new parliament buildings for the Dominion of Canada, we should build practically the latest thing in the architectural world to-day.

Mr. MURPHY: What system of heating has been decided upon? I ask this because, prior to the beginning of the work, in fact, before the selection of a committee to superintend the work, I wrote the then Minister of Public Works, suggesting that there be employed a certain modern method of heating which would do away with boilers and all that kind of thing in the building itself. The reply I received indicated that some such idea as that would be adopted. Later on I saw it was proposed to heat the building by electricity, but, judging by what my hon. friend has said to-night, that scheme has not been carried out.

Mr. CARVELL: As regards electricity, this is the first intimation I have received that such a method of heating was in contemplation. We would have to have another water-power practically equal to the Chaudière, in order properly to heat this building by electricity. Somebody has to devise a new scheme of electrical heating before it will be commercially feasible for a building of that kind. The contracts have all been let for the heating plant, which consists of a central plant on Cliff street, down from the Hill, near the old Supreme Court building. The plan provides for six large boilers with automatic stokers. It is to be a hot-water heating system. I am speaking now without any actual knowledge, but I think I am right in stating that the scheme is to send the steam up the hill in large pipes, this steam to be used to heat water in the building for circulation throughout the building. That is, we transmit the steam from the central heating plant to the building rather than transmit the hot water. It is a technical matter on which I am not in a position to pass judgment.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a hot water system.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, but the hot water is heated by steam generated in the central plant. This plant will be of sufficient capacity to take care of the heating in the East Block, the West Block, the Langevin Block, the post office block and the Supreme Court buildings. As the system is on a unit basis, it might possibly be extended.

Mr. MURPHY: What has been decided with regard to the main tower? There appears to be provision made for a portion of it, but, though that has stood there for a length of time, yet either for reasons of convenience in connection with the rest of the work or because the plan has not been finally adopted, the work has not been gone on with.

Mr. CARVELL: That is largely because the architect has, as he says, been dreaming over it. There is no reason why he should not keep on dreaming for a few months longer. Naturally, and I think quite rightly, he wishes to have, from an architectural point of view in connection with the rest of the building, the best tower he can devise. The main tower will be built in front of the building as now erected, and it is to be 44 feet square at the base, running up that size perhaps 150 feet. I am speaking now offhand. It then tapers off to some extent. I am not architect enough to describe to my hon. friend all the beauties of this tower, but when completed it will be 260 feet from the ground level. The foundation will undoubtedly be laid this year and possibly some portion of the substructure, but I do not think it is the intention to complete the tower until another year. It is not a necessary portion of the building. There is, in my judgment, no reason to spending the money involved, a fairly large amount, until we have to spend it. The building could be completed and occupied without the construction of this tower, although it is the intention to proceed with it and complete it in the ordinary course of affars.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the minister to say that by next November it would be possible to occupy a number of rooms in the new building for office purposes.

Mr. CARVELL: Eighty-four rooms.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister justifies that on the ground of saving rent?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Might it not be possible to do something of the same kind in connection with the chambers of the House of Commons and the Senate—not that it would result in a saving of rent, but it would result in Parliament meeting, so to speak, in its own building again. My hon. friend mentioned that the question of decorations had not been actually decided upon. I understood him to say that matter was still open, and he added that if the decora-

tions were to be gone on with, it was desirable that they should be excellent in every respect, and, in fact, the very best that can be found in the Dominion. With that I entirely agree, but the two chambers might be sufficiently advanced for the purposes of occupation, and the decorations could go on in the recesses between sessions. I merely offer that as a suggestion to the minister.

Mr. CARVELL: I have a great deal of sympathy with suggestions offered by my hon. friend, and I can assure him that meets with a great deal of favour by different members of the Government.

Of course, we are, in the judgment of the House, very largely in connection with this national building. The only difficulty is that the contractors and architects say it is impossible; I do not mean impossible in the sense that it could not possibly be done, but practically, they say, it is impossible, and I would not want to urge my views against the professional views of such men as the contractors and architects of this building.

Mr. MURPHY: Impossible to have it ready for next session?

Mr. CARVELL: Practically impossible. I pressed it upon them very strongly—in fact, I commenced pressing it over three months ago—and other members of the Government have also pressed it, but the architects are very strongly of the opinion that it would be a very great mistake. Eighty-four rooms could be finished, and I think that would be quite sufficient for the use of members of the Government and hon. gentlemen, but the difficulty is there will be practically no offices ready for the officers of the House, and as my hon. friend knows, it takes a very large amount of space to take care of the requirements of the officers of the two Houses of Parliament. I am rather forced to the conclusion that it would be almost an impossible task to have the building reasonably ready for the next session of Parliament.

Mr. JACOBS: I trust that in the tower which the minister has described proper provision will be made for the lodgment of such state prisoners as we may have to take care of from time to time.

Mr. CARVELL: It is my intention to fix up a room in the basement of the tower for such characters as my hon. friend has described.

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. JACOBS: That is absolutely unconstitutional. The proper place to put state prisoners is in the tower.

Mr. COPP: If I remember correctly, the work was to be done by force contract. Does that apply to the whole building?

Mr. CARVELL: That included the whole building from the basement to the top of the tower, everything on the outside and everything on the inside.

Mr. COPP: Would the contractors get a certain percentage on such work as the heating?

Mr. CARVELL: It covers everything one could imagine that goes into the construction of the building.

Mr. CAHILL: Is hot-water heating a good system?

Mr. CARVELL: The hot-water heating system passed the experimental stage years ago, and it is to be found in the large buildings and hospitals and universities in Toronto and Montreal and practically every American city. There is no question whatever about its economy and its usefulness. I cannot give my hon. friend exact figures as to what the architects think will be saved, but there will be a very great saving of fuel and in cost, and it will do away with all dust and soot. There is just as much difference as between the steam car and the electric street car. Every one knows that in a building heated by an internal plant there is a large amount of dust accumulating all the time, and this will be absolutely eliminated in the new building. From the standpoint of cleanliness and economy I think there is no question whatever as to the advisability of a central heating plant.

Mr. CAHILL: I was not thinking so much of the isolation of the plant as of the merits of the hot-water heating system.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know enough about the technical side of it to answer my hon. friend, but we all know that all over this country buildings are heated by steam or by hot water. Generally speaking, I think the hot-water system is not used in very high buildings. This question has been gone into very thoroughly by the technical officers, and they have decided on the hot-water system as being the best and most economical method of heating.

Mr. COPP: What percentage is paid to the contractor under this force agreement over and above cost?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the contract with me, but from my recollection they get eight per cent up to $4,000,000, seven per cent for the next million, and I think there is no commission after $5,000,000.

Mr. JACOBS: Are any members on this side of the House assisting the minister in the plans for the new building?

Mr. CARVELL: I regret to say, there are none.

Mr. MURPHY: In that connection, and having regard to the question asked by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Copp) may I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) who, I know, has not lost his regard for economy although he does not occupy his accustomed place on this side of the House, that he would see that the decorations do not form part of this contract on which the contractors are to get seven and eight per cent. I do not think that the present contractors, eminent as they are in their own line, occupy any particular place in the artistic world in Canada, and I think my hon. friend will be well advised to terminate the contract as soon as he reasonably can, and I would suggest that the decorations be made under some other arrangement. In any event my hon. friend will admit that the present contractors are not artists for decorative purposes, although artists in other directions, I admit, particularly in contracting.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not a member of the committee when the contract was made. I might go back and say that I think my hon. friend was a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Mr. CARVELL: And therefore he would be in a much better position to speak of the exact terms and conditions than I would be. But whether my memory is correct or not, I think I am safe in saying, from what the building has cost up to the present time and from the contracts that have already been entered into, that the building will cost $5,000,000 exclusive of decorations, and as the percentage stops at $5,000,000, the point of my hon. friend is therefore not so very important. If there was not the $5,000,000 limit, the committee, I think, would be well advised in considering whether they had the power to terminate the contract at that point or not.

Mr. MURPHY: Suppose the actual construction cost was $4,500,000, that would leave a margin of $500,000, and if that is to be used for decorations, I submit that it should not form part of the original contract. My hon. friend will remember that my name did appear on the committee, but I never acted, for reasons which it is not necessary to go into now.

Mr. CARVELL: The word "decorations" covers a very broad field.

Mr. MURPHY: You will make it an elastic term.

Mr. CARVELL: It covers a very great part of the building. For instance, I would include in the word "decorations" the marble arches, whether the entrance be finished in an elaborate manner or not. If you finish that hall in marble, as I think a large part of it should be finished, that work must be done by just such men as the present contractors. If, on the other hand, we are to have a plain wall covered with valuable paintings, I think my hon. friend's criticism would be very much to the point, but I can assure him that it is not intended to finish this in painting, but in something very much more substantial, and I am satisfied that $5,000,000 will have been expended long before we come to the time of paintings and such artistic decorations as will be covered by that term.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was appointed a member of that committee two years ago, and, like my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy), I resigned, after having attended the preliminary meetings of the committee, not that I found much to be criticised up to the time of my resignation, but when I resigned I found we were overstepping the mark. The Parliament of Canada had voted a certain sum toward the restoration of the buildings as they were before the fire, but then it was decided to raze what was left of the buildings and to erect a new Parliament building. I thought I had not been appointed a member of that committee to erect a new building, but to restore the old. Be that as it may, the construction has gone on, and I must say that I have no fault to find, from an architectural point of view especially. I think this new building will be a monument worthy of Canada. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Russell when he says it is quite a different thing to complete the artistic part of that building and the purely structural part of it. I believe that Peter Lyall and Company are a very reliable firm, and with regard to the erection of the structure itself, I think they stand well as the head of their profession in Canada. But with regard to the artistic

end of this monumental building, I say that the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Russell should be accepted. The Parliament of Canada, comprising the House of Commons and Senate, is not an ordinary building. It is a national temple, so to speak, and will last for generations and generations. It has been my privilege to travel twice around the world, and I have seen many parliaments, and I may say that all parliaments are profusely artistic in their completion. We need not go beyond Canada. The Parliament buildings in Quebec are really a gem; but to proceed from one country to another, the Capitol in Washington, the House of Commons in England, the Palais Bourbon in France, and the new Parliament buildings in South Africa, are some of the most artistic buildings in the world. It seems to me that the young artists of Canada should contribute towards the completion of the interior of the building, and that we should imitate what has been done at Westminster, England, where you read on the walls of Parliament the whole history of the English people and of the English nation. You have there splendid paintings, and sculptures which are masterpieces. You have the same class of works in Washington and in Paris. We have a history behind us in Canada, and we have a great future ahead of us, and if a concours were established, it seems to me we would have something to stimulate the genius of our young artists, and at the same time to commemorate the salient facts and great periods in the history of Canada. It is not necessary that this commemoration, in view of the present financial crisis, should materialize at once, but plans can be laid out for the future, as a concours of that nature always takes months and years before being realized. I am just throwing out the idea.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there is any question whatever that my hon. friend is right. I have not read over the contract, but it would take a great deal of argument to make me believe that the Parliament of Canada appointed a committee to purchase valuable paintings. As I view it, we are to erect buildings, and it may be a hundred years before the decorations are finished.

An hon. MEMBER: We can not wait that long.

Mr. CARVELL: No, perhaps we cannot wait. I do not think there will be any intention on the part of any one to pay a commission to the present contractors for supplying paintings in the future. I think my hon. friends can rest assured as to that At any rate, if I occupy my present position for a few years, hon. gentlemen can rest assured that we will erect the building, and let posterity take care of the artistic side of it.

Mr. COPP: When this contract or agreement was entered into, I understood the intention was to repair the old building. We all know that the architects reported upon the walls of the old buildings shortly after the disastrous fire, and stated that very large portions of them were good, and all that they could be repaired and built upon. After the information I received at that time, like many other, I was quite surprised on returning to Ottawa during the summer to find that the buildings had been absolutely razed, and that a new building was being constructed. I am not saying a word of criticism of the hon. minister in reference to the action he has taken, because this arrangement, I understand, was made by a committee of which my hon. friend was not at that time a member, and the agreement was entered into for the purpose of rebuilding the structure on what is known as a force contract. The builders were to receive 8 per cent profit on the cost of the work up to $4,000,000; and on the cost from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000 they were to receive a profit of 7 per cent. I understand that somewhere in the vicinity of $3,000,000 has been expended?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, in that vicinity

Mr. COPP: That being so, the contractors have made a very handsome thing in the past year on this work. My hon. friend says there is an agreement in regard to this matter. In the present condition of business in this country it might be decided that a contract might be changed or varied to a certain extent and an opportunity given to others without giving too much profit to any individual. I have nothing to say against the contractors; they are men who have been in this business for years and as far as I know they have a splendid reputation for doing work of this character. There may be an argument that it would be better to construct certain public works under force contract rather than under the regular contracting system. That might have been so if the original intention had been followed of repairing the building, for changes might be found necessary in the course of the work and these could be more readily made under a force contract. But it is only up to a certain point, possibly in the construction of the stone work and the steel

structure, that the work should be conducted in this particular way. When the committee asked for tenders for putting in the heating system, the ventilating system, the sanitary arrangements and the elevators, for which I understand contracts are let, there is no good reason why others outside of the contractors for these different classes of work should be given a percentage or a rake-off, in view of the fact that they have nothing whatever to do with the work. When the committee make a contract under which the builders will have a percentage on work with which they have nothing whatever to do, it seems to me that it is not in line with good business principles.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend knows I was not a member of the committee when the contract was made. I can only state what is known to a great many hon. members, and to the country generally, that when the main contract for the reconstruction of the building was made it was believed that a large part of the old walls were intact and could be utilized again. I think, however, my hon. friend will admit that the moment it was decided to put the Commons Chamber in the western end of the building and the Senate in the eastern, it became necessary to tear down a portion of the new work that had been erected in 1907-8. My information is, and I think it is correct, that when the engineers and architects made a critical examination of the building in the spring of 1916 they found they were in error in their first report that practically all the outside walls should be retained, and they decided to tear them down. The architects decided to tear them down. I believe without even the consent of the Minister of Public Works of that day. I would like to recall to my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) the fact that right up to February of this year the former member for St. John, now the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, was a member of that committee. I believe he has had as great an experience in public buildings and public construction as most men in Canada, and he heartily concurred in the decision of the committee. When he has such eminent authority as that, I do not think he ought to criticise me for at least following along in his footsteps, believing that whatever was done was done with the best intentions possible.

Mr. COPP: I distinctly said I was not offering any criticism of my hon. friend with regard to his course except at the present time. I recall the hon. gentleman as having taken strong ground that changes might be made in the interest of the country. In so far as blaming him for following in the footsteps of the former member for St. John is concerned, I may say that that gentleman has gone to a place of safety and he is not responsible to Parliament or to the people in this matter. If my hon. friend follows in his footsteps he must assume the responsibility as well as the honour.

Mr. MURPHY: In answer to a question of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few days ago, I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that it had been decided not to include quarters for the Speakers within the new building. Is that correct?

Mr. CARVELL: That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY: Has any arrangement been made to provide quarters outside of the building?

Mr. CARVELL: No, none whatever. There is a building down in the expropriated area, known as the Manuel house, which the present Speaker has been examining, and it is just possible that it will be fitted up temporarily for the use of the Speaker until such time as some definite plan can be decided upon. Outside of that there have been no arrangements or even discussions as to what provision will be made for a Speaker's residence in the future.

Mr. MURPHY: There used to be frequent references in the press, in the initial stages of this work, to the scope that it was likely to assume, and I recall several very elaborate descriptions of a stack room underground on the face of the cliff or the Lover's Walk. Has that been decided upon as a part of the new building, or has anything definite been done in regard to it?

Mr. CARVELL: Nothing has been done about that whatever. I am speaking now without all the data before me, but I am sure that no decision has been made, and I do not think it probable that that question will come up in the near future.

Mr. FIELDING: Is the exclusion of the Speaker's chamber due to lack of space or to other considerations?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think it is so much for lack of space. There is an enormous amount of space in the new building. I think I am safe in saying that the architects, and a great many people who have investigated it, came to the conclusion that

with the ceilings about 20 feet high an ordinary room would look more like a box turned on its end than a room. It would be an ungainly affair and you would have to have rooms with ceilings such as I have described unless you put the Speaker's quarters up on the third or fourth story. Personally, if I have any feeling in the matter, I would prefer to stick to the old custom of having the Speaker's house within the Parliament buildings. That may be only because I still have some veneration for the antiquities, the records of the past and the traditions of our fathers. But, after all, we are living in a progressive age, and because Speakers from time immemorial have had their residence in the House of Commons, both in the old country and in this, I do not suggest that we should still follow that custom. I must confess that it is an open question, and without having any strong feelings one way or the other, I think that in what I am saying I am voicing the sentiments of the gentlemen who were on the Committee and by whom it was decided that probably it would be better to forsake the traditions of the past and have the house for modern Speakers either maintained by themselves, or by the country, in some other locality.

Mr. FIELDING: I hope I am not lacking in veneration for the older things, but it is not on that ground alone that quarters should be provided for the Speaker. If it is a matter of principle that the Speaker or any official shall have a residence, there is something to be said in favour of it; and in that case there is an obvious advantage in locating the Speaker's quarters where he can be easily accessible. If the policy upon the matter has been settled, there is no use in discussing it, but if it is still an open question I certainly favour the idea that the Speaker should have an official residence, and that it should, if possible, be within the Parliament buildings. In the old Parliament buildings the trouble was, not that the Speaker had a residence in the building, but that quite a number of other people also had residence there, and if they were all to be again included I think the minister would be quite right and that there is no particular reason why the accommodation should not be used for other purposes. So far as the Speaker of the House is concerned, and I think the remark also applies to the Speaker of the Senate, if they are to have official residence, there is an obvious convenience in having them within the Parliament buildings.

Mr. CRONYN: I would like to say that not only should the Speaker be accessible during the session, but as he is charged with the oversight of a great deal of what goes on inside the House, residence on the spot would be an obvious advantage. Nor does it seem to me that in modern days, when buildings are equipped with elevators and so forth, there is any great objection to putting the Speaker's residence in an upper story. There are, indeed, advantages to be enjoyed under such circumstances, particularly with such a site as the one occupied by the Parliament buildings here.

While I am on my feet I would like to support the remarks of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) when he expressed the hope that we might get into the new House before next session. Despite what the minister has said, I am inclined to believe that if sufficient effort were made we might be able to occupy and utilize the chambers and sufficient of the new buildings to carry on our work next session. Speaking as a back bencher, who, save when the House is empty, has not the luxury of a front seat, but has to sit on a wooden chair at a very awkward angle, it does not appeal to me that we should be condemned for another session to the present chamber. After all, though Parliament is the place for talk, it has also been well described as a factory for the turning out of the Acts which govern the country, and it strikes me that the plant of this factory is about as inefficient as one could find. Even this evening, and perhaps this is due to my own disability, I had the greatest difficulty in hearing what the Minister of Public Works was saying. He speaks loudly and distinctly, but in this chamber you often lose a great deal of what is said. I feel quite certain that the poor attendance of members in the House is at times due to these causes of discomfort and bad acoustics. There has been some talk of "ginger groups" in the House. I think if we formed a "ginger group" we might do something towards spurring on the architect with this work. As I understand it, the trouble is not so much with the contractor as with the architect. As the minister has said with regard to the tower, the architect desires to dream for some further days of its beauty. Well, let us finish the interior in some habitable way and let the beauty come later; there will be plenty of time for that. I would still have hope that something may be done to hurry things so

that we might get into the new quarters next session.

Mr. McCREA: The contractor's commission, I understand, is eight per cent up to four million dollars, and after that seven per cent. What commission or remuneration does the architect receive for his work?

Mr. CARVELL: I think it is five and a half per cent.

Mr. McCREA: That probably accounts for his wanting to demolish the whole building.

Mr. CARVELL: I have never asked what animated him, and therefore I am unable to answer the question. I can, however, inform my hon. friend that there are two architects, and between them they receive, I think it is, five and a half per cent commission. They furnish all the technical assistants, with their clerks, and the five and a half per cent covers the total cost to the country of designing and supervising the construction of the building.

Mr. PEDLOW: I was one of the members who had the extreme pleasure of visiting the new Parliament buildings at the invitation of the Minister of Public Works a few days ago, and I enjoyed the privilege very much. In rambling through the buildings with the Minister of Public Works and the chief architect, the matter of the completion of the Commons and Senate chambers was thoroughly discussed, and I was given to understand in a measure that the completion of the chambers in time for the next session of Parliament was not such an impossibility as seems to have been conveyed to the House to-night, in fact, that it was not altogether impossible. I heartily agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) that, while grumbling at our surroundings may not come with a very good grace from a new member, especially in war times, yet when better conditions could possibly be provided by a little extra effort, that effort should not be lost sight of. I felt confident, from the assurances given me by the Minister of Public Works, that a strong effort would be made towards that end. My own views, on the occasion of our tour through the buildings, did not quite coincide with the ideas of the architect, who was disposed to take all the time possible in completing the structure, and was not disposed to hand over the buildings for occupancy until such time as he had put on the last flourish. However, I do not think the architect's ideas should prevail altogether. I suggested that the workmen should be concentrated from now on upon the completion of the Commons and Senate chambers. If that were done I think there should be no difficulty whatever in having those sections at least finished in time for the next session of Parliament.

The hon. member for London suggested that possibly the present House would be more comfortable if there were a few more "ginger groups" in it. An hon. gentleman on this side then made the suggestion that we had an exhibition by a "ginger group" not long since, occupying seats almost exactly where the hon. member for London at present is sitting, which was very much enjoyed by members on both sides, and also, perhaps, by a portion of the gallery. I think where the "ginger" is required is behind the architect. If the committee who have charge of this matter on behalf of the Government, and have the say-so, give the architect distinctly to understand what they want, and insist upon having both chambers finished in proper time, their views would in all probability be carried out.

Mr. EDWARDS: Reference has been made to Hon. Mr. Pugsley, the former Minister of Public Works. I did not see very much in that gentleman's record as Minister of Public Works to commend itself to me, but that may have been my fault, not his. We should, however, speak kindly of the absent, as we do of the dead. I am in agreement with the determination arrived at by the Committee to tear down what remained of the walls after the fire. I do not know whether any of these walls could have been utilized, but, though I had no special knowledge of the subject, I thought from the first that it would be a mistake to give the new building an appearance of patch-work by utilizing such walls as were not entirely destroyed. Our country is too big and has too great a future to justify our patching up such an important building as this. With regard to living quarters for the Speakers of the Commons and the Senate, I believe that no place should be provided in the building for that purpose. I would not provide quarters for the Speaker of the Senate, at any rate, because the Senate does not sit very late, and after the Senate rises the Speaker of that House might better be off in a quiet place by himself, resting for the duties of the next day. Why should we provide, in a building constructed for legislative purposes, living quarters for the

gentleman who happens to be appointed Speaker for three or four years, and is succeeded by somebody else for a similar period? I would give the Speaker only such office quarters as are necessary, where he could be communicated with during office hours by members of the House who desire to see him. Perhaps some hon. gentleman can give me a reason why the Speaker of the Commons or the Speaker of the Senate should be provided with living quarters within the building or a residence outside; for my part I see none. As to our going into the building before next session, it is true that we should all like to do that. The acoustic properties of this Chamber are about as bad as they possibly can be.

10 p.m.

If one happens to be facing the gentleman who is addressing the House, it is possible to hear what he says, but if you are behind, it is difficult indeed to hear. While we should all like to get into the new building by next session, it must be remembered that we are spending $5,000,000 in the construction of a home for the future legislators of our country, and we should not proceed with haste. We have had to put up with inconveniences here for a few sessions, and we can stand them for another session, if necessary. It is not desirable that the construction of the building should be unduly rushed, because as Canadians we all want to see the new building, when it is finished, the finest on the North American continent. It is not a question of a few hundred thousand dollars; the people of Canada are not going to quibble over the cost of this building, which should last for all time. I agree that the contractors should not make anything out of such things as pictures and decorations—I am glad to have the minister's assurance in that regard—but there should be no cheese-paring in the matter of the cost of the building. We want to make it as fine as architectural genius can make it; we want it to be something which may be pointed to with pride by the people of our own country and looked upon by others who come here as something worthy of this great country and its future.

Mr. MURPHY: With the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) I am in complete agreement as to the disappearance of the Speaker's residence from the Parliament building. I see no reason for an official residence for the Speaker within the building. The reasons advanced by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that the Speaker should be at all times accessible does not entail the placing of an official residence within the walls of the Parliament building. So long as the Speaker has an office there, like any other official of Parliament, and is accessible within office hours, that meets all the requirements of Parliament. The very presence of these quarters in the old building led to certain features that nobody would associate with legislation—some of which, I think, the member for Shelburne and Queen's had in mind when he made his brief remarks. For that reason, I hope that the present decision to keep the building free of an official residence for the Speaker of either House will be adhered to. I need not add anything to the suggestion made to the minister as to the general desire that exists for completing the building. At the same time, that advice must be qualified, as the member for Frontenac has said; we must not rush the construction of the building at the expense of its excellence. That, I am sure, is not in the mind of any hon. gentleman who has spoken this evening.

Mr. BUREAU: Would it be possible to have work on the chamber proceed to the extent that we could occupy it during the session, and to suspend the work on the building while the House was sitting? Of course, we are all anxious to get into the new building in order that we may have more comfortable quarters, but to rush the completion of the chamber itself might be detrimental to the rest of the building. At the same time, it would not be desirable for us to deliberate while the noise of hammers and saws was being heard around us. I think that we should go on with the work gradually, so that when we occupy the building we shall be not only comfortable, but quiet as well. As to the quarters for the Speaker, I agree with the member for Frontenac. It is not often that we meet on the same ground and shake hands, but tonight it happens that we entertain the same opinion. I do not believe that the Speaker of either House ought to have living quarters within the building. As long as they are where we can reach them, the purposes of Parliament can be served; if the Speaker has an office in the building that is all we want. He may live in any part of the city, and proceed to and from the House by motor car or other means of transportation; so that it would not be any disadvantage to members if he lived outside.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Tramway.

Mr. BUREAU: We may require him after the street cars stop running. It would be better for the country to pay for a motor car to be used by the Speaker than to establish quarters for him within the Parliament building.

Mr. MICHAUD: When my hon. friend speaks about the noise of saws and hammers around the House of Commons, does he include the Senate?

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad we have had this discussion, and I would not have objected had every member of the Committee to-night expressed his views upon these matters, because the Government as such is taking practically no responsibility over the erection of this building. We look upon this as the home for the future Parliament of Canada, and, as such, it is being constructed by the Committee of the Parliament of Canada, acting, of course, under the advice, to a very great extent, of the technical gentlemen who have been employed to assist it. The very fact that there has been such a difference of opinion expressed here to-night as to whether we should hurry on the work so as to occupy the building next year, and whether we should have the Speaker's quarters within or without the building, or anywhere at all, shows that the committee have some difficulty in deciding upon these very important questions. I have no objection whatever to the "ginger group" to which my hon. friend refers, in discussing the matter from every angle, and I would not care if there was a "dynamite group."

Mr. BUREAU: Have them on the lawn.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as the construction of this Parliament building is concerned, I would be glad to hear all the criticisms and all the suggestions which any hon. member can offer, because I realize this is not a contentious matter. It is purely a matter of getting the very finest building which we can get consistently with the reasonable amount of money at our disposal. But I am very much impressed by the suggestion made by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). He is usually pretty logical when he wants to be.

Mr. BUREAU: When he wants to be? That is a modification.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend suggests that it will be pretty hard to hold a session of Parliament with a hundred workmen working all around us finishing up the remainder of the building—for I do not believe it would be possible before next session to do more than finish up those 84 rooms, the two chambers and some of the corridors. There would have to be an army of workmen working in and around the building while the House was in session. There are other things hon. members are forgetting. This would give no accommodation for the working staff of the House. We must have accommodation for the officials of the House. If my hon. friends can devise any scheme whatever whereby they can hurry up the architect, or the contractor, or the committee, or any other person or body of persons having jurisdiction or power, I shall be very glad to carry it out. But it would not be good business to hurry up the completion of the building at the expense of efficiency.

Mr. MURPHY: As to responsibility in the matter, I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the contract is not made with the committee. The contract is between the Department of Public Works and the contractor. The contract was executed by the Minister of Public Works who represents His Majesty, the King, and the contractor, not by the committee.

Mr. CARVELL: I presume that is true because the committee would have no legal standing.

Mr. NESBITT: I just wish to endorse what has been said by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) with regard to the Speaker's quarters, and also with regard to hurrying up the erection of the building to the neglect of the work. Most of us are anxious to get into the new building—I am not particularly worrying about it; I can sit here as well as anybody, although the new building would be much more comfortable than this one—but I would not like to see the work neglected on account of too much haste.

Mr. EULER: Any one who has seen the stage to which the new building has been carried will admit that it is practically physically impossible to complete it in time for the next session of Parliament. I would just like to make one suggestion. I agree with all that has been said about the discomforts of this chamber. As a new member, possibly I should not pass my opinion, but it is quite true this chamber is not what it ought to be, and the suggestion I wish to make is this: that the authorities ought to endeavour to make it as comfortable as possible for the next session, if we do have to spend next session

here. Perhaps one of the greatest difficulties with which we have to contend is in the matter of acoustics—we cannot understand the members as they speak. That difficulty can very largely be overcome if every hon. member who rises to speak attempts to speak as distinctly as possible, and I believe we ourselves can overcome most of the difficulties in that direction for one session at least. I would like to express the opinion that, when the seating arrangements of this Chamber were made, they seemed to be made with the one distinct idea of making them as uncomfortable as possible. I am referring to the chairs and the seating arrangements, and the matter of heating and ventilation. Many of us have perhaps acquired the first colds of this winter since coming into this House. It is quite possible, with a little care, to make the accommodation here a good deal better than it has been.

Mr. BUREAU: The fire alarm system in this building indicates by lights on what story a fire occurs. Should a fire start on the second story, a light of a certain colour will appear showing where the fire is. Is that the system to be adopted in the new building, or is the old system to be used?

Mr. CARVELL: I could not answer that question; in fact I do not think the matter has been discussed. The system installed in this building is certainly a very excellent one. It was installed by a gentleman who is employed on the staff, in fact, who has charge of this building. By pressing a button, it indicates by a light which floor the fire is on, and whether it be to the right or to the left of the main entrance. It shows the stand pipe and it is certainly a wonderful contrivance. As regards the new building the matter has not been discussed, but it would certainly be worthy of discussion.

Mr. MURPHY: The new building will be fireproof?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and I cannot conceive there will ever be a fire in the new building. That may be a violent assumption.

Mr. BUREAU: The Titanic "could not be sunk."

Mr. CARVELL: This is stronger even than the Titanic. There will not be a particle of wood of any kind or description in this new building excepting the doors, and, I think, base boards around the inside of the offices. There are no door frames as such; there are no wooden window frames or wooden sashes; everything is either metal or concrete. Therefore, while you might burn the desks and papers in a room, while you might possibly conceive of such a condition of affairs that would burn the doors, that would be the end of it, so that I am not bothering my head very much about a fire alarm in the new building.

Ottawa eastern departmental block—new fireproof roof, etc., $120,000.

Mr. CARVELL: This item has been carried along for a number of years, and it is very doubtful if any money will be expended during the coming year. In peace times it would be proper to expend this money, not so much to make the East Block waterproof because it is that very well now, but to make it fireproof especially that portion of the building occupied by the Finance and Treasury Departments. They have fairly safe vaults. Money is scarce, and the roof will have to be in a good deal worse state than it is now before we shall spend any money on it this year.

Ottawa—new public building, $1,000,000.

Mr. MURPHY: What has the minister in contemplation?

Mr. CARVELL: When I assumed the duties of Minister of Public Works, pretty nearly every morning a request was laid on my desk for more space, and the officers of the department were spending a good deal of their time hunting around the city seeing where it was possible to house the Service. The Service, of course, has grown very much of late and necessarily so; the war has brought additional responsibilities, and adequate quarters must be provided for the officials. I asked the deputy to furnish me at once with a statement of the number of buildings, their location and description, rented by the Government in the city of Ottawa. I have not the list here, but I can tell the committee in a general way that when this statement was made up some two months ago we were paying rentals in the city of Ottawa amounting to $657,000 a year. To be absolutely accurate, I should say that some portion of that covers heating and elevator service paid for by the landlords, but after making every reasonable deduction, I think I am safe in saying that the actual rentals paid by the Government in the city of Ottawa amount to $600,000 a year, and they run all the way from 40 cents to $1 and $1.25 a square foot—I know of one case where it is even more than that. There seems to be no plan or

system upon which one can go. It is a question to some extent of location. Those new buildings on Sparks street, for instance, naturally command a higher rental than older buildings. But the Government has been driven to the point where it is not a question of getting the best building on Sparks street, but of going wherever the space can be had and paying almost what the landlords like to charge; we are about in the position that we have not anything to say about it. Now it was proposed by the officers of the department that we should erect a building on the block between Albert and Queen streets, on the west side of O'Connor street. That, of course, raised a question which has been discussed in the newspapers to a great extent, and I am finding no fault with that, because that is what newspapers are for; every member of the community has a perfect right to go to the newspapers and discuss matters pertaining to the public welfare. Some three or four years ago a commission was appointed to prepare and lay before the Government a general plan for the construction and development of governmental offices. That plan is now in our possession, and while I am not sufficient of a landscape artist to pass judgment upon it, it looks all right to me. But if we erected to-day a building in keeping with that plan, north of Wellington street, either west of the old Supreme Court buildings or on Sussex street, it would necessitate a pretty high type of building because I do not think the people of Canada would want those in authority to erect permanent office buildings on a grand scale unless they were built in keeping with the general architectural design submitted to the Government. I think I am safe in saying that it will cost 75 per cent more to erect a building to-day than it did four or five years ago or than it will cost probably four or five years hence. The question of time is also a very important element. I could not bring myself to believe that I should be justified as a business man in starting on the erection of a building in keeping with that general plan. We should be spending a very large amount of money for the space we obtained, and should also be losing a lot of valuable time, because we could not possibly have any one unit of a building of that class ready for occupation inside of two or three years. We therefore got the officers of the department to figure on an ordinary office building on the site which I have mentioned. I thought I expressed my wishes in fairly clear language; I think I have the faculty of making people understand what I mean as a rule, and I certainly wanted nothing but a real, good, substantial business block erected. The site we decided upon is 200 feet square, and we proposed to erect a building 200 feet long by 150 feet wide, with an opening in the centre 100 feet by 50 feet; that would give a corridor around the whole building, which was to be nine stories high, and every room would have light and air on one side. We asked the Chief Architect to make an estimate, and in the month of January he estimated that a building of this size containing 700 rooms and 140,000 square feet of floor space could be erected for $1,076,250. We estimated that the site would cost $200,000; so the building would cost altogether about one and a half million dollars. I took the matter up with Council, where it was discussed and decided upon as a matter of policy. Specifications were prepared and we called for tenders, but before the tenders were in for the main building it was thought—and I am satisfied we were correct—that we could do better by calling for tenders for the steel work ourselves, making a separate contract for that work. We received a tender from the Dominion Bridge Company for $334,000, and one from the Hamilton Bridge Works for $358,000. The architect's estimate was $325,000. We therefore accepted the tender of the Dominion Bridge Company, the lowest tender. When the tenders were received for the main building, by adding to that the tender we had received from the Dominion Bridge Company, we found that the building was going to cost —I do not want to give the exact figures here because it might affect future tenders —some four or five hundred thousand dollars more than we had been told it would cost. When those tenders were brought to me I naturally asked some questions, and going over the specifications I found that we were building a work of art instead of a business building. I found copper roofs, copper doors, marble slabs, in fact everything which a man could imagine from an artistic standpoint. But I did not find it very much better from a business standpoint, and therefore I gave instructions to cut things down and see what could be done. They are working at it now and producing wonderful results. The new plans will be ready for inspection probably within the next day or two, and if we can succeed in having this building erected on a purely business basis and for a reasonable figure, we are going to do it; if we cannot, we shall have to resort to some other expedient.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the site been purchased?

Mr. CARVELL: A portion of it has. The question came up about the value of this site. Personally I was in favour of putting it in the Exchequer Court.

However, we had a couple of good men in the department detailed to start it and see what they could do. One of these men especially had a large experience in a mortgage company in valuing both city and country property, and he has satisfied me at least that he is able to buy these properties perhaps cheaper than we could obtain them if we went to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is he?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. C. H. Hunter.

Mr. PEDLOW: This is not the property Mr. Acres made $22,000 out of?

Mr. CARVELL: No, that is another part of the city I can assure my hon. friend that nobody will make 22 cents commission on this purchase. We have settled with three parties for a sum in the neighbourhood of $125,000. We are still negotiating with the other parties, and I have strong hopes that some amicable arrangement can be made. Of course, if the owners of the land will not come down to what the department consider fair and reasonable, we will have to put them in the Exchequer Court; but I have strong reasons for believing it will not be necessary to do that.

Mr. MURPHY: In the meantime, some of the buildings have been torn down.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and a portion of the site, one of the most valuable lots, was owned by the Government heretofore, and occupied as a museum. That and some smaller buildings have been torn down. One or two of the lots were vacant. If the building is erected on the site proposed, there would be light on four sides. We will have Queen street on one side, O'Connor on the second side, and Slater on the third side, a fifty-foot open space on the west side between that and the next building; so there will be light on four sides, access on four sides, a well 100 feet by 50 feet in the centre, and a street car line going right by the building. In my judgment it is good business to erect a building of this kind, get into it and save rent, because the interest will not amount to anything like the amounts we are paying in rents, and it may possibly have a salutary effect on some of the landlords in Ottawa.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. MURPHY: Within that time is it contemplated that it will be completed?

Mr. CARVELL: We believe, in fact, we are sure, that had the former specifications been such that we could have let the contract upon them, the building would have been finished by the first day of June, 1919. We hope to have it ready for occupancy on 1st July, 1919.

Mr. EDWARDS: What floor space is the Government renting now?

Mr. CARVELL: Speaking generally, it is a little over one million feet. The Public Works Department have rented 885,000 square feet, the Imperial Munitions Board 77,000 square feet, and the Department of Militia and Defence 184,000 square feet, and those three items put together make about 1,146,000 square feet of rented space.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Dominion Government pay for the rental of the Imperial Munitions Board building?

Mr. CARVELL: No. I am simply giving, for the information of the House, the amount of space occupied by the public service at Ottawa. The Munitions Board finance themselves, and while, of course, a large amount of money is furnished by the Dominion to that board, it is really loaned to the British Government and charged up to them.

Mr. FIELDING: Some years ago the Government bought a large block of land lying west of Mackenzie avenue, between Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street, for building purposes, and on that block the Customs building was erected. Is there any remaining portion of that land not built upon? Have we vacant land there?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, we have a large amount of vacant land there. I might say it is being very largely occupied now temporarily for work shops and stone sheds in connection with the construction of the new Parliament building, but that is only a temporary arrangement.

Mr. FIELDING: Would that be the reason it could not be built upon, or is it because the character of the building already there is different from that which my hon. friend contemplates?

Mr. CARVELL: Both. I do not look upon the fact that it is now temporarily occupied as very much of a bar to using it for a building, if we desired to do so. That building could be moved to another part of the city, but I am opposed to erecting a

building there, unless it be a building along the general plan reported or recommended by this commission to which I have referred, or by some other commission. My opinion—and I think I am voicing the sentiments of practically every gentleman in this House—is that when the Dominion of Canada starts out to erect housing accommodation for its officials, the building ought to be something in line with the splendid building which Parliament is going to occupy, and I am safe in saying—in fact we have lots of expert testimony from the officials of the department—that it will cost from 50 to 75 per cent more per square foot of space to erect a building of such a general character than it will to erect the kind of building which we propose to put up in another part of the city. I do not think anybody would feel justified in erecting a nine-story office building as a part of our permanent government institutions. I admit that, so far as I am concerned personally, I would never consent to erect a nine-story office building on any lands which we hope in the future will be the permanent home of the official staff of the Government of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman refers to the special plans. I fancy he has reference chiefly to the plans contemplated for the lands west of the Supreme Court, but the land to which I refer has already on it the Customs House, and I suppose any other buildings that were erected there would have to conform to the architecture of that building, and that might be very much more expensive than what my hon. friend has in mind. But I think the general plan—referring to the buildings that might be erected west of the Supreme Court—would hardly affect the class of building to be put up on land on Mackenzie avenue.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the recommendation before me, but I can assure my hon. friend that the recommendation of the Federal Plan Commission did cover the land on Mackenzie avenue, as well as the land on Wellington street. In fact, they went so far as to cover the site of the Russell House —and it was "some" plan. However, I am not violating the plan; I am leaving that for other hands to despoil. I am trying to exercise real good horse sense in putting up an office building as cheaply and as expeditiously as we can.

Mr. FIELDING: The plans referred to did not deal with these buildings. It was a much larger matter. It was a plan for the creation of the federal district of Ottawa, and covered a pretty wide area. Or was there a distinct plan for building separate and apart from that?

Mr. CARVELL: I think they, in their wisdom, took into consideration not only what the Government should do, but what all the rest of the people of Ottawa should do. They even went so far as to say you should put an office building here, and a residence there, and almost put the ban on any person who decided to put an office building there and a residence here. However, I am not violating the Holy Writ of that plan. We are simply trying to put up an office building in that portion of the city where other office buildings are, and where it can be used to the best advantage by the Service at large, for the least possible money.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would hesitate a good deal before erecting another building on Mackenzie avenue, as mentioned by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I am told that, if the truth were known about the money sunk in the foundation of that building it would be a case where truth is stranger than fiction.

Mr. CARVELL: Of course, I know it cost some money.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand they began building that foundation on the side of a mountain, that it was slipping down from time to time, and that instead of making some inquiry and finding out where the foot of the mountain was, they kept building until what they had built slipped down to the bottom. That is a very expensive way of getting a foundation.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend is drawing on his fertile, Scotch imagination, because the Customs building is certainly a very excellent building. It is true it cost a great deal of money and there is no doubt that they found a very unsatisfactory foundation and were compelled to go down to a very great depth. I do not know that that had much to do with the decision to erect this building on Queen street, because I understand that, as they went north on Mackenzie avenue, they found that the foundation became very much better, and that in the opinion of the engineers the remainder of the space referred to by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) would be quite satisfactory for the erection of any kind of public building. The thing that

weighed with the officials of the department, myself included, was the fact that we did not feel we would be justified in putting up a fairly cheap business block on that portion of the Government grounds, and we did not feel justified in going to the expense of undertaking the erection of a permanent building in accordance with a general plan in the present financial stringency.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am told that the foundations of the new Montreal Customs house are on a par with those of the Customs Department in Ottawa. I am told that it is impossible to find a solid bottom. There has been any amount of money sunk there too.

Mr. CARVELL: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. CAHILL: If I am right in my calculation, you are paying about sixty cents a square foot for the space now occupied. Do you expect to make any saving on that by the erection of this new building?

Mr. CARVELL: We are paying very much more than sixty cents a square foot for such accommodation as this new building will furnish. We are paying probably, on the average, from 85 to 90 cents for the accommodation such as this will be. It was figured out in the report which I read to the House a while ago that a million and a quarter dollars, the total cost of this building, including heating, elevator service, and everything in connection with it, would represent about 68 or 69 cents per square foot of area.

Mr. CAHILL: Including depreciation?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, that takes in depreciation and interest upon investment. That takes in everything that the ordinary commercial company or individual would consider if they were erecting a building as a business proposition. If the building were going to cost half a million more than that, I would have to reduce my figures to that extent. I can only say to the House that we are not going to erect a building to cost half a million dollars more —that is all there is about it.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it not on a cubic foot basis that the cost of buildings is estimated instead of on the square foot basis? Another question. Have you taken into consideration whether the fire protection service in the city of Ottawa will reach the top of a building nine stories high?

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: I have not personally investigated that, but I can only say that if the fire pressure in the city of Ottawa was sufficient to reach the top of the Parliament Buildings at the time of the great fire, there cannot be much difficulty about it reaching the top of a building 110 feet high down in that part of the city. It is only a nine story building, and you will find buildings on Sparks street, a couple of blocks away, from 25 to 30 feet higher still. I do not think there is any question about that. As to the other question raised by my hon. friend, it is true, I believe, that when architects are estimating the probable cost of a building they take the cubic contents, but it is also true that when they are renting buildings it is done upon the basis of the floor area, taking the actual inside measurements of the offices themselves and disregarding the halls and elevator space. When I quote the figure of 141,000 square feet at a certain price, I refer to 141,000 square feet of actual office space exclusive of corridors and elevator space. By the same method of calculating, you arrive at the cost per square foot of the buildings which are being rented by the Government in Ottawa.

Mr. McKENZIE: When the minister erects this large building, will he be able to give up any of the buildings which are now rented, or will he require this building in addition to what we have now?

Mr. CARVELL: I certainly think so. If my hon. friend will take the figures which I gave, he will see that this building will contain a little more than ten per cent of the total space of the rented buildings in Ottawa. My judgment is that from this day forward the amount of space required will decrease rather than increase. For instance, in one branch of the Militia Department, nearly 300 employees have been dispensed with in the last two months. The work of co-ordinating the different branches has progressed to such an extent that they can dispense with the services of a great many clerks, and I think that will be true of very many departments of the public service. There is no question that the addition of 140,000 square feet of space will release at least that much rented space and probably very much more than that.

Mr. KAY: I understood my hon. friend to say that the Parliament buildings would not be completed for the session to be held in January, 1919. Does he know when they will be completed?

Mr. CARVELL: We have had expert evidence from about twenty-five hon. gentlemen here this evening, and there was such an extreme disagreement among them that I would not like to venture an opinion, but I think I would be safe in saying to my hon. friend that if he lives—and I hope he will—until the session which will probably begin in January, 1920, he will have a seat in the new House.

Mr. KAY: Has my hon. friend considered the possibility of using this Museum for office space when we have vacated it? If the Parliament buildings are ready for use in January, 1920, we would vacate it, I think, early in the spring of 1919, and it would be available for office space.

Mr. CARVELL: That depends very largely on my hon. friends. You know that under our system of Government it is the Opposition that determines the length of sessions, and if my hon. friends want to get away early in the spring of 1919 they will not find any objection from this side of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: We have had bad examples in the past.

Mr. JACOBS: We are not an Opposition; we are merely friendly critics.

Mr. CARVELL: I have not considered the possibility of using this building for office space, but I think the suggestion is well worthy of consideration. I see no reason why all this space, in time of war and for some time thereafter, should not be occupied as office space until such time as we can get more permanent quarters elsewhere.

Harbours and Rivers—St. John Harbour, improvements, $250,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: This item is full of reminiscences, full of thoughts of past great men, or at least great men who have passed out of this House.

Mr. CARVELL: Not passed away, by any means.

Mr. McKENZIE: There were two set speeches that we always used to get upon any item relating to the harbour at St. John. They were magnificently well-framed and well-delivered speech of the present Governor of New Brunswick, Mr. Pugsley, and the effective reply of the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Hazen, who is now the Chief Justice of the province. Whenever we heard the one, we were positively certain to hear the other. And to-night I am saddened by the thought that we shall not hear the one or the other.

Mr. CARVELL: We will keep away from Courtney bay to-night.

Mr. McKENZIE: I remember distinctly that the last time an item of this kind was up for consideration, just for devilment, so to speak, I took issue with the gentleman who is now the Chief Justice of New Brunswick by telling him that there was no harbour in St. John at all, it was only the place where there was a continuous battle royal going on between the St. John river and the bay of Fundy. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works on what battle front he proposes spending this money?

Mr. CARVELL: I will be just as frank with my hon. friend as he has been with me. I have a slight recollection of those set speeches to which he has referred; they were always well-worded, and they always arrived at the same destination. One sure thing is, I am not going to land in Courtney bay to-night. I am sorry to say I cannot tell my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) exactly where this money will be expended, or whether it will be expended at all. There was an appropriation of a million dollars in the Estimates last year for the harbour of St. John, and when I assumed office a contract awaited signature for the construction of a breakwater between the end of the present breakwater and Partridge Island, which would have cost three-quarters of a million dollars. I did not feel that I was justified, in view of the present financial stringency, in going on with that work. I decided that in so far as it was possible I was going to retrench to the very last dollar, and I did not know of any place that would be as good a place to start that policy as at home. Therefore, I refused to sign that contract. Now there is a very great deal of agitation that that work should go on. There is also a great deal of agitation that work shall go on in the remainder of the harbour; and I tell the committee frankly that I am not in a position to-night to state exactly in what portion of the harbour this money will be expended, or whether it will be expended at all. I sincerely hope it will. I hope things may be so arranged that we will be able to expend at least that amount of money, but I want to assure my hon. friends that if it is expended it will be on behalf of the transportation interests of the country and not to carry out anybody's pet schemes or theory.

Mr. COPP: And not on force account either.

Mr. CARVELL: And not on force account either.

Quebec Harbour, Champlain Dry Dock, $355,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work of the Quebec dry dock?

Mr. CARVELL: This work is at Lauzon, but I christened it the Champlain dry dock. I thought it was very fitting that a big dry dock at that portion of the river St. Lawrence should bear the name of the great explorer.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Champlain is also somewhat of a New Brunswick name.

Mr. CARVELL: That is true, Champlain was in New Brunswick before he went to what is now the city of Quebec. I may say that the work is practically completed; it merely requires some finishing touches, although of course, it will take some time to finish up many of the details. This is simply the item which it is estimated will finish up the work and pay the drawback and other items in connection with it. I do not mean to say by any means that the sum of $355,000 will be required for the new work. There is still a large amount of drawback in the hands of the Government, and to complete whatever is required will take the large amount of money estimated.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From what quarry is the stone taken for this work?

Mr. CARVELL: I am informed that the granite comes from Megantic. I do not know that there is very much stone used in the dry dock. I was there in December —some question having arisen between the Government and the Davy Shipbulding Company over the purchase of land, and spent half a day on the work. I was very much interested in the amount of work completed, and also in the magnificent dry dock I found there. It is practically a concrete dock, and I do not think there will be very much granite or stone of any kind used in its construction. I was informed, however, that whatever granite was used came from Megantic.

Mr. POWER: Can the minister tell me whether the price of the land is included in this vote or the amounts previously spent?

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say that the price of the land is included in the amount previously given, but what that amount was I am not in a position to state at the present time. This estimate is intended, or expected at least, to entirely cover and pay off everything which will remain to be paid in order to finish the dry dock with its power plant,pumping arrangements and everything in connection with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think it is very important that the work should be proceeded with as soon as possible, because I was told yesterday by Mr. Davy, who happened to be in Ottawa, that the partial blowing up of the Halifax dry dock would bring a lot of ship repairing business to Quebec; in fact, that the shipyards of Quebec and Montreal would have to look after mostly all the business of ship repairing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope that my hon. friend, or any other members of the House either, will not get the idea that the Halifax dry dock is out of commission. That dock was put out of commission by the explosion which occurred last winter, and I may as well state here, and I am glad to have the opportunity of doing so, that the Minister of Railways and Canals and myself spent three or four days in the city of Halifax after the explosion. At that time there were eight or nine ships in the harbour which would have to enter the dry dock, and we at once entered into negotiations with the owners, the dry dock being a private institution. The owners claimed that they were unable to finish the dock, and would not finish it. They wanted us to buy it, which we did not feel like doing, and we started in to make repairs. The owners are to pay towards the cost the amount of their insurance, which is $11,000, and we are putting up the balance, an amount which will not be very great.

However, the first thing was to get this dock in commission, and it has been in commission for nearly two months. The ship that was in it was repaired and sent out, and I believe that another has since been taken in, repaired and sent out. The Halifax dry dock, therefore, is operating just as it was a year ago. But that does not obviate the necessity of placing the Champlain dry dock in commission at the earliest possible moment; in fact, it could be operated almost immediately. This dock is in two compartments: there is a gate in the centre which can be closed so that one end may be used as a dry dock and the other to contain water, or vice versa. The outer section could be, and, I imagine,

is, being used to-day. In addition to that, we have the old dry dock, which has answered the purposes of the St. Lawrence during the last twenty or twenty-five years. I can assure my hon. friends that the work will be pushed forward as rapidly as possible, and will be entirely completed within a few months.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to know what the policy of the Government is in the matter of building dry docks. Do we own a dry dock at Esquimalt?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and one at Kingston.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The dry dock at Esquimalt was passed over from the Imperial Government to the Dominion.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware that the Government owns any dry docks on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CARVELL: No. The Government has no particular policy with regard to the construction of dry docks except that which is embodied in the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, which was passed in 1908 or 1909 and subsequently amended. The dimensions of a first-class dry dock have been increased to 1,150 feet in length, and a guarantee of interest is provided at 4½ per cent for a period of thirty-five years on an amount not exceeding $4,500,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Attempts have been made by different Ministers of Public Works to make the Dry Dock Subsidies Act more attractive than it was at the beginning, but so far no business concern has taken advantage of its provisions. If the Government are going into the business of building dry docks, private companies will not take advantage of this Act, because they would then come into competition with the Government. I suppose there is not much use in suggesting any large public expenditure just now, but I wish to point out that the harbour of Sydney, with its proximity to Newfoundland and its importance in connection with trans-Atlantic traffic, is becoming a great shipping and commercial centre. But, excepting a marine railway, no facilities have been provided there to take care of ships. I understand that the matter has been discussed in the other House by Senator McLennan, who comes from practically the same place that I do. I should like the enterprising Minister of Public Works to take into consideration the fact that we have great need for a dry dock in that part of the country, particularly in view of the presence there of large steel works; and I hope that he will remember this, if the policy of building dry docks is to be carried out by the Government.

11 p.m.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate everything my hon. friend has said about the harbour of Sydney. It is certainly a very beautiful sheet of water, especially in summer, and I hope that some enterprising citizen or citizens in that part of Nova Scotia will come forward with a business proposal under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. If they do, I assure him, they will receive every encouragement that the department can give them. The same applies to similar proposals which might be made in other parts of the country. A floating dry dock has been built under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act by the Vickers people in Montreal.

Mr. McKENZIE: That was imported from the Old Country?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. Another floating dock which was brought from the Old Country, has been built at Prince Rupert under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. I think these are the only two which have been built under that Act. However, the Act is there, and it is open to any body of capitalists who wish to invest some of their own money in these public enterprises to take advantage of its provisions. I should like to inculcate a spirit of giving into some of the capitalists of Canada. I have watched them very carefully during the last fourteen or fifteen years, and I have observed on their part a great willingness to receive public money; I hope that I can now cause them to realize the importance of the duty of giving money to the public. I should like to see these gentlemen put up some of their own money to build these works, accept Government subsidies, and become real patriots. By doing this they would build up a better public sentiment than we have in Canada at present. I do not say that the Government will or will not adopt any particular policy with regard to the construction of these docks, but I throw out the suggestion to many capitalists who have grown wealthy during the last three or four years, that they come along with a real business proposal for the construction of dry docks in the large centres of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Vickers people have been very enterprising. I happen to know that firm because their works are

located in my new constituency of Maisonneuve. Although they had invested a large amount of money, for many years they did little work. Since the war began, however, they have been fortunate, and at the same time they have rendered valuable service to the British Admiralty. During the first year of the war I saw there two or three cruisers which had taken part in the famous naval engagement off the Falkland Islands. The Vickers have been growing and developing, and I daresay they have to-day one of the largest shipyards on the North American continent.

Mr. CARVELL: They come within the class of men whom I should like to see doing business in this line.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I call attention to the danger which exists of our crippling the shipyards of Canada if we apply not only the spirit but the letter of the new Order in Council concerning conscription to employees of ship-building establishments? Conscription is the law, it is true, and must be obeyed. But I was speaking yesterday to a prominent shipbuilder who was at a loss to understand how the Government could deprive his shipyard of from one hundred to two hundred of his hands—riveters, heaters, riggers, shipwrights, plumbers, furnace men, boilermakers, draughtsmen. Although it seems rather easy for any one to become a heater or a riveter, yet this shipbuilder was explaining to me that it took not months merely, but several years of training for a man to become a good heater or a good riveter. I beg to draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of protecting, I shall not say the shipbuilding of the country, but the ship-repairing that will take place during the months to come. I was just mentioning the case of one or two cruisers which took part in the engagement at the Falkland Islands and which were repaired at Vickers during the first year of the war. Since then, this has not been made public, but the Vickers Company in Montreal and the Davy Company in Quebec have done a quantity of work for the Imperial Government; they have built submarines, destroyers, chasers and trawlers. They have contracts with the Imperial Government, the Dominion Government and the governments of the Allied countries. They have cancelled some contracts which they had with neutral governments. We should treat this question as business men and see to it that this industry is not crippled at this very crucial moment of the war.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite appreciate what my hon. friend states. I realize the importance of those shipyards, as I had the pleasure of going through them in December last. I was very much impressed with the evidence of business which I saw there. I shall be glad to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Militia and Defence to the statement made by my hon. friend this evening.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: What is the total cost of the Champlain dry dock, including land?

Mr. CARVELL: Speaking roughly, about $3,400,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: On the 25th of March the minister, in answer to a question of mine, stated that the cost of the dry dock was $3,077,460.28.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend probably was not in a few minutes ago, when an item of $355,000 was passed by the committee to take care of work that has yet to be done, the drawback and things of that kind. I am speaking roughly, but the total cost of the work will be around $3,400,000.

Mr. PARENT: This amount of money is very well spent. For years past, I remember, the shipping interests have made every effort with the Government to secure a dry dock to accommodate big ships, should an accident occur. Special efforts were made after the disaster to the Bavarian, a large ship which was coming near Quebec when an accident happened, and which could not be repaired on account of lack of a dry dock to accommodate it. Quebec now affords possibly the best harbour in the world, comprising an area of about twelve square miles with a depth of water of about 150 feet. There is no other port in Canada that can boast of having such a fine harbour as that of Quebec. Will the minister express his opinion as to the possibility of utilizing such a nice harbour as Quebec harbour as a free port?

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend is asking me to answer something which I would not feel in a position to answer. I have not given the matter any study. Possibly at some future time I might give him a more studied opinion upon it.

Quebec Harbour—River St. Charles—improvements to navigation, $15,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Has the contract placed with Quinlan and Robertson, of Quebec, been cancelled?

Mr. CARVELL: The contract has not formally been cancelled, but the works were closed down early in the summer of 1917, and, I think I am safe in saying, with the consent of the contractors and of the Government as well. The contractors have been paid off practically everything coming to them, and this $15,000 it is hoped will be sufficient to settle up the matter to date. The contract has not been cancelled and closed up because Quinlan and Robertson, like many other contractors in Canada, are claiming they are entitled to compensation for the closing down of the work. They base their claim on various grounds which, perhaps, it would not be proper to discuss here. There is the closing down of the work, and they want us to buy their plant, and so on. Those matters have not yet been settled, but I hope they will be in the near future. This item is purely for the purpose of paying them the amount of money which we believe will be due to them when the accounts are finally straightened out. It is only an estimate; the amount may be more, it may be less.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: If I ask this question, it is because last year it was rumoured that Quinlan & Robertson had made a demand on the Government to cancel the contract. The Quebec Board of Trade, also the Quebec City Council, at the time interviewed the Hon. Mr. Sévigny, who stated that a demand had been made to the Government, but that the matter had not been settled and that the work would go on without interruption.

Mr. CARVELL: I entered the department only in the month of October, and I really do not know what decisions were arrived at before that date. If that was the policy early in the summer of 1917, there must have been a change of policy before October, because I know it has not, since the month of October, been the policy of the department to proceed with the work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When did Mr. Sévigny make the promise?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Last spring.

Mr. CARVELL: There must have been a change of policy during the summer.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is the minister aware that the city of Quebec, to obtain the work on the St. Charles river, made considerable sacrifices in placing a contract with the Government, and that the work was to be proceeded with without interruption?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not aware of that, and I want to say to my hon. friend that we have not by any means abandoned the work. It was simply not considered strictly essential work during the present financial stringency. My hon. friend from West Quebec (Mr. Parent) has just boasted of the splendid facilities of the harbour of Quebec, all of which is true, and as this was intended to take care of local shipping more than of ocean-going shipping, it was felt it would not be justifiable to spend a large amount of money under present conditions. I have always understood that the construction of those works would be of very great advantage to the city of Quebec in providing a great trunk sewage system. However, that does not play a very great part probably. I can only say that the work has not been abandoned; it has simply been closed down, and I hope the time will come when it can be finished. Many other works in Canada are in just the same position.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Have precautions been taken to preserve the work already done?

Mr. CARVELL: Every precaution has been taken.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I understood the minister to say that this work was not of very great importance to Quebec. On the contrary, it is of first-rate importance. The city has already spent $200,000 for a market along the St. Charles river, but we cannot use it until this work is completed.

Mr. CARVELL: I quite appreciate that, but if my hon. friend sits here for the next fortnight and listens to these estimates being discussed he will see that these same conditions prevail in practically every city in Canada. In the next item, for instance, for the Toronto Harbour Works, he will find we have applied the axe much more vigorously than we did in Quebec. There is no doubt that there are local reasons in all these places why these works should go on, but we have tried as far as possible to apply the same rule on all public works in Canada, unless they are absolutely essential for war purposes.

Mr. POWER: I would point out to the minister that altogether some $700,000 has been spent on improvements to the river St. Charles, and that to preserve the work that has been done we are spending less than $15,000, because I understand that out of this $15,000 a certain amount goes to the contractor.

Mr. CARVELL: Practically all of it goes to the contractor if it is found on settling the accounts that it is due him. We are not voting any money in this item for protecting the works.

Toronto Harbour improvements, $550,000.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I just heard the minister say that he had applied the axe pretty well all over Canada in regard to public works. I think he applied it too vigorously to the Toronto Harbour improvements. I think he will remember that late last fall he visited the harbour of Toronto, and while I was not able to accompany him on that inspection I understood from the mayor that the minister was impressed with the necessity of a large expenditure this year to protect the work already done. The minister knows that the Harbour Commission proposes to spend about $13,000,000, the city of Toronto about $2,000,000 and the Public Works Department about $6,000,000, altogether about $21,000,000. There has already been expended on these improvements between the Government, the city, and the Harbour Commission, some $7,000,000. I think the minister will remember that a few days ago he was advised of the condition of the harbour by telegram from the mayor and the Harbour Commissioner spoke to him of the possible loss of a great amount of property. The commissioner said that it was our duty to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the destruction of a large part of the shore property, the cellars in houses facing the shore being flooded by the heavy storms from the southeast which had washed the shore away. What the minister's answer was I do not know, but I do know, after the millions that have been spent on these improvements, it is necessary for the minister to be more generous and bring down a revote for a large amount to protect the work that has been done. Take, for instance the work that has been done in the west part of the city, from the Humber east to the Island, and then continuing to Munroe park—a frontage of some six miles on which the Government has undertaken to build a breakwater to protect the harbour and the shore. To the west, the crib-work is down to the zero level and now it is necessary to place the cement structures on that to prevent the storms from destroying the shore, but I understand that not sufficient money has been granted for that purpose. If the land is not protected to the west there is danger of the work that has already been done—such as filling in along the shore—at an expenditure of some millions, being destroyed. Then we come to the Island shore, which is partly protected, but to the west of the island again last year the shore was awash right up to the buildings and some of the splendid residences there were in danger; the sidewalks were washed and gas pipes were affected, and the city had to put up some temporary cribs to protect the shore for the time being. Then we come to the east. This year, on account of the high water and the storms, a great deal of the shore property has been destroyed already, and the Harbour Commission and the city council say it is up to the Minister of Public Works to do something at once to protect the shore. Surely the minister after his inspection of these improvements and after admitting the splendid work that has been done and the necessity for protecting it, will bring down a more generous grant for protecting that work. Then we have what is called the ship channel. You come in at the eastern entrance. Last year that work had to be pulled to pieces, some $800,000 worth of work. Changes are now being made and there is a great necessity for that work being completed also. The Harbour Commission has reclaimed some two or three hundred acres of land at a cost of some millions of dollars, and we have located there some of the largest industries in America and there is a demand for more sites; but if the Government is not going to protect the work that has already been done and is now under way it will not be possible to carry on the work to advantage. It is a disadvantage alike to the Harbour Commission, the city of Toronto and the Government—the three parties concerned in the proposed expenditure of some $21,000,000. Surely, in the face of conditions in Toronto the minister is not going to stop at this proposed grant of $550,000. I should like to have some expression of the minister's views as to the necessity of doing something to protect the work that has already been done. Conditions may arise any day whereby millions of dollars worth of work might be destroyed and surely this is too serious a matter to allow to happen for the sake of economy. It is not economy; it is false economy. The minister is saving half a million dollars on the expenditure of last year, but his economy may cost him a couple of million dollars. He is taking all the chances imaginable.

The minister must know the position we are in there with our Island. With those southeast storms there is great danger of

immense destruction, which may occur any day, and after all this money has been expended, if we are not going to protect that work, I do not see that we can give the minister much credit along the line of economy, when he proposes to save $400,000 or $500,000 compared with the expenditure last year. If the work had been completed it might have been a good economy, but not at this stage. The Harbour Commissioners prepared an estimate of $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 as the cost of this work. The city is going on with its share of that work at a cost of from one-half to three-quarters of a million. If the Harbour Commission of Toronto is going to spend this amount, realizing the necessity of it, surely the Government must see the real necessity of performing their part of the duty which lies upon them. While the minister might have applied the axe advantageously to some other facilities for harbours where there is not that danger of destruction which there is in this case, where the work is partly completed, it might be economy, but in this case it would be false economy to say we are going to forego that expenditure for the sake of conserving large expenditures, because he really knows, having been over the ground and made the inspection, what has been done, the amount expended, and the great danger. Realizing that, surely he is not going to leave the city, the Harbour Commissioners and this Government in the position that we are going to take the chance of the destruction of a couple of million dollars' of work. I hope the hon. minister will assure me that, after making his recommendation of half a million dollars, he will supplement that by another half million to protect the money already expended.

Mr. SHEARD: I would like to emphasize what the hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) has said, especially in connection with the Island shores. The Island shore adjacent to the harbour fluctuates considerably from year to year, and I know that last year and the year before there were considerable inroads by the water into the Island shore, so much so that the water came up to the fences around the houses, although there used to be a distance, I suppose, of 250 feet in the lake shore as formed. The Government some time ago put out some temporary groynes to protect the shore near Gibraltar point, but they have not been at all effective. Since that time the eastern shore has been considerably inundated just to the east end of the harbour. I understand that this spring several houses have been damaged, not only the cellars flooded, but the foundations impaired. Therefore, I join with my hon. colleague from East York in the appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works to be as generous as the exigencies will allow and in impressing upon him also the very urgent importance of carefully scrutinizing the economies that are being practiced in that particular regard.

Mr. McKENZIE: I noticed that the hon. gentlemen who speak largely on behalf of the city and harbour of Toronto have touched upon a subject that is an old one in this House as to provincial, Dominion or municipal obligations. We from the different parts of the country have been very exacting in our demands for public moneys for public purposes, but I must remind my hon. friend that we never went to the extent of asking public money for the digging of cellars and putting of walls around houses. The hon. gentleman tells us tonight we must be careful to protect the walls of the houses in the city of Toronto, to see that the sidewalks in Toronto are not interfered with, and that the end of the sewer pipes are well protected by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SHEARD: As promised.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman may not understand the situation, but in the province from which I come we have had experience in matters somewhat akin to this. We have seen the public roads being eaten away by the action of the tide along certain portions of Nova Scotia, but the people here, whichever government was in power, absolutely refused to give us any money to protect the roads along the harbours in Nova Scotia. They said, "That is a local matter; if it is affecting a town or city, it is a matter the town or city must look after; it is a municipal affair, and you will not get Dominion money for it." If it was outside of a town, the provincial government would have to look after it, as they held it was a provincial matter. I am simply drawing the attention of the minister to this. If, by any false understanding of the position of the Department of Public Works, or by false kindness or by excessive zeal, the predecessor of the present minister in the kindness of his heart, and in return for favour lavished upon him from a political standpoint by the city of Toronto, has undertaken to point the walls of the different houses, put sewer pipes under the houses, and generally look after them all round—put them to bed

and cuddle the clothes around them—I think he has gone too far, and that the present minister, particularly in war time, has enough to look after to protect the harbour because it is public property and supposed to be, and is no doubt, for the general benefit of the Government at large. But when it comes to fixing sidewalks, putting foundations under houses, and seeing that they have a proper system of sewage, I draw the line and protest against the moneys of Canada being used in that way for Toronto or any other city.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) quite misunderstands me, and I am sorry for it. I thought I made it quite clear. It may be the hon. gentleman does not understand the situation, he may think the city is asking for favours from this Government. The city is asking for no favours from the hon. Minister of Public Works or any other minister, it is only asking that the Government carry out their undertaking. And we are not asking them to build sewers or point foundations; I made no such statement. I am surprised the hon. gentleman makes such assertion, trying to mislead the House, suggesting that I was not familiar with the necessities, and that I made a statement I did not make. I said that, on account of this wash which is caused through there being no protection, damage was done. As I understand it, the lake shore is owned by the Dominion, and not by the provincial government. The in-shores are owned by the provincial government, but the lake shores which stop at the Island, are owned by the Dominion.

Mr. McKENZIE: In so far as they are used for shipping purposes, but not beyond that.

Mr. FOSTER: The Government has already spent large amounts there to protect the shore. The cribwork is ready for the concrete construction to prevent the wash on the shore, to save the shore, and to save this property I speak of, and which the hon. member for Toronto South spoke of three weeks ago. Our city engineer tells us the responsibility is with this Government, and the Minister of Public Works—whether he is right or not, I do not know, but I think he knows what his responsibilities are,—knows we are asking for no favours. We are not asking for something unbecoming a great city. We are not suggesting the frivolous things spoken of by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). After the minister's inspection, I think he will understand my explanation and he will appreciate the fact that the west shore of the Island is affected by these heavy storms. He understands from the work they have already done the great necessity of further work to protect what our engineers tell us would be a very heavy damage for which the Government would be responsible. Surely it is false economy for the Government to make this small grant when there may be a further damage of a couple of million of dollars. I hope I have made myself clear to the minister.

Mr. SHEARD: In order to remove the impression that appears to have taken possession of the hon. gentleman opposite, I wish to tell him that there are no sewers anywhere near, and I think I am correct in saying that these inroads have been largely made upon the Government property adjacent to and immediately west of the Government light-house and the Government light-house property. It is true that a gas main runs along that right of way which, I believe, is a Government road. The water has washed away the foundations of the gas main. As to the eastern portion to which I referred, I believe the Government have a breakwater already partially under way, and at that particular point it is intended to protect the lake shore. The storms have been exceedingly severe, and they have cut into the roadways to a very unusual extent. I mention these facts in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may be quite assured that we are not seeking particular favours for the city of Toronto, however much we might feel entitled to consideration—I may say that we have never received very much either from the Department of Public Works or from any other department of the Government in so far as I am aware.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no fault to find with the statements made by the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of Toronto, excepting that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Foster) must have been misinformed when he said that I told the mayor anything, because I have never spoken to the mayor of Toronto in my life. I never saw Mayor Church.

Mr. FOSTER: Not on the inspection?

Mr. CARVELL: He was not there, and I did not advertise the fact that I was going to Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER: You were there?

Mr. CARVELL: I was in Toronto, and I will tell my hon. friends all about it—not all, I would not tell them all, but I will tell them some things about it. I do not know Mayor Church, I did not meet him when I was there, and I left for Hamilton in the afternoon. I would have been very glad indeed to have met the mayor if I had had the opportunity, but I had not. I never told him of the necessity for large expenditures, or anything in connection with it, and I am satisfied that Mayor Church will bear me out in that statement, if he is asked. I did get a telegram from the mayor three or four weeks ago, stating that the breakwater was being destroyed. Perhaps I did not take it sufficiently seriously, because, very much like my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), I feel that it is not a burden cast upon the Federal Parliament to protect private property belonging to a province or a municipality. While in some cases it is done—and I am not finding fault if it is done—it is not done as a matter of right, and I do not accept responsibility for it. Every once in a while in the spring of the year I have a slice of my farm taken away, and I always repair the damage myself. I never felt that I had a right to come to the Federal Government and ask for redress. However, I admit that when it comes to the island in front of the city of Toronto, probably a different principle should be applied. I have always understood, during my somewhat length parliamentary experience, that it was the duty of the Federal Parliament to look after navigation, and that we were justified in expending public moneys wherever necessary and in such amount as they could be obtained if it was going to do anything to help trade and navigation. Very often members press their views upon Governments to such an extent that they depart from that very proper principle. I am not quarrelling with that. I am only pointing out what I consider to be the general principle which should guide the policy of the Federal Government in regard to matters of this kind.

Since I assumed the duties of the office which I now occupy, I have received requests and delegations from the city of Toronto regarding these harbour works. I was waited upon by a number of gentlemen, and while I was busy, I thought that it was really necessary to spend a few hours going over the work. I did so in company with the chairman, the chief engineer and another gentleman in connection with the Harbour Commision, the representative of Stewarts, the contractors, and one other gentleman whose name I have forgotten.

Perhaps I shall be pardoned if I take ten minutes to explain to the committee the proposal with regard to Toronto harbour, because it is a matter that has been discussed in the House many times in the last four or five years. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) referred to the fact that 800,000 feet of this work had to be done over again. It certainly was not a very creditable piece of work for the parties who were interested. The department demanded that the work which was so defective should be made good, and it was made good. On my inspection I was more than satisfied with the character of the work as it stands to-day. The general scheme was a very elaborate one and it was divided into three parts. The first part was the protection work in the east, or that part in front of the island which lies opposite the city of Toronto. The idea was to build a breakwater all along the shore in front of the island to prevent any further erosion by the waters of lake Ontario on the southern side of the island. The second part of the project was the building of a breakwater five and a half miles long extending west from the harbour and running out to the Humber river. When I was there no work had been done on the eastern scheme as far as I know, but about 3,000 feet of cribwork had been completed in connection with the scheme at the western end of the breakwater near the Humber bay, and also some cribwork just near the entrance of the harbour. My information is that the cribwork is now within two feet of the top, and that it has cost about $150,000. The contention is that if the work be not proceeded with it may be lost either partially or wholly. The Harbour Commissioners of Toronto were working in conjunction with the general scheme and they had dumped a very large amount of material from the lake in behind the proposed breakwater with a view to creating an esplanade, something which will be of general utility to the city of Toronto, or, I should say, a general improvement. The idea was that there would be a lagoon inside of the breakwater and that beyond the lagoon there would be this belt of land which is being made by dumping sand and gravel from the bed of the lake. When it is finished it will certainly be a very splendid proposition, a great acquisition to the city of Toronto, and no doubt it will beautify the city to a great extent. I think the

city is very well justified in spending the money it is doing in carrying on this work.

The third part of the proposition consisted in dredging a channel four hundred feet wide, which channel would be about a mile and a quarter long, practically through the centre of Ashbridge's Bay, to a depth of twenty-four feet. The spoil dredged out of the channel was to be thrown over on either side and would raise the level of the land above the water, because, as it was, Ashbridge's Bay was practically level with the water—sometimes it would be overflooded and sometimes there would be dry land—and by throwing out this material and building it up four or five feet it created, no doubt, very valuable industrial sites, on which one very large plant has been erected. Others are under contemplation, and I believe in course of erection.

Now, I have outlined to the committee the general scheme of the Toronto harbour improvement. When I went there, as I said before, I found nothing done on the eastern end, but three thousand feet, or upwards, of cribwork had been sunk on the western end. The intention was to put concrete coping on the cribwork, bringing it up five or six feet above the level of the water. Now it is contended by the Harbour Commissioners that because this cribwork has not been covered, and has not been extended, some of the material which they have dumped in behind the proposed cribwork is being washed away by the action of the waves, and there is a loss to them in that way. That I do not know anything about, but I am told so by responsible engineers, and I accept it as being correct. This work would have required, I am satisfied, if I had gone on with it, at leasts $3,000,000, and as Minister of Public Works I had to face the question, whether I was justified in going on, or was the department, or was the Government—because, after all, I am only the mouthpiece of the Government so far as this work is concerned—were we justified in expending $3,000,000 on a scheme which in no way contributed to the navigation or transportation facilities of Canada? Now, I am not criticising the action of any of my predecessors. If it had not been for the war I would have considered it my duty, and an obligation which I would not try to get away from, to carry out the contract of my predecessor to the limit. But I say again that the problem I had to face was this: Was I justified in recommending the expenditure of $3,000,000 which did not add to the transportation facilities of this country? I gave the matter very careful consideration. I was pressed very strongly by the gentlemen who accompanied me as to the necessity of going on with the work. I am not in the habit of saying things to people which I do not mean, and, therefore, I do not think the gentlemen who accompanied me will say that I made any promise to them as to what I would or would not do.

I came back to Ottawa and discussed the subject with the officers of the department, and I finally decided that the work at Ashbridge's bay was of some benefit to the country in the prosecution of this war, because munition plants had been established and others would be established on the reclaimed land. As I said before, this channel of about a mile and a quarter long is four hundred feet wide, with industrial sites on either side of it. Cribwork had been sunk, piles had been driven in front of it, concrete was placed on top of that again, and I think I am safe in saying that three-quarters of all that work on the mile and a quarter channel had been completed. At the further end of it was a turning basin, in round figures about a thousand feet square, which also was to be dredged out to the extent of twenty-four feet, and was to have some cribwork and concrete coping around it the same as around the channel. I came to the conclusion, that as there were munition plants established along that canal, and there would be more munition plants as I was informed, and as it really was of some advantage to navigation because if the canal were finished vessels could come along lake Ontario, through the harbour of Toronto, and along that canal to the works, and thus effect and assist the transportation of materials for industries along its shores, I would not be justified in closing down works so far as that canal was concerned. So, I gave instructions to go on and finish it. It is intended to finish it, and I believe the concrete work has all been completed, up to the present time. It now remains to dredge out the canal to the depth of twenty-four feet, which will to some extent make further industrial sites, which I hope may be built upon, and I am sure will be of benefit to the city of Toronto, and also of benefit to this country in trying to prosecute the war.

I could not see how the construction of these breakwaters, which were purely for other purposes, and not for navigation purposes, could in any way assist the country

under our present stress, and I could not see how I was justified in expending nearly $3,000,000 under present conditions. I arrived at that conclusion by reason of having investigated the matter myself, and after a very careful discussion with the officers of the department. I may have been wrong, I do not put my judgment up as being infallible under any circumstances, but I do think I have got a reasonable amount of business common sense, and when I look at a project like that I consider it from every standpoint, and I could not see that the completion of these works at either end was a necessity under present conditions. In doing so I applied exactly the same rule of conduct for that work that I did to works in the city of St. John, in the city of Quebec, and in the city of Vancouver, and in fact, nearly every other place in Canada where public works were going on. I am still satisfied that I was right in my judgment, and I am still satisfied that it was proper to go on and finish this canal, and that it would have been improper to have gone any farther. I can only say to my friends from Toronto what I have said to my friends from Quebec: We have not abandoned the work; I hope the day may come when the Dominion of Canada will be in a position to carry out all of its moral, as well as its legal obligations. And when that day comes I can assure my friends, if I occupy this position, it will give me the very greatest pleasure indeed to carry them out. But as I view my responsibilities, and as I view the financial conditions of Canada to-day, I would not be justified in recommending the expenditure of this money in Toronto, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, or anywhere else. We are compelled to spend money in Halifax on account of the recent explosion there, to a much greater extent than many of us would like to do, but it is one of the things that cannot be helped. Halifax is the port of departure for all the great ocean liners carrying our own troops, as well as the troops of our Allies, and, therefore, that work must be prosecuted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given the committee the facts exactly as I understand them, and as explicitly as I could, and I do feel that the members representing Toronto, when they come to think the matter over, will arrive at about the same conclusion as the Government has, that while we exceedingly regret the necessity of closing down works of this kind, yet we would not feel justified in spending $3,000,000, or even a portion of that sum, for any work that is not absolutely necessary in the interests of navigation and the carrying on of the affairs of the country, at a crucial time like the present.

Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $350,000.

Mr. MANION: What is this amount for?

Mr. CARVELL: It is required for dredging under contract at Port Arthur, repairs to revetment wall, Grand Trunk Pacific basin, Port Arthur, harbour surveys, and so on. It is for the ordinary harbour works which we believe are absolutely necessary to take care of the grain business.

Mr. MANION: Is this dredging to be done in the Canadian Northern basin at Fort William, or is it for the removal of lot 10?

Mr. CARVELL: There is an item for the removal of a portion of lot 10.

Mr. MANION: What about the turning basin above the Canadian Northern dock?

Mr. CARVELL: It is intended to go on with that.

Vancouver Harbour—improvements, $150,000.

Mr. CARVELL: No new works are being undertaken in Vancouver or Victoria harbours. This amount is chiefly for a second shed on one of the big wharves at Vancouver, and to complete wharves now under construction. The amount for Victoria is for the purpose of building a wharf and closing up the present scheme.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 12.04 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, April 25, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

A YOUNG PATRIOT.

LETTER FROM A SIXTEEN-YEAR-OLD BOY READ BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

On Motions being called:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): May I ask the indulgence of the House for just a moment while I read a letter which reached me on Saturday last, and which I think expresses so admirably the spirit of the young men of Canada that it is desirable to give it publicity at this time. I shall not give the name or the address of the writer, a boy of sixteen years, because I know he did not write the letter in order that his name might come before the public. It is as follows:

Toronto, Ont., April 18, 1918.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—

I am asking you a favour to help me get in the army. I am only a boy of 16 years and want to give my life for my country. I have tried many times but failed. Why I am asking you is because you are like a King to Canada and if you said a word it would help me more than anything else. My dad has been to the Front and now he is back again, and you have taken my brother, and now I am the only one left to do something for my country. And, Sir, if you only knew how I am going crazy to do something to gain honour. I am strong and healthy, I have never had any sickness in my life. I was just reading the paper this morning and saw what you said "Canadians must hold the line." They cannot do it without men. Please will you give me a position in that line. I don't call myself a man but I might help to hold that line. So please give me a chance, the line is more valuable than my life.

Yours very truly.

The boy lived on Melinda street, in Toronto. Two sentences struck me as really remarkable—the one in which he says, "now I am the only one left to do something for my country." He might naturally and most reasonably have said, "I am the only one left to do something for my family," but he did not say that; he said, "I am the only one left to do something for my country." And then observe the last words of the letter, "the line is more valuable than my life."

I am sure that that letter does indeed express the spirit of the Canadian people, and as long as that spirit endures, and I am confident it will always endure, we need have no fear for the destiny of our country whether in this war or after the war.

REPORT.

Report of Hydrometric Surveys (Stream measurements for the calendar year 1916).—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

HALIFAX AND VANCOUVER HARBOURS EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CROWE:

1. What has been the cost, respectively, of (a) dredging, (b) construction of wharves, (c) breakwaters, and (d) repairs, in connection with the harbours of Halifax, N.S., St. John, N.B., Victoria, B.C., and Vancouver, B.C., since October, 1911, to the present date?

2. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the construction and repairs of dry docks in the harbours of Halifax, N.S., and St. John, N.B.?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Railways and Canals:

(a) St. John Long Wharf		$ 10,642 68
Halifax—in connection with foundations and berths—		
Ocean Terminals		2,149,829 57
(b) Construction of Wharves—		
St. John		Nil
Halifax—Pier 2 and Shed		1,285,452 24
Halifax Ocean Terminal Wharves, not including filling from Ocean Terminals, Railways or expenditures on railways		4,026,835 83
(c) Breakwaters—St John		Nil
Breakwaters, Halifax		401,656 57
(d) Repairs to wharves and Sheds—		
St. John, not including elevator and conveyors		39,606 93
Halifax		68,408 67
Public Works :		
Halifax, N.S.	Nil.	
St. John, N.B.:		
(a)	$5,352,277 12	
(b)	3,414,273 97	
(c)	1,372,037 49	
(d)	4,857 04	
		$10,143,445 62
Vancouver, B.C.:		
(a)	$1,496704 03	
(b)	2,685,683 28	
(c)	Nil.	
(d)	Nil.	
		4,182,387 31
Victoria, B.C.:		
(a)	$1,104,771 77	
(b)	2,641,918 06	
(c)	2,310,525 57	
(d)	1,322 46	
		6,058,537 86
Grand Total		$20,384,370 79

Marine and Fisheries:

(b) The Department of Marine :	
Dartmouth, N.S.:	
1915-16	$ 16,019 79
1916-17	2,964 46
	$ 18,984 25
St. John, N.B.:	
1911-12	$ 69,000 00
1913-14	118,033 88
1914-15	80,349 22
1915-16	58,937 46
1916-17	11,392 22
	$337,712 78
Victoria, B.C., Depot :	
1914-15	25,415 65
1915-16	655 27
1916-17	22,493 80
	$ 48,564 72

2. No expenditure in so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned.

The Department of Marine has no information.

Public Works:

Halifax old Graving Dock: This dock was built in 1889 by the Halifax Graving Dock Co., Ltd., and has received from this department, under authority of Act 45 Vict.,

ch. 17, an annual subsidy of $10,000 for the twenty years ended 30th September, 1909. Damages caused by the explosion of 6th December, 1917, are now being attended to and paid by this department; expenditures to 31st March, 1918, $15,745.

Halifax new Graving Dock: Preliminaries, etc., $4,451.52.

This department has expended no money on any graving docks at St. John, N. B.

ST. LAMBERT POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Has the Government been made aware that in the federal election of 1917, liquor was stored in the home of the Postmaster of St. Lambert, in the county of Lévis?

2. Does the Government know that said liquor has been seized by Excise officers?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No information.

2. Answered by No. 1.

JAS. STARRATT MARSHALL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has there been since August, 1914, a person named Jas. Starratt Marshall, of Spa Springs, Annapolis County, in the Active Militia of Canada?

2. If not, when did he leave the service?

3. If so, when did he join the service, and what has been his occupation?

4. What amount has he received during the period in which he was employed?

5. Has the Government any information as to whether or not whilst in the service he carried on the work of laundryman either in his public or private capacity?

6. If in the former capacity, what extra pay did he receive?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Appointed to the 69th Annapolis Regiment as 2nd lieutenant on the 8th September, 1896, and is now a captain in that regiment.

4. No record of this officer having been given any special employment other than as an officer of the regiment when called out for annual training during peace times, when he would receive the pay of his rank.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

ENLISTMENTS UNDER THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many men, per province, enlisted under the voluntary system, from the beginning of the war until the proclamation putting into force The Military Service Act, and how many of such men were British born, and how many Canadian born?

2. How many men per province, enlisted voluntarily since the said proclamation to the present date, and how many of such men were British born, and how many Canadian born?

3. How many men per province, were liable to Military service under the provisions of The Military Service Act?

4. How many of these men, per province, reported for Military service up to the present date?

5. How many, per province, claimed exemption before the Local Exemption Boards?

6. How many claims, per province, were granted by the Local Exemption Boards?

7. How many appeals were taken by the Military authorities against such exemption?

8. How many men, per province, claimed their exemption and were subsequently ordered to report?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Militia and Defence: Enlistments under the voluntary system from the beginning of the war until the proclamation putting into force the Military Service Act, i.e., 13th October, 1917, are not available, but the following are the figures to 31st October, 1917:—

Ontario	191,632
Quebec	48,934
Nova Scotia and P.E.I.	23,436
New Brunswick	18,022
Manitoba	52,784
Saskatchewan	26,111
Alberta	36,279
British Columbia and Yukon	42,608
	439,806
Nationalities—	
Canadian born	197,473
British born	215,769
Other nationalities	26,564
	439,806

2. Militia and Defence: Voluntary enlistments since the said proclamation up to and including March 31st, 1918, are not available, but the following are the figures from 31st October, 1917, to 31st March, 1918:

Ontario	8,081,	inc. from	U.S.A.	5,618
Quebec	3,727,	"	"	1,611
Nova Scotia and P.E.I.	636,	"	"	1
New Brunswick	763,	"	"	212
Manitoba	2,966,	"	"	1,208
Saskatchewan	98,	"	"	....
Alberta	415,	"	"	88
British Columbia and Yukon	2,021,	"	"	1,118
	18,707			9,856

Included in this number are 6,775 Class 1 men voluntarily reporting since the said proclamation.

At the present time information with regard to country of birth of these men is not available.

3. Justice: The information asked for will be found in the Report of Military Service Council laid on the Table and distributed to members.

4. Militia and Defence: Number of men who have reported for military service who were liable under the provisions of the Military Service Act up to and including March 31, 1918:

Ontario	13,295
Quebec	3,284
Nova Scotia and P.E.I.	1,709
New Brunswick	1,502
Manitoba	4,149
Saskatchewan	2,609
Alberta	1,632
British Columbia and Yukon	2,888
	31,068

5, 6, 7 and 8. Justice: The information asked for will be found in the Report of Military Service Council laid on the Table and distributed to members.

SENATOR BRADBURY.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Is Senator (Lt.-Col.) Geo. H. Bradbury receiving a pension from the Pensions Board in Canada?
2. If so, what is the amount per annum he is receiving?
3. On what date was the pension granted? Was it before or after Union Government was formed?
4. What is the reason given for granting the pension?
5. Did Lt.-Col. Geo. H. Bradbury serve in France?
6. If so, for what period?

Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes.
2. $780 per annum.
3. February 27th, 1918. After.
4. For disability incurred on service.
5. Yes.
6. About two weeks.

EXPLOSIVES ON SHIPS.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What companies manufacturing explosives have loaded their products on board ships in the harbour of Montreal during the last season of navigation?
2. Is the Government aware that on account of a fire which started in one of the ships in the harbour of Montreal, a disaster somewhat similar to the Halifax disaster was barely averted?
3. Is the Government aware that on another occasion, in the harbour of Montreal, when explosives were being put on board, a large quantity of said explosives fell to the bottom of a ship, through the breakage of a cable, thereby again exposing Montreal to a great peril?
4. If so, will the Government bind these companies to effect their loadings outside the limits of Montreal for the present season of navigation?
5. Is the Government taking necessary steps towards protecting war munition depots, as well as the people residing in their vicinity, by establishing lightning rods or adopting some other means of counteracting the effects of lightning?

[Mr. Burrell.]

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. The Government have no information.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Under consideration.
5. The Government will continue to protect munition depots.

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL COMPANY.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What amount, if any, was paid April, 1917, to the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company?
2. Who recommended said amount to be paid to the company?
3. Under what authority was said amount paid?
4. For what purpose was it paid?
5. Is said amount to be refunded to the Government?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS:

1. $18,559.88.
2. The Minister of Labour.
3. That of the Governor General in Council.
4. To enable the prompt payment to the miners for the period November 16, 1916, to February 5, 1917, of the wage bonus recommended by a commission appointed to report on the cost of living. This action was taken with a view to lessening the danger of a cessation of work in the collieries concerned, such cessation involving a public calamity.
5. The amounts were advanced to the different mining companies concerned on the understanding that the money would be so far as possible collected from the consumers, the mining companies not being themselves in a position to increase the prices for coal which had been delivered. A considerable amount has been collected from the consumers, but it has not been possible in dealing with the sums received always to determine if the dealings of a particular consumer have related exclusively to a particular colliery.

CAPTAIN W. E. SCHUSTER.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. When did Captain W. E. Schuster, of Belleville, receive his commission, and what were his military qualifications therefor?
2. Was he ever Overseas? If so, where and when, and how long did he remain overseas?
3. Did Captain Schuster ever take part in actual warfare? If so, was he wounded?
4. What were his duties in Canada, and at what rate per day was he paid?
5. How much was paid Captain Schuster up to April 20th, 1918?
6. What is he doing now, and what is his present rate of pay?
7. Is Captain Schuster to be sent overseas? If not, why not?
8. Is Captain Schuster of German origin, and is he still wearing his uniform?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 (a) Appointed 1st March, 1916, and posted to Forestry unit; (b) apparently possessed technical qualifications.

2. Proceeded overseas 30th May, 1916. Returned from overseas January, 1918.

3. Complete record of service is not available, as documents have not been received from the overseas military forces of Canada. There is, however, no record of this officer having been wounded.

4. Previous to proceeding overseas, he was employed on recruiting duties and arranging despatch of technical equipment of 224th Forestry battalion. He received the pay and allowance of his rank.

5. This information will have to be obtained from the overseas military forces of Canada.

6. Not now employed in any military capacity.

7. No, services not required.

8 (a). This officer was born in Canada; (b) No, not so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is aware.

MR. W. F. O'CONNOR, K.C.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Was Mr. O'Connor, K.C., late Cost of Living Commissioner, at the time of his appointment, required to report to superior authority in case of trouble with or change in his staff?

2. Was the said Mr. O'Connor free to make and make public, and as a matter of fact, did he make and make public such reports as he deemed it necessary to make as said Commissioner?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Mr. O'Connor was and is a secretary in the Department of Justice, as to part of his time, was loaned to the Department of Labour without any reference to "superior authority."

2. Yes.

LT.-COLONEL H. B. TREMAIN, M.P.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is H. B. Tremain, M.P., for Hants, Nova Scotia, in the employ of tht Militia Department?

2. If so, what pay is he drawing?

3. When was he appointed?

4. What amount of money has he received?

5. Is his wife drawing separation allowance?

6. If so, how much has been paid to her to date?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Lt.-Colonel H. B. Tremain, M.P., is an officer of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and is at present on leave without pay.

2. No pay.

3. November 9, 1915.

4. This information is being obtained from the Overseas Military Forces of Canada.

5 and 6. Separation allowance has been paid to the wife of this officer, from November 3, 1915, to April 30, 1917. Total payments, $1,076. The account is now closed.

*Mr. TOBIN:

1. Who is the secretary of the Minister of Labour?

2. What is his name?

3. When was he appointed, and at what salary?

4. What is his salary now?

5. Where is he from?

Hon. Mr. CROTHERS:

1 and 2. J. C. McKellar.

3. April, 1912; $1,600.

4. $2,000.

5. St. Thomas.

PRICE OF CHEESE AND CONDENSED MILK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. F. GLASS (Middlesex East): I wish to make an inquiry of the Government with reference to an article in this morning's Montreal Gazette relating to the matter of fixing the price of cheese in Canada for 1918. It is reported that the Dairy Produce Commission yesterday, in Montreal, authorized that the price of cheese be fixed as follows for the year 1918: 23 cents per pound for No. 1 grade, f.o.b. steamer at Montreal; 22½ cents per pound for No. 2 grade, and 22 cents for No. 3 grade. After fully considering the whole situation, the commission unanimously approved of the proposal. A committee was also appointed to take into consideration the matter of fixing the price of condensed milk. The price of condensed milk has an important bearing on the price of cheese, and I wanted to inquire—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot enter into a discussion of the matter. If he wishes to put a question, he may do so.

Mr. GLASS: Am I in order in reading the statement as it is?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think so. The hon. member may call the attention of the Government to the statement, and put a question with regard to it.

Mr. GLASS: May I ask the Government whether the facts as reported in the Gazette are correct? Is it the intention of the Government to fix the price of other dairy products so that they will be on a parity with the price fixed for cheese?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I cannot say definitely whether the report is correct or not; I assume that it is so far as the fixing of the price of cheese is concerned. I will call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the remaining portion of my hon. friend's question.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. PREVOST (Terrebonne) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to point out to the Government the following facts as they were reported to me in a letter which I have just received.

It is in further reference to the brutal unjust dealings of the Federal police officers in the carrying out of the Compulsory Military Service Act. Here is the letter addressed to me by a notable citizen of Terrebonne, in my own county, and which is dated April 24.

Mr. J. E. Prévost, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,

Since this morning, on the 23rd, there are in Terrebonne—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not in order. If he wishes to put a question to the Government, he may do so; he cannot read a letter.

Mr. PREVOST (translation): With your permission, I shall ask the Government whether they have any knowledge of the facts which are pointed out to me in this letter. There would have been in Terrebonne, in my county, since the 23rd instant, some twenty-five Federal policemen who are, so it is said, looking after some shirkers under this Act. On the 23rd, they arrested a young man who was the bearer, since the autumn previous, of a certificate of exemption from the local tribunal of Terrebonne. This certificate was taken away from him, at noon, while he was going back to his work, and they refused to return it to him under the pretence that it was worthless. When he passed by in the evening, he was arrested and detained, as a prisoner, until a late hour in the evening, when certain interested friends of his telephoned to the registrar, Mr. Godin, who ordered his release. They also attempted to take away the papers from another youth who resisted and refused to part with them as he would then have been without any means of showing that he was not transgressing the Military Service Act. Several of these officers are thus overzealous in apprehending young conscripts. The young man, whose exemption papers were thus taken away from him, resides at Saint François de Sales, in the county of Laval and Two Mountains. I do ask the Government whether they are cognizant of these facts and, if not, whether they propose fully investigating them. Moreover, I suggest that they should see to it that an end is put to such ruthless proceedings in the carrying out of warrants. They are in themselves an explanation of the dissatisfaction which is widespread throughout the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask hon. members not to abuse the privilege which allows questions on urgent matters to be put before the Orders of the Day are called. Quite frequently questions are put which should more properly go on the Order paper in the ordinary course, so that the Government may have notice of them. There can be no objection to an important question regarding a matter of policy. But matters dealing with individual cases should not be brought up on the Orders of the Day.

MILITARY SERVICE—MEN MEDICALLY UNFIT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): I desire to call attention to an error in the Hansard report. Yesterday I put the following question to the Minister of Militia:

> Are the men in Class "E" exempted under medical certificates obliged to report under the new Order in Council which has been passed?

The report says class "D", but what I wanted to know was whether men in class E, medically unfit, were required to report under the new Order in Council. As the question is reported, some confusion might be created. I understand that men in class D are those temporarily unfit, while those in class E are permanently unfit for service. Further on, speaking about the medical certificate, what I meant—and what I think I said, though it may have been misunderstood—was would the medical certificate of the Military Board appointed for the purpose be sufficient to exempt a man declared medically unfit. From the reply made to me by the minister, I think he understood my question aright.

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand the hon. gentleman to refer to men in the lower category—I think he said E.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Major-General MEWBURN: Category E consists of men not likely to become fit within six months; that is the regulation laid down by the medical people. What I intended to say in answer to my hon. friend was this: in calling up these classes of 20, 21 and 22 years, we were not asking to report at present those men already registered, and who had not been put in class A by the Medical Boards. All we require is men of class A who are fit for service at the front. The categories laid down by the medical board are: A, fit for general service; B, fit for service abroad, but not for general service—that would be forestry, and so on; D, temporarily unfit, but possibly becoming A or B within six months—that is, men in convalescent homes, and so on; E, not likely to become fit in six months.

Mr. BUREAU: E is the class I was referring to.

Major-General MEWBURN: We had no intention of calling them. If things get worse, some of these men within the ages of 20, 21 and 22 may have to undergo another medical examination. We have, however, no intention of disturbing any of the men already declared not to be in class A.

Mr. PREVOST: May I expect an answer from the hon. minister relative to the facts which I have stated?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (translation): Had not the hon. member from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) so hastily interfered, my intention was to answer my honourable friend from Terrebonne.

I must say that the Government have no knowledge of the two incidents referred to by the hon. member. If he will give us the names of the interested parties or the names of the officers—should they be known to him—that would help us a great deal in taking the necessary steps, so as to ascertain whether his statements were true. As to the necessity of giving orders so that there should be no high-handed dealings, I must say that all the officers have received the most express and formal instructions to avoid all that could be even described as partaking of the nature of such behaviour on the part of men so inclined.

SMALLPOX IN CAPE ISLAND DISTRICT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to direct the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence to a matter which may be of more than local importance? Reports in the press indicate that there has been a considerable outbreak of smallpox in the district of Cape Island in the western part of Nova Scotia and that the disease has been taken into that district by returned soldiers. I venture to suggest that the hon. gentleman will, through his medical officers, make inquiry into the matter not only in justice to the people of the district at present concerned but because, if the report be found to be correct, it is evident that there is danger of similar troubles occurring in other parts of the country to which returned soldiers go. I deem it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. gentleman as, if true, it indicates that there is need of a more rigid examination, first, on the part of the quarantine authorities at the ports of landing and on the part of the medical gentlemen connected with our own Department of Militia and Defence. The hon. gentleman has probably not heard of it and all I desire to do is to call his attention to it and to ask that the matter be investigated through his medical officers.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I most assuredly will do what my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) suggests. I have not had my attention called to it so far. If the hon. gentleman could give me any further information that he has I would appreciate it.

Mr. FIELDING: My only information is that which I have learned from the public press. The trouble has occurred in the district of Cape Island in Shelburne county in the western part of Nova Scotia. Cape Sable Island is in my district although it is not to be confused with Sable Island, the graveyard of the Atlantic. It is in the southern part of Nova Scotia where Cape Sable juts out into the Atlantic. There, quite a number of cases have occurred. It is treated, as a matter of course, as if the disease had been taken into that district by returned soldiers. That assumption may not be well founded. I am not asserting that it is but I merely ask my hon. friend to see that the matter receives attention.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 66, to correct a clerical error in the French version of the Naturalization Act, 1914—Hon. Mr. Doherty.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill No. 20, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Hay and Straw Inspection), Mr. Boivin in the Chair, continued from April 24, 1918.

On section 340f—bales to be tagged showing weight:

The CHAIRMAN: We had reached clause 340f of the Bill and Sir George Foster had moved that the clause be struck out. The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) had moved in amendment:

That clause 340F be replaced by the following:

340F. Every seller of hay or straw in Canada shall affix to every bale of hay or straw sold or offered for sale a tag, having thereon, plainly written and legible, the name of the seller and the weight of the bale.

Amendment negatived and section 340f stricken from the Bill.

On subsection 340 H—How railways are to facilitate inspection:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move to strike out this subsection.

Motion agreed to.

On subsection 341—Governor in Council empowered to prescribe fees for inspection:

Mr. DENIS: The present law provides that a fee of twenty cents a ton shall be charged by the inspector. I am at a loss to understand why the present law is not maintained, and what reason there is for making the proposed change under which the Governor in Council is given power to prescribe fees. Is it the intention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to so regulate matters that different fees will be charged in different sections in the country?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has, I think, the right idea. Sections where inspection may be carried out may differ very largely as to the quantity of hay which is inspected in each district. An inspector is paid by fees, but it is impossible to get an inspector, or to keep him, unless he derives sufficient remuneration from those fees, that being the only payment made to him. It may be impossible in some districts to even get an inspector, although he may be wanted there, unless a higher fee be fixed than in a district requiring a large number of inspections. That is one reason. The other reason is this: If there are many inspections and the experience of the year shows that after the expenses have been met and a fair remuneration made to the inspector there is too large a surplus, so that the inspector may be getting more than he ought to, in that case the fee may be reduced somewhat so as to bring the amount derived up to a reasonable remuneration. That is the object sought to be accomplished.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. DENIS: My opinion was that in certain cases the fee was high enough, or even too high.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. DENIS: The minister's explanation is quite intelligible to me, and therefore I have no objection to offer.

Mr. MAHARG: Are we to understand from the minister that the inspection fee may vary according to districts?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MAHARG: Does the minister not think that that is a very unfair principle? It does not apply to other products of the farm, for example, all kinds of grain and stock. In such cases the inspection fee is a flat rate, and I understand the inspectors are paid a fixed salary. If there is any shortage the Government makes good the deficit, and if there should be a surplus it stands to the Government's credit. I think the change proposed will work a hardship and prevent an inspection from being had where it is really wanted.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The whole system of inspection, so far as this Act is concerned, is based on its not being compulsory; no one is obliged to pay the fee unless he so wishes. The system is also based on the principle of payment by fee, and not by salary, so that my hon. friend (Mr. Maharg) will see that in some cases unless the fee were fairly good it would be impossible for the district to get the services of an inspector, whilst in other districts, where there was a large quantity of hay to be inspected, a fixed fee might take more from the sellers than would be advisable and might yield a larger salary to the inspector than he should reasonably ask. Taking into account the differences in districts, it is almost impossible to prescribe a fixed fee unless you give a salary which shall work equitably. That is the reason for the provision to fix the fee by Order in Council. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Maharg) will see that unless you pay salaries there is no other equitable way by which in the first place you could get good inspectors, and in the second place make provision

that the inspectors should sufficiently be paid in certain cases, and not paid too much in others.

Mr. GERVAIS: Mr. Chairman, after the discussion raised by the remarks of my hon. friend from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctôt) in connection with section 340f of this Bill, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has deemed it proper to strike out that section. After further discussion, it was thought proper by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) to move an amendment to that section providing for the identification of hay when it has reached its destination. The hon. minister thought it proper to have the discussion adjourned on this motion.

Section 341 now under consideration deals with such fees as shall be charged by the inspector. I have read the Bill through over and over again, and I must confess that, apart from section 341, the Bill under consideration does not in any respect differ from the Act passed in 1906; the only requisite provision and the one which is the most essential—I mean the clause providing for identification of the hay—has been cut out by the honourable minister himself, and he has also discarded the clause which provides for the official grading of hay and of straw. I cannot see what is the use of a Bill like this which is really a repetition of the Act passed in 1906. If the intention is only to change the inspectors' salaries, why not proceed in the usual way, i.e., by amendments or by Order in Council?

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is very desirable that the fees to be charged by inspectors should, if possible, be enumerated in the Act. The minister himself doubtless understands that the interested parties would like to have the fees to be charged inserted in the Act, and, of course, the cost of inspection is a very important part of the proceedings. Now the sellers on consulting the Act, if passed in its present form, will be unable to learn how much the inspection is going to cost them, or what the Act means, unless they get a copy of the Order in Council which is referred to. It is always desirable to have an Act of Parliament complete in itself and to embody all its requirements within its four corners. I would, therefore, urge upon the minister to carry out my suggestion. Let the Bill stand over for a few days until the nature of the Order in Council has been determined, and then incorporate in it the requirements of that Order in Council. I am sure that the whole country will then appreciate very much better the provisions of the law, and the interested parties be saved the trouble of looking around in order to ascertain what may or may not be in the Order in Council. It might be fixed in this way: in the schedule of fees the amount could be fixed at so much per ton, not to exceed so much per day. If a man, at the rate of 20 cents a ton, would make too much pay for one day, a maximum amount which he could not exceed could be put in the Bill. And, if there is not sufficient tonnage to be inspected to yield a fair day's pay at the rate per ton, there could be a provision in the schedule that he is to receive not less than a minimum amount per day. If a man requires an inspector to inspect, say three tons of hay, it could be provided that the inspector would receive half a day's pay or more, as the case may be.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Who will pay that?

Mr. McKENZIE: The man who hires the inspector.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In that case, if the man hires the inspector on a day that there is not much hay to be inspected, he will pay the inspector a large amount. If he gets his hay inspected on a day when there is a large amount, then he will get the inspection for a very small amount. My hon. friend will see that it is practically impossible to let the Bill stand over for a day, or several days, on that account. Take, for instance, my hon. friend's own locality. There is a difference between Sydney, or North Sydney—which is the hub down there—and Montreal. You appoint an inspector for Montreal, and say that he shall receive 20 cents for every ton inspected. Montreal, I suppose, in the course of the season may possibly handle 30,000 to 50,000 tons of hay. Sydney would require inspection for comparatively a much smaller amount. It is impossible to fix in the law the amount which would be reasonable for Montreal and which would also be reasonable for North Sydney, and it is impossible to find out just how many districts there may be with varying capacities of hay to be inspected, and to fix the fees according to the capacity of inspection. I think my hon. friend will see that, with all the desire possible to have everything in the Act that can be put in, it is impossible to put the fees in the Act and have an equitable arrangement.

Mr. McKENZIE: I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, how it is possible to put an equitable

fee in an Order in Council which it is not possible to put in an Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will explain. My hon. friend, or the people in North Sydney, demand an inspection district. We get, as far as possible, statistics with reference to the amount of hay that is sold on the market in North Sydney, and an estimate will be made from that as to what proportion of that hay will be inspected when it is sold, because inspection is not compulsory. The Order in Council will then fix the fee at a rate which would give the man who is to be appointed as inspector at North Sydney a reasonable amount for his time and labour. You could not get a man in any other way, it seems to me. So, you have to take the circumstances of the district into account in fixing the fee. That you cannot do in the Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: As I understand it—and I am not familiar with the old Act—the present fee is 20 cents a ton. Perhaps the minister has had some complaints about it. I have not heard of any general complaint about that fee being too small or too great. It is evidently regarded as a fair charge. Why change the condition?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will tell my hon. friend. We hope and I think everybody wishes, that more and more we should get into the habit of appraising our hay by standards and selling it by standards, and on inspection. It is better for the farmer, the dealer, and the consumer as well. It gives the latter a protection. At the present time, inspection is only carried on at three places in Canada, namely, Toronto, Montreal, and, I think, Kingston. It is only at these large centres that we have had any experience as a basis to work on. You fix the fee which may be proper for these large centres. Then a small district applies to have inspection put in force. It finds the fee fixed in the law but you cannot get a competent man to do the work in the small section, with a small quantity to be inspected, for that fixed fee. Then if it is necessary and considered advisable to arrange an inspection district in that other district, you would have to grade the fee according to the probable amount to be inspected, with a view to giving the man something worth his trouble for inspection. That is the reason.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understand that, and am not going to press the matter. I am still of the opinion that what I suggest would carry out the idea, and enable a seller to get an inspector. In the larger districts, 20 cents a ton has been found to be a satisfactory and workable fee under the Act. But, I suppose, the minister does not wish to be bothered creating new districts every day. He is prepared to create a new district, and to arrange from time to time a rate of fees for inspection in that new district. But, if he had a maximum and minimum charge for any district in the Bill, all he would have to do would be to create his district, and the fees would come into effect. In North Sydney, where there is not very much inspection of hay, if the inspector has twenty or thirty tons, or even less, to inspect, the farmer knows that quantity will take perhaps half a day, and he knows he will have to pay at the rate of 20 cents a ton, but at the most not more than two or three dollars to the inspector. Where the rate per ton would not be sufficient remuneration, there is the minimum charge for a day's work provided for. My particular desire is that this Bill should be complete in itself and have all the machinery in it. So far as I am personally concerned in my county it does not concern me very much, but I do know as a lawyer that a law should be as complete as possible.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is possible.

Mr. LANCTOT: Inspection is carried on at Montreal for the hay purchased by the Department of Agriculture at the present time, I understand. In the local market my experience is that, in very few cases, have we been obliged to go to an inspector. The difficulty is always settled without an inspector, if the seller knows hay and the buyer knows it too. During the discussion of this Bill yesterday, many opinions were expressed, one especially by an hon. member from British Columbia. I think I may be permitted to refer to the whole discussion in a few minutes, if possible. We were discussing one clause regarding stained hay and rotten hay. Some hon. members from this side of the House claimed that that sort of hay should be allowed on the market. I object to that, Mr. Chairman, because I stand for the reputation of Canadian hay. It does the farmer no good to put poor or rotten hay on the market. Now, the minister seems to be struck with the inspection phase of the matter and nothing else. The dealers and the farmers do not care much about the classification of hay, because, as I said yesterday, that is made by the dealer. We sell by the grade. But what we want left in the Bill is the clause which has been

struck out, No. 340f, to hold the farmer responsible for the hay that he has pressed from his barn. You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that the dealer buys the hay from the farmer, and in my section of the country 95 per cent of the farmers have presses of their own. When there is a large crop of hay in our section or in the whole country, we have stacked hay all over the country. We buy the barn hay and the stacked hay on condition that the farmer will pay attention to the pressing, and do it when the weather is fine. Supposing a presser comes to a farm to-day, and the weather is fine. The farmer tells him to put his hay press near some stacks of hay which he has in the field. The presser does so, and he starts the machine. The next day it rains perhaps only a very little. The presser, who may have three or four men working for him, says: It is true it is raining a little, but we are going to finish pressing this stack to-day. They do so. That hay is then put into the barn, and perhaps owing to the scarcity of cars, which we have had in this country for the last year or two, that hay may remain in the barn all winter. What will happen? That hay, if it has been pressed in bad condition, will freeze in the barn when the cold weather comes. When it is finally taken to the car, a man who knows his business can immediatly tell if the hay is in bad shape or not, and he will say: the bales are like pieces of ice or iron. But if a man who does not know anything about hay, is handling it, he will simply take the tally of the hay and throw it into the car, and it will be taken to Chicago, or New York, or elsewhere. Three or four weeks later, the man to whom the hay has been delivered will make a complaint that the hay is in such bad shape that he cannot sell it for sufficient to cover the freight and duty. The farmers throughout the country should be made aware of this Bill for their own benefit in the future, so that they will not press hay when the weather is unsuitable, and so that they will press hay only when it is in good condition. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) is a farmer himself and he knows I am speaking for the benefit of the farmers of this country.

Mr. CARVELL: How is the hon. member going to stop the farmers from pressing hay?

Mr. LANCTOT: If some one is there. I am speaking, however, for the hay dealer who buys hay over a section of thirty, or forty, or fifty square miles.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. LANCTOT: The reputation of Canadian hay is being very hard hit on the American market to-day on account of so many cars of frozen hay that have been sent there during the last four weeks. Last Monday, in Montreal, one of my friends from the United States was telling me that our choice No. 1 Canadian hay would not fetch as much as it did before that frozen hay was put on the American market. Take a big New York liveryman who purchases ten or twelve cars of hay. If, after he has put that hay into his loft, he finds that it is unsatisfactory, he will ask: Where does this hay come from? If the reply is that it came from Canada, he says: In future I shall not buy any more hay from Canada unless I am certain it is all right. This affects the good reputation of our hay. Bad hay should not be sent on to the market. Section 340f was the best section in the Bill, and the name of the farmer should be put on the tag. Any kind of hay, so long as it is sound, may be marketed, because there are so many different grades. I know I am out of order, so I shall not discuss the matter further.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not desire to interrupt the hon. member, but the very interesting address which we have just heard has absolutely nothing to do with the clause 341 which is under consideration, and which refers only to the fees.

Mr. LANCTOT: I have spoken for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. DENIS: I accept at once the principle that it would hardly be fair to have an equal standard rate throughout the country, and I think every one admits that; but, as suggested by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), the law should be made clear. Before Orders in Council are passed determining the fees that are to be paid in different sections of this country, information will have to be gathered. This information may already be available to the minister. Consequently, for the sake of having a clear and good law, and a law in which the fees will be well determined, why not, if the information is available, fix the fees now, and have a schedule at the end of the Bill, or dispose of the matter in any other way in which the minister may see fit, so as to determine what the fees are to be? Otherwise, we shall not know what the fees are. As a lawyer, I should be in an awkward position if a man

came to me and said: I have some hay on my farm in a certain locality, and I want to know what the fee is for inspecting it. I should not know what the fee is unless I wrote to the Government for the information.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member will only have to keep on file a copy of the Canada Gazette, and I imagine he does so.

Mr. DENIS: Yes, but supposing I could answer the question, the average trader could not do it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The average trader is not likely to have a copy of the statute. My hon. friend, of course, always keeps that by him.

Mr. DENIS: When the fees are written in the statute, the matter will always be plain.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is absolutely impossible, because my hon. friend goes on the assumption that we have mapped out this country into districts, and that we have obtained the information with reference to the different districts.

4 p.m.

We are not going to map out and form any district unless there is a local demand for it. This is an enabling Act. I have no idea, and there is no information in the department as to whether North Sydney, or any other district, or how many of them will ask for an inspection district to be created, so that it will be impossible to have the information ready so as to put in the schedules with the fees appropriate to each schedule. The information is not available, and if we were to schedule every district in the country, we would be doing a great deal of work which would be altogether superfluous.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: This clause, as it stands, is correct. It will obviate a similar difficulty to that which I brought up yesterday in reference to canned foods. One of the difficulties in regard to small factories is that there is no inspection because the quantity turned out is so small. I understand such small factories have no regulations. If in the Bill that was passed yesterday with regard to canned foods there had been a regulation like this one, the difficulty of which I was then speaking would be obviated. Similarly, in the case of hay, there are numbers of districts that will produce fifty, one hundred, or two hundred tons of hay, and in order to have an inspection there, it would be necessary to fix a higher rate than that at a place like Montreal in which a thousand or two thousand tons a day are inspected. A maximum and a minimum fee might be set, but it would destroy the effect of the Bill to make the amount too small, because, in that case, you would not be able to get an inspector at all.

On clause 342—penalty for putting foreign matter in bales:

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister regard the introduction of No. 2 hay into a No. 1 bale as putting foreign matter into the bale? Would that bring a man within the penalty prescribed by law?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The case is not for decision, and I do not know what the opinion of the judge would be. Personally, I think foreign matter would mean straw, bundles of weeds, dirt, stones or anything of that kind. These things have been put into baled hay more than once; I do not know that it is a very common offence, but it is certainly a very nasty one and deserves a heavy penalty. I do not think foreign matter would include hay of a different grade. A case of that kind would be covered by the inspection.

Mr. McKENZIE: The clause says that any foreign matter which improperly increases the weight of the bale or prejudicially affects its quality, will render a man liable. The introduction of a lower grade would, in my judgment, certainly affect prejudicially the quality of a bale of No. 1 hay.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You would also have to consider whether that was foreign matter or not. I should think it would be an offence against the Act to introduce hay of inferior quality into a bale of good hay.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Huntingdon mentioned the other day that that sort of thing is done. A man may see a beautiful mow of hay in a barn and arrange to buy it and have the farmer press it for him, but when he gets it, he finds that it has been mixed with an inferior class of hay. I think this clause was designed to provide to some extent against such an offence.

Mr. GERVAIS (Berthier): The Bill provides a penalty for the person putting any substance or foreign body in hay. How will you know when the hay is in a foreign market who has put in a stone, for example?

You have rejected the identification clause. How are you to know who owned the hay when the stone was placed there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The penalty is for a general offence in the way of fraud, and whoever tried the case would exercise his judgment as to the kind of fraud that was intended. There are a thousand things that might be put in, but it would be impossible to cumber up the Act with all these details. I think we cannot do better than to allow the person who tries the case to say whether the offence comes within the Act.

Mr. DENIS: One of the reasons why I insisted so strongly on my amendment last night was to make the present clause more effective. John Jones or Tom Smith would not know who had committed the fraud unless his name appeared on the bale.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The imposition of a penalty tends to lessen the liability of the offence being committed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 340C—grades:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The question was raised yesterday as to what constituted No. 1 grade of straw. I have been in communication with the Department of Agriculture and they have made this suggestion, which I think is a very good one: that there is a kind of straw, probably not very plentiful, which could be clearly defined as No. 1 and be made a merchantable grade. This straw is of good feeding value. I therefore beg to move that after the word "follows" in the first line of clause 340C we insert the following:

No. 1 straw shall be bright, clean, well-saved oat straw suitable for feeding purposes.

I think this would be a good straw to fix as No. 1.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I move:

That 340C. be further amended by adding after the word "straw" in the second line, the following words: "from all cultivated cereals."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To correct an error in the printing, I move:

That 340 be amended by striking out from line 22 the words "of fair colour and sound," and replacing them by the words: "of good colour, sound and well cured."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. COPP: I was unable to be present yesterday when this Bill was under discussion, and I have not had an opportunity of reading the remarks made by different members in regard to it. Since the matter came up this afternoon I sent for the original Act of which this is an amendment, but so far I have been unable to obtain it. I hardly know just what changes are made by section 340.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In general, the changes made under the amendments just adopted are almost nil. Practically, the substance of 340 is the same as the old Act.

Mr. COPP: In what we call the dike lands in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, an exceptionally fine quality of marketable hay is grown which is not strong in timothy, as the upland hay is. I refer to the counties of Albert and Westmorland in New Brunswick, Cumberland, and possibly the Annapolis valley, in Nova Scotia. I fear that hay grown on these dike lands will not measure up to the standard of grades 1, 2 and 3 timothy, and as a result of this legislation, an excellent quality of hay may be forced on the market at a lower price than would otherwise be the case.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is it within my hon. friend's knowledge that this has actually resulted?

Mr. COPP: No, we have had no inspectors there. For instance, a quantity of hay shipped from that section of the country to North Cape Breton and Victoria might be turned down by the inspector there because it did not contain the specified proportion of timothy. Could some words not be added to the Bill with reference to this hay grown on dike lands?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will communicate his suggestion to me in writing, I shall be glad to have the officers of the department take it up, and it may be considered in the Senate.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia—Amherst Drill Hall, $10,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this a new building?

Mr. CARVELL: No. The amount is to cover some small expenditures necessary to finish the building, which must have cost about $150,000.

My recollection is that there is a little flooring to be put in, cleaning up and general finishing.

Mr. McCREA: Is it the intention of the Government to build any new drill halls? I understand there are several that are built and that it is a bill of expense to keep them warm and looked after, although nothing is doing and there has not been for years.

Mr. CARVELL: I suppose that practically everything in connection with war time is a bill of expense. You cannot measure the value of a public work in war time by the expense it has been to the public. I think the true measure would be the service which these public buildings have rendered to the army in the last three or four years. But, to answer my hon. friend's question, I do not know that there is anything in these Estimates providing for new drill halls. I am pretty sure there is not and, if there is, while I will not ask the committee to strike it out, I will give the assurance that there will not be any new works undertaken along that line during the coming year.

Halifax—Quarantine station on Lawlor's Island—water supply, $10,000.

Mr. CARVELL: This is for the purpose of boring an artesian well at Lawlor's Island. They have had a great deal of difficulty in providing a suitable fresh water supply at the quarantine station there. Half of this amount is a revote.

New Brunswick — St. John — Dominion buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $5,000.

Mr. CARVELL: This is just the general vote to take care of the small repairs that became necessary in public buildings.

Mr. LEGER: Has the minister any intention of continuing the work of erecting a public building to provide for the post office and custom house in the village of Buctouche in the county of Kent? An appropriation was made for that work a few years ago and a certain amount of work was done. Is it the intention to go on with the work?

Mr. CARVELL: I find nothing in the Estimates for that. It has not been brought to my attention before. I do not know whether anything has been done except the purchase of a site some time before the war. However, I must say to my hon. friend that at the present time I can hold out no hope of erecting a public building for him much as I would like to do so, because Buctouche, I realize, is one of the most progressive towns in the whole province. But, on account of the present financial stringency, I would not feel justified in starting any new expenditures of that kind.

Mr. LEGER: An appropriation was made for this work two or three years ago and we expected that it would be continued. I think the war was on at that time. Buctouche is a very important little town. There is a great lumbering business done there and also a large mercantile business. There are two grist mills and the country surrounding Buctouche is important from the agricultural point of view. It is a fine farming country. Therefore, I feel justified in bringing the matter to the atttention of the minister in order to find out if anything is to be done. I know that some money was expended there. The site was bought, but I do not know how far it went beyond that.

Mr. MICHAUD: The Minister of Public Works is aware of the fact that in the town of Edmundston there is great need for improvement in the post office accommodation. During the past ten years this town has contributed $400,000 to the revenue of the country. It has had receipts from customs and post office to the amount of $40,000 a year and this amount has been paid into the public treasury. As my hon. friend is aware, Edmundston has a population of about 3,000. At the present moment we are building pulp mills which will cost some $3,000,000. We need a new post office very badly. There is practically no accommodation at the present moment. In view of the amount of money which this town contributes to the revenue of the country, and in view of the prospect of it having a large increase in population in a short time, it must be apparent that we need better accommodation. My hon. friend is aware that this is a very important town in many ways. He has visited it on many occasions and he knows where the present post office is situated and the great inconvenience we have in sorting and distributing the mail three or four times a day. In view of all the money that we have paid to the treasury of the country, we are surely entitled to consideration. I hope my hon. friend, who knows the circumstances and locality very well, will not hesitate to come to our rescue and give us a public building.

Mr. CARVELL: In reply to the very modest request of my hon. friend from Madawaska (Mr. Michaud) I would say it is true that I know the location of the post office in Edmundston. I have been there many times and I only wish I were in a

position to bring before Parliament a vote of $15,000 or $20,000 for the erection of a public building in that very thriving town. Without any exception at all there is no town, or city, in New Brunswick, possibly with the exception of Bathurst, which is progressing as rapidly as Edmundston. My hon. friend is quite right when he says that it has a population of about 3,000 people. Probably that population will increase by 1,000 or 2,000 the next two years. The only post office accommodation which they have for a town of that size is a room in an ordinary dwelling house. Only a few days ago I received a letter from a very influential resident of the town outlining to me what he considered the necessities of the case, but I have not had time up to the present to investigate the real facts and see how much the postmistress is receiving in the way of rental, because, after all, the amount which she is receiving as a rental ought to a very great degree to decide what kind of accommodation should be given. I have no hesitation in saying, from my own personal knowledge, that the citizens are entitled to better accommodation than they are now receiving. I will take the matter up with the post office authorities and see what I can do. In the communication which I received they asked for the expenditure of the modest sum of $400, which they stated would practically give the whole lower portion of the dwellinghouse for the purpose of the office, and would provide a place for the people to even come inside out of the rain, because as it is to-day they simply come to the door, no matter what the weather may be, and stand until they get served with their mail. I think I can go so far as to promise my hon. friend that if the Post Office Department will not properly take care of this matter I will be able to find at least $400 in order to give better accommodation than exists at present, but as to a new building I can only give him the same answer as I gave to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Leger).

Mr. MICHAUD: The minister will not forget that our revenues are sufficient each year to warrant the building of a post office.

Mr. CARVELL: That may be true, but I do not want the hon. gentleman to forget that after all that money has been expended we have got to borrow four or five hundred million dollars more to carry on the affairs of the country.

Maritime Provinces generally—Dominion Public Buildings—Improvements, repairs, etc., $25,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: In view of the great advance in the cost of living, has the Minister of Public Works made any provision for augmenting the salaries of caretakers of public buildings in Canada? I have reference particularly to my own province, but the question is just as applicable to other parts of the Dominion. Before the war, and even for some years previously, prices were soaring and under such circumstances janitors of public buildings must have found their salaries which do not exceed at most $300 or $400 quite inadequate. Some of these men in the country districts have five or six children to maintain, and now that the cost of living has doubled, in some cases more than doubled, it has been made pretty manifest that these people find it exceedingly difficult to live on the small salary paid to them. I would be pleased to know if the minister has granted these caretakers any advance, and if not, would he give the matter his consideration and see that such a salary is paid as will enable them to live fairly comfortably.

Mr. CARVELL: This matter has received a great deal of attention during the last six months. I am told, and I believe it is true, that on the advent of every new minister of Public Works practically everybody in the service puts up a demand for more pay. This has not only happened recently, but it is a general occurrence. These demands came in shoals almost in the months of November and December last, and realizing the force of just such arguments as the hon. gentleman has been giving to the committee this afternoon, we endeavoured to place the salaries of all these caretakers on some sort of equitable basis. We found that in some cases the salaries were not properly adjusted, and we therefore took $1,000 as a basis of what a man's salary should be. We then deducted from that amount what would be the reasonable value of the privileges accorded him in the way of rent, light, heat and water, all of which, of course, are primary necessities in the cost of living, and gave the man the balance in the form of salary. I think, therefore, that if my hon. friend will make inquiry he will find that practically every caretaker in Canada is treated exactly upon the same basis. I am not sure as to the actual details, but I think that in the big cities the basis is a little larger than $1,000, and if that be the basis in large cities it is somewhat less in the smaller towns, because, naturally, rent would be a heavier item in a large city than it would be in a

small town. I can assure my hon. friend that we have tried to work out this question of the salaries of caretakers on a fair and equitable basis, and so much so that I do not think that there has been a complaint or request on that score put up to the department in the last two months. If there has been any, it has escaped my memory.

Mr. LEGER: Is there an appropriation for repairs to the post office at Richibucto in the county of Kent? I understand that it is intended to provide a concrete walk to the post office, and as that would cost only a small amount I would draw the attention of the minister to the desirability of this work being undertaken at an early date.

Mr. CARVELL: In looking over the accounts I find we spent about $200 upon the public buildings in Richibucto last year. I cannot say offhand whether it is intended to spend any more money out of this vote upon that work, but I will make a note of my hon. friend's suggestion. We will have the matter investigated by our architects and endeavour to do all that we can to meet his wishes.

Mr. LEGER: The money expended last year was devoted to painting part of the front of the building; the sides and the back of the building were left unpainted. What I am now urging is that all the painting should be finished, and the present wooden sidewalk leading to the building, which was laid many years ago and is in a bad state of repair, be replaced by a concrete pathway.

Mr. CARVELL: I will take a note of my hon. friend's suggestion.

Province of Quebec, Dominion Public Buildings—Improvements, repairs, etc., $35,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: To what buildings in Quebec does this item apply?

Mr. CARVELL: The item covers practically all the public buildings in Quebec province; and is utilized by the expenditure of a few dollars here and a few dollars there. The money is intended to cover unforeseen expenses in conducting the public buildings of the province, and no minister could state offhand exactly how he proposes to distribute this vote of $35,000. Money is voted for this purpose every year to be expended as the officers of the department think proper.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is $35,000 sufficient to keep in repair all the public buildings in Quebec?

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: There are other items devoted to special buildings. The vote under consideration is intended to be used as thought best to keep the public buildings generally in a state of repair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is applicable in unforeseen cases.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Am I to understand that when there are large repairs tenders are invited?

Mr. CARVELL: Wherever it is possible to have work done by tender that course will be followed. This vote has reference to small repairs the need for which develops in the operation of the year's work. I can assure my hon. friend that if any of these works are of such a nature as to permit of tenders being called, that system will be adopted.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand there is a list in each city of the names of contractors or employees, and those who get the work are selected from these lists.

Mr. CARVELL: I have heard of that myself.

Mr. McKENZIE: Surely not.

Mr. CARVELL: Of course, I am going back a long time now, but my memory is fairly good. I want to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Du Tremblay) that that method has been abolished, and forgotten I hope. In future any work such as the hon. member describes, which must be done by day work, will be done under the direct supervision of the engineer in charge of the work, and he alone will have the right of choosing the men or firms to carry it out, and then we will hold him responsible that it is properly done; I think when the responsibility is put on the shoulders of the proper officer we will come pretty close to getting the best results that can possibly be had.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think that the regulation laid down in the Public Works Act applies to repairs. If it is necessary to spend more than $5,000 it is obligatory to call for tenders. At all events, I have no fear, with the present minister in the Public Works Department, that any money will be spent contrary to the public interest. If there is one thing more than another which has produced a salutary effect on public opinion it was the announcement made by the hon. gentleman that he has done away with patronage lists in his department. After all, people, whether Conservatives,

Liberals, or Unionists, are all taxpayers, and in these days of financial crisis, we want to get the best work done in the cheapest and most honest way. The minister is right in stating publicly that the local engineer of the department, in Montreal and Quebec, shall follow his own best judgment in these small repairs, and select the best men to do them, and to see to it that it is not a question of picayune patronage to be distributed to A, B, C, or D. I see that several items have been struck out of the main Estimates, and my own county of Gaspe was among the sufferers. I did not raise any objection to the striking out of the items, because I understand the difficult financial condition of the country.

I, for one, would not object if the Estimates were cut in two. We could dispense with fifty per cent of the expenditure. If our people knew the straits we were in they would certainly applaud if the Government had the courage to cut down the expenditure. At a time when we are spending $500,000,000 to carry on the war, I do not see why there should be any frills in the way of patronage around the country. For my own part, I would be ready to vote to reduce the Estimates by 50 per cent.

Mr. McCREA: Has the minister been long enough in harness yet to discover that there is a larger number of employees of one kind or another in the public departments than there is work for, or who are receiving salaries above the value of the service they are giving? Without mentioning any particular place or office, I have one in my mind, and it has been a puzzle to me for some years past to know what its employees are doing. That office has a staff of an engineer and several assistants, and I am very curious to know how much work they are superintending, or what the value of the work that they look after is compared with the amount of salaries paid. I think this same condition applies to many offices all over this country. What I would like to know from the minister is whether he has discovered that the offices in his department are a good deal overmanned?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was not very long in the department before I learned many of the things that my hon. friend is alluding to, and I can assure you it has given me more trouble than almost anything else to arrive at a fair and equitable way of rectifying the condition. It is a hard thing for any man who professes to have a heart in him to simply say to a man: "Your services are no longer required; get out." Yet it may come to that. I can say to my hon. friend that for the last four months, practically since the New Year, the department has been obtaining the most reliable reports it could possibly get on every officer in the public service. We have these pretty well codified now, and all over the Dominion, I regret to say, there are a great many in official positions who, I do not think, are rendering very much service for the money they are receiving. It is a very unpleasant duty, forced upon a new minister especially, to relieve these men of their positions, and perhaps throw them out, knowing that many are not in a position to enter a new business or profession. The Public Works Department has just recently taken over the construction of all works heretofore carried on by the Military Hospitals Commission. We feel that very many of the officials who have not very much to do, as there are no ordinary public works going on, can be utilized in connection with inspection and other duties in this new work, and I am in hopes that in that way we may absorb a very large number of them. Quite a number have already been dispensed with. These are the men who practically were performing no services whatever on account very largely of the reduced expenditures. I can assure my hon. friend, however, that we have given the subject our very best consideration, and the House may rest assured that within a very few months these people will either be absorbed in some work for which they will be giving valuable services to the country or they will disappear from the pay roll.

Mr. McCREA: I was glad to hear the minister say that his department was overmanned, but I was rather sorry to hear of his being so chickenhearted that he did not feel like dispensing with the services of those employees for whom there is no work There have been times in the history of this country when it was quite a hardship for men to be thrown out of a job, for the reason that there was nothing for them to do. But this particular time is not one of those times.

At this particular time a man who is out of a job need not be pitied, because there is plenty of work to do, and there is no necessity for keeping a man in the Government employ, or in the employ of any other party, if there is no business for him to do. I hope the minister and all the other members of the Government will realize that this is the country's money we are

spending, and that the country is very short of money just now. I hope they will lay aside their tender heartedness and dispense with the services of every man who has nothing to do and who is not earning money for King and country.

Mr. CANNON: Is there a staff of architects looking after repairs to public works and buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: We have a staff of architects in every province, and we have staffs in different districts of certain provinces.

Mr. CANNON: In the Auditor General's Report, page V-30, I notice a Mr. J. P. Ouellet last year received $2,196.08 for work done in connection with the maintenance and construction of buildings for the Public Works Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where?

Mr. CANNON: In the city of Quebec. Is there an architect looking after public works in the city of Quebec?

Mr. CARVELL: My information is that the gentleman referred to is an architect who received a certain commission by way of remuneration for his services in looking after the erection of a public building in the city of Quebec. That would not be a regular employment. He received the salary last yar. He might receive something this year, although I think not, because the building has been practically completed. The position is not a permanent one. The gentleman has received simply a commission. The practice has grown up—I am not condemning it, neither am I advocating it—of handing the inspection of important public buildings to certain architects on a commission basis. They get their pay while the work progresses, and, of course, they cease to be officers of the department after the work is finished.

Mr. CANNON: Is there in the city of Quebec an architect to look after the work done on public buildings, and, if there is, why is Mr. Ouellet employed in his stead?

Mr. CARVELL: There is, in the city of Quebec, Mr. Pouliot, who is called clerk of works. I have no knowledge of his professional qualifications, and at this moment I really could not answer my hon. friend as to why the other gentleman was employed. I know, as a fact, that the other gentleman was employed in his capacity of architect, and that he received his pay by way of commission.

[Mr. McCrea.]

Mr. CANNON: In the same item to which I have referred there is a special amount paid to Mr. Ouellet, reading:

One and one-half per cent. for verifying C. P. R. accounts, $83.42.

I do not see why the Government should pay Mr. Ouellet for verifying Canadian Pacific Railway accounts.

Mr. CARVELL: I understand the Canadian Pacific did some work for the Government in connection with the immigration building at Quebec, and this gentleman certified the accounts and supervised the work. He received the usual commission for doing so.

Mr. CANNON: Does the minister not think those accounts should be verified by the accountant of the department?

Mr. CARVELL: They must be verified by the accountant. The only question is one of principle of policy, whether it is the proper way to pay the man who performs the services. I am rather of the opinion that, in future, those services will be performed by the permanent officials of the department. That is my judgment. There may arise cases when we shall have to vary from that policy, but, as a matter of policy, I think it is best to encourage the men in the employ of the department, cast the responsibility upon them, let them realize that the department is going to hold them responsible for the proper performance of that work, and I believe we shall get more loyal service and better results all around. That is only a question of policy. I want my hon. friends to realize that I am not here to condemn matters of policy of my predecessor. I am willing to take all reasonable responsibility, but there is not much use in asking me why things were done. I am only too happy to give any information which I can, and I shall not have very much difficulty in telling my hon. friends what my policy will be in the future.

5 p.m.

Mr. CANNON: I am not asking these questions in order to criticise the minister, because I know he is not responsible for what may have happened last year, as he was not then at the head of the department. I understand, however, that now while the Estimates are on, is about the only occasion given to members of this House to get certain information that it might be interesting for them to know. That is why I am putting these questions.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope my hon. friend will not, for a moment, think I am finding fault with his method of obtaining information. Go ahead. We shall give the committee all the information we possibly can. I hope nobody will have the idea that I am objecting to any set of questions or the obtaining of any information desired.

Mr. CANNON: In this item for Mr. J. P. Ouellet, I see he has received $258.95 for supervision of sundry work; plans, etc., for $34,500 contract, $1,207.50. What was that contract and to whom was it given? Where was the work done?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not in a position to give the information now, but if the hon. member will write me a letter, giving the page and the account in such a way that there will be no question about its identity, we shall at once send him back a letter giving him all the information, and we are willing to do the same in regard to every subject in the Auditor General's Report, relating to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CANNON: I have no objection to corresponding with the minister, but on the other hand when answers are given in the House they are published in Hansard and the information is not of a private but of a public character. It is much better for the public that the answer should be given in the House if the minister is in a position to give it. The deputy minister is here. Perhaps he can enlighten the minister on the subject.

Mr. CARVELL: I regret I am not able to answer the question. I may say to my hon. friend however, that any letter I write to him will be public, and he is in a position to put it in the newspapers or make any use of it he desires.

Mr. CANNON: To close up this incident, I wish to tell the minister I drew his attention to this item in the Auditor General's Report only because it struck me as being most extraordinary that the department should pay a large sum to an architect when there is already in the department a staff of architects paid by the country to do the work. I do not say that Mr. Ouellet was employed because he happened to be a political friend of the late Government. I know the gentleman who was Minister of Public Works last year, would not be induced to employ this gentleman's services on that account, but nevertheless it strikes me as rather strange that such a large amount should be given to Mr. Ouellet when the department did not need his services at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I happen to know the situation in Quebec. The resident engineer appointed by the Department of Public Works is Mr. Decarie, a man of exceptional ability, very conscientious, and very hard working—an absolutely safe man, with a staff of well trained officers under him. With such a man as that in the department, I do not think that the minister is justified in paying large sums of money to outsiders such as have been mentioned by my hon. friend from Dorchester. Mr. Decarie, because he was an honest, painstaking and capable engineer, has been completely ignored, and the result has been that the reconstruction of the Quebec post office, a work of only reasonably large dimensions, which was commenced in 1911 or 1912, has not yet been completed. Why? Because the department has simply let matters drift, and every ward politician in the city of Quebec has had his finger in the pie. I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been sunk in that post office, and it is not yet completed. If Mr. Decarie had been put in charge of the work it would have been completed long ago and at much less expense.

Mr. CARVELL: My attention was drawn to this matter some months ago, when I made an investigation. I find that the contract is for a lump sum, and therefore the exceedingly long time during which repairs have been going on does not perhaps mean so much to the department as one might think. I thank my hon. friend for the information he has given me. I have met the gentleman he has referred to, and have every confidence in his ability. I thought that this particular contract was finished; but if it has not been it will travel pretty fast in the next two or three months.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a scandal to think that a building not half the size of this Museum, and which has been under way for six or seven years, should not have been completed before this. If Mr. Decarie had been in charge of the reconstruction it would have been completed four years ago. The minister, if he will investigate, will find that there is a regular mine of scandals connected with that building.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the city of Quebec postal accommodation at the present time?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Where, then, is the urgency for completing the work?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The building is being reconstructed; it is not a new work. The reconstruction was begun in 1911 or 1912.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not see that that is any great crime, just because it happens to be in the city of Quebec. Other places are suffering the same inconvenience.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend misses the point.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend is complaining because a certain work in Quebec has not been completed; it is a shame and a scandal, and so on. In reply to that part of his remarks, I say there are lots of places in this country where buildings have been left in an unfinished state owing to the necessity for avoiding all unnecessary expenditure while the war is on. But if any work is dropped east of the Ottawa river, a howl is raised about it at once. If there is any part of Canada where buildings should be completed, it is in the section west of the Ottawa river.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend missed my point altogether. The contract is for a lump sum, and was given six or seven years ago. The money has to be spent anyway. My point was that if the reconstruction had been under the supervision of the resident engineer the building would have been ready long ago. It is a small building, relatively speaking, but large for the city of Quebec. I was asking why we should pay architects to superintend the work when it is not being completed? I was not making any such complaint as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend has mentioned this Museum building that we are meeting in. If the building they are putting up in Quebec is going to be like this one it would be better if they took ten or fifteen years more to complete it. This building was constructed during the time my hon. friend was a minister of the Crown. By some, the building is regarded as absolutely unsafe. Only a short time ago they had to take part of it down to prevent the whole thing from coming down. I presume the plans for this building had the hon. gentleman's approval when he was a member of the Government. Therefore, when he recommends an architect as able to carry out a work to perfection in a very short time, I take his recommendation with a very large dose of salt, in view of what his architects have done. Here is a building with cracks in it; it is going to pieces, sliding down the hill into the canal or somewhere else. This building was put up at a time when the hon. gentleman had a say in the erection of public buildings.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This Museum building was erected long before I became a member of the Government. My hon. friend knows the reasons for the cracks in it.

Mr. CARVELL: The contract for the reconstruction of the post office in Quebec was for the lump sum of $385,000, and was given on the 23rd of March, 1913. Extra work was authorized to the amount of $21,501, and there is extra work now under adjustment amounting to $3,000. So the total probable cost is $409,501. Up to the 14th of March last the contractor had been paid $400,032, leaving a balance required to fill the contract of $9,468. It is possible that other small portions of the work will have to be finished up. A wall of some kind is being removed by the department, and it is suggested that this work should be done by the contractor; that will require adjustment. In order to be sure that this matter will be cleaned up without delay, we are asking for $15,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Was a claim sent in to the department by the contractor on account of the loss occasioned to him by the increased cost of labour and material?

Mr. CARVELL: A claim was sent in either by the contractor or by his solicitor. It was not paid. Hon. gentlemen can rest assured that we will treat this matter purely as a business proposition.

Mr. CANNON: Who looks after the valuation of land expropriated by the Department of Public Works?

Mr. CARVELL: An estimate of the value is made by some one in the locality considered as an expert and, if it can be arranged, an agreement is made with the owner for the taking over of the land on a reasonable basis. If such an agreement cannot be made, the matter goes to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. CANNON: I see in the Auditor General's Report that a gentleman named Amyot received the sum of $1,000 in full and final settlement of all claims in connection with the expropriation of a land site. Can the minister give me the particulars of this $1,000 payment?

Mr. CARVELL: This man was the owner of part of a site, and a settlement was made with him. That is all the information I have, but I will furnish all the facts

connected with the matter if the hon. gentleman so desires.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station—Boiler houses, new boilers, etc., $30,000.

Mr. DECHENE: Is this for a new boiler house, or for repairs to the old one?

Mr. CARVELL: I understand that this is for additional boilers. Quarantine stations are under the control of the Department of Agriculture; the Public Works Department erect the buildings for them. During the last session a lengthy discussion took place in the House with regard to the voting of $115,000 or $120,000 for the erection of new buildings at Grosse Isle. The Department of Agriculture informs me that it is absolutely necesary that the quarantine station there be completed before the troops begin to return in large numbers. During seven months of the year the troops will have to come by the St. Lawrence, and necessary quarantine accommodation will have to be provided. I threw all the obstacles I could in the way of the erection of this building, but the officials of the Agricultural Department persisted in saying that the expenditure is absolutely necessary, and, therefore, I cannot refuse it. If we go on with the new buildings it may not be necessary to instal this new plant, but if we do not the additional amount for heating plant will have to be spent. The work will be done by tender and contract. As presently advised, I think it will be necessary to proceed with this work on a large scale during the coming summer. Nearly four years ago tenders were called for part of this work; they amounted to about $150,000. In all probability we will not have to construct the whole work as has been proposed, but there will at least have to be the main administration building and two units in the place of wards. It has not been definitely decided to do so, but in all probability we shall proceed with the work in the near future.

Mr. DECHENE: I understand that the foundation of the new quarantine station has already been laid and part of the work done.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. DECHENE: Is it known that the pillars were not amply protected and that, through the influence probably of water or frost, some of them are tipping over?

Mr. CARVELL: That is news to me. I have asked my deputy about it, and he says that it is news to him also. We will have inquiry made into the matter at once, and if my hon. friend's information is correct, we shall see who is responsible.

Mr. DECHENE: One of the men who is in charge of the foundation work came to my office last winter and told me that he had observed that some of the pillars were somewhat tipped over. He suggested that they might have to be rebuilt, and asked me, when I should go to Ottawa, to point out that this deficiency was not the fault of the contractor; that the pillars were not sufficiently protected.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not understand that. If the pillars were properly constructed frost would not interfere with them. It would be a reflection on any man if he erected buildings or works of any kind under these conditions. I can assure my hon. friend that we will have this matter investigated and find out what the facts are.

Mr. DECHENE: There was a complete foundation in some places and in some other places there were just pillars set in the ground. Of course they had to make a deep hole to reach a solid rock foundation. The hole was filled with ice and water during the winter and probably that caused the trouble with the pillars.

Mr. CARVELL: I find from the notes placed before me that tenders were called for these foundations early in the autumn of 1913 and that a contract was let on the 21st November, 1913, to J. B. Gallibois of Montmagny for $20,753. The total amount that was finally paid to the contractors on the 3rd August, 1915, was $22,541. There was a payment of $20,750 on the contract, plus $2,788, allowed for extra piling. These are all the facts I have. I am very much interested in what the hon. gentleman tells me and I shall certainly have the matter investigated.

Mr. DECHENE: Will the new boiler house and boilers be connected with the new hospital or are they to supply power to the old building?

Mr. CARVELL: I think I was in error in the statement I made a few moments ago. The proposed boilers are for the disinfecting plant and for necessary purposes at the wharf. They are at the old building and I think they will have nothing to do with the new hospital referred to in the other item.

Mr. DECHENE: I see an item for "improvements and repairs to buildings and fittings, furniture." Are these fittings and

furniture supplied by contract or by day's work under direction of the commanding officer?

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say again that if any of these works are such that we can properly call for tenders, tenders will be called. You can quite readily conceive that there may be a condition of affairs, such as tearing down and rebuilding, under which it would not be possible to properly specify the work. It is pretty hard to call for tenders for that kind of work but every portion of this work which is new, or which is well defined, or for which a proper specification can be intelligently prepared, will be done by tender and contract. The remainder will be done by the officials of the Public Works Department who are responsible in that part of the province of Quebec.

Mr. DECHENE: I do not ask this question with the idea of making trouble. I understand that during the last few years there was a contractor in charge of work in connection with the quarantine station there. He was supposed to look after the furniture and fittings in the Government buildings. Last year, I understand, some work was done by the labourers under the supervision of the commanding officer. I would like to know why there was a change and if any money was saved as a result of it.

Mr. CARVELL: That portion of the province of Quebec is under the control of a gentleman named Tremblay who lives at Montmagny and, while I am not acquainted with the details of what took place last year, I will say that any work done by the Public Works Department, which requires the employment of temporary labourers, will be done under the officials of the Public Works Department, no matter what may have been done in the past, and we will hold them responsible for seeing that it is done properly. When it comes to a question of the buying of furniture that probably will be done by the War Purchasing Commission under the new arrangement. I can assure my hon. friend that it will be done properly no matter by whom.

Mr. DECHENE: The work which is now done under the supervision of the commanding officer was formerly done under the supervision of a civil engineer, Mr. Tremblay. Generally, Mr. Tremblay took charge and saw that the contractor was doing his business properly but I understand that last year Mr. Tremblay had practically nothing to do with it and that the commanding officer just ran it as he pleased.

Mr. CARVELL: I have never heard of this before. A system has grown up during a great many years past by which different departments have been constructing public buildings and looking after them. It may have been due to this system that the commanding officer took charge of the work at the quarantine station. I am not aware of the details but I can assure my hon. friend that the public works of this country in the future are going to be constructed by the Public Works Department and that the officials and nobody else, are going to be held responsible for the due execution of these works.

Mr. DECHENE: I have heard that it was the intention of the Government to build a new wharf to accommodate the new building that is to be located on the lower part of the island. There are two wharves, one at the upper end of the island and one at the lower end next the new building. Is it the intention of the Government to enlarge this wharf or to leave it as it is now. The Government steamers do not stop at the lower wharf but always go to the upper wharf.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no appropriation in the Estimates this year for any enlargement of that wharf. The matter was brought to my attention during the last three or four months and the information I have received is that eventually the wharf will have to be enlarged but I do not think I can hold out much hope to my hon. friend that the work will be undertaken during the coming year. We may be compelled to embark on the construction of the immigration building proper as a matter of necessity. But I think the wharf will have to get along as it is at present.

Montreal General Post Office—remodelling old building, $20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The General Post Office was enlarged some years ago. The old building of the Montreal Gazette was purchased and the post office was extended. Every one who has to go into the general post office realizes that it is a very small building for the business that is carried on there.

Mr. CARVELL: You mean simply for the employees there, do you not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are any number of employees there.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what I thought.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There were seven hundred employees in 1911, or thereabouts, and in less than three years the number was duplicated. I think there are from fourteen to sixteen hundred employees there at present.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a very important office I know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The business has not increased correspondingly. I understand that for the repairing of mail bags, sacks, boxes, and so forth, the department, some years ago, rented another building opposite, on Craig street. Has the lease of that building expired, or is the Government going to continue it?

Mr. CARVELL: That raises a question that has given me a great deal of thought during the last three or four months. To answer my hon. friend's question categorically, the lease to which he refers is still running, and I cannot tell him exactly when it will expire. However, this raises the same question with respect to the city of Montreal that we were discussing last evening in connection with the city of Ottawa. The public services in Montreal are scattered round in quite a number of places, but with the difference that there are not nearly the same number of employees in that city as there are in Ottawa. But it has been impressed upon my mind very strongly that just as soon as the finances of the country will admit of it, the Government should either erect or purchase a building in some central locality in the city of Montreal in which to house all its employees. I have examined the rentals that are being paid for offices, and I find that whenever you send out a Government official for the purpose of obtaining quarters for himself he first makes for St. James street; he thinks he should be provided with bank premises right in the middle of that thoroughfare. When you argue with the official for a while he states: Well, I will be satisfied if I can have one of the best corners on St. Catherine street. The result is that we are usually paying for the best corners, and paying prices that are not necessary and not justifiable. Under present conditions, where these offices are separated and spread all over the city, it is a pretty hard matter to control them. I do not care who the Minister of Public Works may be, when he is compelled to hunt around for offices he is very often forced to take that which he would rather not have. For that reason I believe that in the city of Montreal we require a centrally located and Dominion-owned building for the housing of all the officials probably to a greater extent than in any other part of Canada. I believe that would be a good policy to adopt in all the big centres. The matter has been forced particularly upon our attention lately, by reason of the necessity for making provision for the collection of the income tax. Offices have been opened up in many of the large business centres of Canada, and, of course, the Government officers, as I said before, in Montreal want to get on St. James Street, and in Winnipeg they want to get—

Mr. LEMIEUX: On Main Street.

Mr. CARVELL: Or a street equally as prominent, and none of them want to go upstairs. They say, "We must have bank premises on the best business corners there are in the city," which is only human nature. I tell them they do not require such expensive buildings as these, and I am having my way to some extent. I also tell them that wherever there is a vacant room in a public building there is where they ought to go. They are filling up these rooms now, and there will not be much vacant space left hereafter in the public buildings in those cities where these officials are located. However, it only emphasizes the point I am making: The moment the Government starts out to rent space in any city or town, it is going to pay a much higher figure, proportionately to what the business community pay for similar accommodation, than it ought to, and, therefore, in my judgment, the Government should own its own building, not in small places, but in large centres like Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, and possibly the Pacific Coast. The business in these cities is of sufficient importance to justify the Government in having its own accommodation. Under present conditions that is impossible, and all that is left for us is to go on and do the best we can, discontinuing some of these rented premises when the leases expire, if possible, and making the best business arrangement we can.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I want to draw the minister's attention to the needs of Outremont, with a population of about fifteen thousand persons, and distant about three miles from the general post office in Montreal. Outremont has no post office, whereas Maisonneuve, Westmount, and other communities in the environment of Montreal, are well provided for in that respect. It is very inconvenient for the people of Outre-

mont not to have proper postal facilities, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will be in a position at an early date to supply what is lacking in this respect. If the finances of the country do not permit it this year, I hope that next year the minister will be able to appropriate a reasonable amount to erect a good postoffice, because I can assure him that one is absolutely necessary.

Mr. CARVELL: It would give me the very greatest pleasure if I could erect public buildings for everybody, that is if they are necessary, and I have no doubt that a postal station for Outremont comes within that category. I think I have had some correspondence with a number of people about the provision of a station at Outremont. Nothing has been done and I am afraid that nothing can be done while conditions continue as at present. Just as soon as the financial affairs of Canada will warrant, it will give us great pleasure to do everything that ought to be done in order to meet the necessities of the public.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps it is the fault of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Du Tremblay) that the condition of which he complains exists, because had he not defeated the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) provision would have been made for a post office in Outremont. We were discussing a moment or two ago the question of the Government obtaining land in the city of Montreal for the purpose of building. I understand that the Government has a large block of land on McGill street, which was purchased several years ago from the Grey Nuns, and a portion of which was used for the erection of an examining warehouse for the Customs Department. The Government also went to the expense of piling the vacant land for further building when required. It seems to me that is an ideal place for a public building, and there ought to be no reason why the Government should cast about looking for other property when they have this land in their possession.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a fact that the Government owns a very desirable site on the location referred to by my hon. friend, one portion of which is occupied, I think, by an examining warehouse.

Mr. LEMIEUX: One portion is occupied by the new examining warehouse, and the other is intended for a customs house.

Mr. CARVELL: The other part is intended for a customs house, I think. The matter has been discussed as to whether that would not be a proper site on which to erect a large office building. We do not want any work of art, but simply a good, plain, fireproof office building, and one large enough to house all the public officials of the Federal Government in the city of Montreal.

Mr. JACOBS: The Government might be able to explain why it was that they went to the expense of piling that immense piece of vacant land for a building to be erected at some future time unknown to even the Government. There was an immense expense incurred in the piling of that ground at the same time when the piling was done for the building which was erected on part of that lot.

Mr. CARVELL: My information is that the work of constructing the foundation of the examining warehouse was done by the Foundation Company, a well-known contracting firm, and it was thought advisable at the same time to prepare a foundation on the adjoining lot so that whenever it was decided to go on with any extension that part of the work would be completed. This lot requires piling to ensure a suitable foundation and we have it.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the minister know that the interest on the money cost of piling this ground has been running on for years, and the Government does not, even now, know if they are going to put up any building on it. It does seem to me that it is very poor business to pile ground for some future occasion which may never arise.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, my hon. friend knows that the war has upset many of our calculations, and I have no doubt that when that work was done it was not anticipated that the conditions would be as they are at the present time. I know nothing about it, except the information which I have given my hon. friend. It is true we are paying interest, but if we had put up an expensive building we would be paying still more interest. However, that is just one of the incidents and exigencies of the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a matter of fact, the piling was started during the war, but not when my hon. friend was head of the department. Perhaps that explains the whole thing.

Mr. JACOBS: Perhaps the minister can tell us how much the piling on the unused

portion of the ground cost. I suppose the information is available?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, yes, but I have not got it here, as there is no item in the estimates for that work.

Quebec Post Office—Enlargement and alterations, $15,000.

Mr. CANNON: The minister told us that a contract had been awarded for a given amount. Is this in addition to the contract given?

Mr. CARVELL: It is to close up the existing contract.

Three Rivers—New Public Building, $20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will this item be cut out?

Mr. BUREAU: Might I ask a question?

Mr. CARVELL: I have some doubts about the expediency of this item.

Mr. BUREAU: So have I. That is why I rose. I would like to inquire if all Dominion officers will be under that roof when that building is completed?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know how many officers we have in Three Rivers. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that there will not be any vacant space in it, and if there are not more officers in Three Rivers than will fill up this building then all the public officers in Three Rivers will be in the public building.

Mr. BUREAU: The reason I inquire is this: the plans for this building were prepared before 1911; tenders were called for after 1911, when there was a change of Government. The lowest tenderer at that time for the original plan, which was large enough to accommodate all the Dominion officers in Three Rivers, was a firm of Liberals.

Mr. CARVELL: What were their names?

Mr. BUREAU: I think Collins, Giroux and Baptist.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it John Collins?

Mr. BUREAU: I think so, but not the one the hon. gentleman uses.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps that is the reason they did not get the contract.

Mr. BUREAU: Am I right in my statement as to the names of the original tenderers?

Mr. CARVELL: No, they were not the lowest tenderers. Verrette, McLeod and Ferron were the lowest.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the second tender. When they saw that the gentlemen I mentioned were the lowest tenderers, the plans were changed, and another tender was called for, and Mr. Verrette, who was a Tory friend of the Government, got the contract. He got it quite low, I understand. Mr. Verrette could not finish his contract. I would like to know how that matter was settled. The contract is now being finished by Mr. Bourque.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is he from Hull?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: He is a very good contractor.

Mr. BUREAU: I have no doubt that he is, judging by other work he has done in Three Rivers. He built the drill shed there. I do not want the information now, as the matter I refer to happened before my hon. friend took office. I would like to know how the Verrette company got out of the contract. I do not state this as a fact, but I understand they had a deposit with the Government as security for the contract, and that the progress estimates on this contract were largely exaggerated, and that even by forfeiting their deposit they were still overpaid for the contract when not one-quarter was completed. The information I want is, how was the Verrette contract settled? As to the Bourque contract, I have no doubt as to its being all right, and as to the work it is being properly done.

Mr. CARVELL: On February 19, 1917, an Order in Council was passed authorizing the closing of the contract with Verrette, McLeod and Ferron, who asked to be relieved of it, stating that they were not able to finish the work at the price agreed upon, namely, $163,495, due to the increased cost of material since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the minister any information about the suspension of the work from 1913 to 1917?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not find any in the note I have before me. The contractors also claim that, owing to a delay caused by a protest of the city of Three Rivers re an encroachment by the contractors on land owned by the city and used in connection with the construction of the building, they were unable to close with the sub-contractors for materials, and when they were ordered to resume work, war had been declared and prices had greatly increased. The final settlement was

as follows: Value of work done by contractors, $96,462.05; value of extra work done by contractors, $13,501; total amount paid to contractors, $109,963.05. New tenders were called for the completion of the work.

Mr. BUREAU: What was the value of the work done?

Mr. CARVELL: $109,963.05.

Mr. BUREAU: How much will you pay the new contractor?

Mr. CARVELL: The new contractor gets $87,500 for completing the work. There seems to be something else required besides that. The fittings would account for the extra amount. The expenditure to March 31, 1917, is $126,110. The probable expenditure for 1917-18 is $100,000. I do not know how much of that was expended, but, I presume, the most of it, because I see the revote is not very large.

Mr. BUREAU: The building is going on very nicely now.

Mr. CARVELL: The vote asked for now is $20,000. That will make a total estimated expenditure of $246,110, or practically a quarter of a million dollars. We confidently hope this amount will be quite sufficient to finish the building. If the building be sufficiently large to accommodate all the public services in that city, they will certainly be housed in that building.

Mr. BUREAU: The building, as first planned, would have been amply large to accommodate all Dominion officials in Three Rivers for the present, and also to have an examining warehouse and a Customs house with all the necessary additions. Every office was provided for. Each department was asked how much space it would require, and that information was given. The first tender amounted, I think, to $256,000.

Mr. CARVELL: $163,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I mean the first tender of all, not the Verrette tender. Tenders were called for twice. The first tender was cancelled because some Liberals were members of the firm that tendered lowest. Then the plan was cut down; the size of the building was reduced. You will now have to rent outside buildings to accommodate your officials, because in the present building, there is not enough room. I think a couple of the departments will be left out. When you accommodate the Inland Revenue Department, the Customs Department, the Post Office and the Public Works Department, you will have no room left for the personnel of the St. Maurice works, or for your engineers, and you will have to rent buildings. The original price was no more than it is going to cost for this smaller building. The minister tells me that the department has settled with Verrette, and I see the Order in Council recites that they could not go on because of a protest from the city council of Three Rivers. The firm had a shack which they used as an office. Part of that shack was on part of the property belonging to the city of Three Rivers. The shack was about 100 feet from the building. It had nothing to do with the building. The firm were driving horses and putting machinery all around. There was no excuse for doing so. They took the contract knowing they could not carry it out. They took it relying on being able to get extras. They got at loggerheads with the present Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), who is in Europe, and the extras were not recommended, and they stopped work. This work was stopped for three years without any reason or justification. During those three years they had carved in stone on the side of the building "Revenue de l'Intérieur," spelling "Revenu" with an "e" at the end of it. Then they took out the stone with the letter "e" on it, and I suppose they faced it around. I am told it cost the department $396 for a man to get up on a ladder, take the stone out and put it in again. They put a hitching post on the corner for the contractor's horse. I am mentioning these things, because, if the department wishes to throw away a quarter of a million dollars, we have a right to get a building worth that amount. The first plan that was prepared and for which tenders were called and submitted, and a contract practically let except for the fact that there were Liberals in the firm, was for a building worth $250,000, and it would have been one of the finest buildings in the province. I do not want to bother my hon. friend with those details. I know he is not responsible. I would, however, like him to get them from the department, and I ask for them publicly, because I know there has been, in the building of that post office at Three Rivers, "red-handed" robbery on the part of Tory firms in that city and their supporters in the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall give my hon. friend every bit of information in regard to the matter there is in the Public Works Department.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Three Rivers—New public building, $20,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to point out that the official name of Three Rivers is Trois Rivières.

Mr. BUREAU: The name has been changed on account of there being a Three Rivers in Michigan.

Kingston R. M. C. — Enlargement of educational block, $150,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Has that work been started?

Mr. CARVELL: No. I have had no opportunity of discussing the matter with those who are particularly interested, and I need more information than I have at present to justify me in starting this work. I am not saying that it will not be started, but very strong reasons will have to be given for this amount of work on the Royal Military College at the present time. The college has done a splendid work in the past, and I hope it will continue to do good work in the future, but what it will do in the next three or four years will not be of very much value in the winning of the present war. I will ask the House to vote this item, on the assurance that before spending anything we will seriously consider whether it is absolutely necessary at this time.

Ottawa departmental buildings—renewing metal covering on Mackenzie wing of West Block, $2,500.

Mr. MURPHY: Why is this item carried over from year to year?

Mr. CARVELL: It was too late in the season to have anything done last year, and we are therefore asking for a revote this year. The work is necessary, and I think will be done this year.

Ottawa Government Printing Bureau—freight elevators, $9,500.

Mr. CARVELL: These are being installed at the present time under contract with Otis-Fensom.

Mr. MURPHY: In what part of the building?

Mr. CARVELL: I understand in practically the same location as the old elevators. The price struck me as being pretty high when the contract was signed, but we have found in calling for tenders for elevators in the new Parliament building that elevators are an expensive item, and we cannot get them any cheaper.

Mr. MURPHY: In view of the congestion at the Bureau I was wondering whether a shaft was going to be erected outside the building for these elevators.

Mr. CARVELL: I think not.

Toronto—Postal station "A," $300,000.

Mr. CARVELL: The Public Works Department is bearing a certain percentage of the cost of the new station building on Front street, Toronto, part of which will be used by the post office. This is our share of the cost this year.

Edmonton—Government's share of cost of permanent pavement on Jasper Avenue crossing Government property occupied by Alberta Penitentiary, including interest thereon at 5 per cent., $21,200.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain this item, and say why interest is included?

Mr. CARVELL: It seems that a pavement 80 feet wide and practically a mile in length was constructed in front of the penitentiary property on Jasper avenue in 1914. The total cost of the whole frontage was $34,919. The share assumed by the city was $9,103, the Government's share being $25,815. There is another item of 3,766 feet of which the Government's share is $18,008, the interest on which, since January 1, 1915, amounts to about $3,000, the total being $21,159, and we are asking for $21,000. An arrangement was made under which we should pay a certain proportion of the cost of paving the street, and this is to close the transaction.

Mr. MURPHY: Why was the money not paid before in order to save interest?

Mr. CARVELL: I think the work was done by the city, and perhaps they were so wealthy in Edmonton that they did not require the money and only lately realized the fact that they were entitled to it. However, if we had paid the money three years ago we should have been out the interest, so it is the same thing.

Victoria—Old post office building—to pay taxes due the city for the year 1917, $1,578.47.

Mr. McKENZIE: What taxes are these?

Mr. CARVELL: This is an old building now leased by the Government to private individuals. When the Government owns property which it leases to other parties, I understand it pays the taxes. Personally I never could see why the Government should not pay taxes on all property which it owns throughout the Dominion. I am not laying that down as the policy of

the Government; I am only stating my private views on the subject.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the revenue from this property?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not that information, but I will get it for my hon. friend. This item has been voted yearly since 1900.

Yukon Territory—Dawson post office—vault, $10,000

Mr. COPP: Is that work to be done this year?

Mr. CARVELL: The vote was taken last year, but the money was not expended. In Dawson difficulty is experienced in obtaining proper foundations for such works as vaults. The population of Dawson is decreasing, and a Bill has been, or is to be, introduced by the Minister of the Interior providing for the reconstruction and rearrangement of governmental affairs in the Yukon Territory. I hope that there will be a very great reduction in the expenditure there. I am not in a position, therefore, to say positively whether or not this work will go on, but I am morally certain that it will not.

Ottawa public buildings—Dominion Observatory and Geodetic Survey building—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $230,000.

Mr. CARVELL: In all probability this item will not meet the expenditure. I wish to place myself on record in this respect, because the cost of fuel is advancing rapidly. It may be necessary to put an item in the Supplementary Estimates under this head. We have purchased 10,000 cords of wood and intend to see whether we can heat these buildings, at least to some extent, with wood during the coming winter. The wood is really costing more than coal, having regard to its heating value.

Mr. TOBIN: How much per cord?

Mr. CARVELL: It is $10 or $11 for hardwood. That is less than the price in many parts of Canada.

Ottawa public buildings—Repairs, furniture, grounds, snow and street maintenance, etc., $450,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is a very large item.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a large item, but I do not know of any way to reduce it. If my hon. friend can tell me some way of cutting it down I will be very glad indeed to take his suggestion.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CHISHOLM: Less furniture and cheaper furniture.

Mr. CARVELL: Unless you can find any cheaper furniture than we have around this room, or than you have in the ordinary rooms occupied by members, you cannot find any fault on account of extravagance there. This is a sample of the furniture that is being purchased by the department all over the city. To be serious about it, the difficulty is that the Civil Service has increased very materially since the beginning of the war and they all require furniture, rugs and things of that kind to make their offices habitable. This item also includes repairs. I suppose the ordinary man is very much like the ordinary woman. When a man rents a house the first thing his wife wants is to have new paper on the walls, to have the house painted and to have everything rearranged. It is about the same thing in the departments. When they get into an office building they want the old partitions torn down, new partitions set up and painted and the walls kalsomined. I do not know of any way of stopping it. I am putting on the brakes as best I can, but I do not see much hope of reducing the item to any great extent.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Is this sum expended just in Ottawa or all over Canada?

Mr. CARVELL: Just in Ottawa.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: You are maintaining the streets here?

Mr. CARVELL: No, just public buildings.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The item says "street maintenance, etc." If I could have the city of Montreal made the capital we would have lots of money expended in our city for removing snow and doing all those other things.

Mr. CARVELL: There is a large portion of Wellington street, extending from the Chateau as far as the old Perley Home, which has been built and is maintained, at the expense of the Government. This also includes certain expenditures in the parks, taking care of the walks around the different buildings, the driveways and things of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the lawns?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, it covers the lawns too.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I see that in 1917-18, $450,000 was voted and spent for this purpose. How is it that you again need $450,000 for the same service? If you put the street in good order and provided furniture for the departments, why should you need $450,000 again?

Mr. CARVELL: I am very much afraid we require it.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: You are repeating all the time.

Mr. CARVELL: I would think that we were doing pretty well if we got through with that amount of money. I admit this is a large amount, but when you consider there are some 10,000 civil servants in the Government employ at Ottawa and that all of these people have to be housed, taken care of and provided with furniture, you will realize there is need for this amount. Then there is the annual maintenance of streets. That does not mean the building of new streets but the maintenance of streets. There is sweeping, cutting grass on lawns, shovelling snow and all those things which are an annual charge.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Are these civil servants exempt from taxes in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: Away back many years ago when the Improvement Commission was created, the Government granted very large sums of money and the commission started out upon a very extensive plan of improvement. In view of that the city of Ottawa agreed to forego taxes to a certain extent upon civil servants. I do not know exactly all the details but that is the general principle. I think the city also gives the Government free water and fire services. It is an arrangement that was made years ago between the municipal authorities of the city of Ottawa and the Government.

Telephone service, $62,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is this item for?

Mr. CARVELL: This is for telephone service for the various departments, including this building. It is growing and, I think, growing faster than it ought to. I do not know whether there is any way of paring it down or not. I think there is, myself. I want to say, however, in justice to the Bell Telephone Company that the rates charged are very reasonable when you compare them with the rates charged in other cities of Canada and the United States of practically the same population. I do not believe there is any city in which the rates generally are as low as they are in Ottawa. But I think there are more telephones in use than there ought to be, that there is a very extravagant system in the management of the phones. The difficulty is that we have neither one thing nor the other; we have neither private branch exchanges nor direct service connections. In my judgment, there should be private branch exchanges everywhere. Unless you have private branch exchanges everywhere then they should be nowhere. Perhaps this is regulated better, in so far as the telephone system is concerned, in the Militia Department than anywhere else. There they have over 200 telephones that are connected with a private branch exchange, but they also have 25 or 30 direct service phones. That means 25 or 30 main lines going into the different offices. Then, again, another difficulty about having private branch exchanges all over the service arises from the fact that, on account of being so cramped for space, there is practically no department of the Government that is housed in one building or in two buildings alongside of each other. Suppose an arrangement could be made by which the Militia Department could have all of the Woods building and all of the Canadian building. Probably then they could have a private branch exchange, and only have sufficient direct wires—probably 15 or 20—to take care of the traffic. In that way you would very materially reduce the cost of the telephone service. But when you have your Militia Department in probably eight or ten different buildings, it is almost impossible to bring the whole service in under a "P.B.X." Then, again, there are many departments that have made no attempt to have private branch exchanges at all. Probably there is no greater sinner in that respect than the Department of Public Works. We are pretty well segregated in the Western Block. We have offices in a number of other buildings, but still the great majority of our telephones are in one block. This is a case where a private branch exchange could be economically installed, and in going over the list I think I could cut out about one-half of the telephones and save money by such an installation. In going over the list of telephones it was a surprise to me to find the number of people in my department who are enjoying the luxury of a telephone, not only in their offices, but in their residences also. Of course the higher officials should have tele-

phones in their residences. I only had the opportunity during the last hour of going over this item, and it certainly has set me thinking. Another sinner in the matter of telephones is the Interior Department. They have no private branch exchange either. The Marine and Fisheries Department are also offenders. But probably the worst of all is the Inland Revenue Department. What on earth they want with all the telephones they have got in that department is a mystery to me, every one of them being a direct line from the Ottawa Central Exchange;—I am making a fairly open confession to-night. I have not had an earlier opportunity of going into the matter, but I think I can effect some saving next year in the matter of telephone service in the departments in this city. I cannot go as far as common business judgment would tell me to go in the matter of private branch exchanges, in view of the Government buildings being spread so generally as they are over the city. On the other hand, there are a number of private branch exchanges installed which never should have been installed. For instance, there are some cases in which ten or fifteen phones have got a private branch exchange. Well, ten 'phones at $40 each would only be $400, and it would cost $800 or $900 to run a private branch exchange of that dimension. The whole thing is, I am sorry to say, without any head, tail, or anything else; the idea seems to be simply go on and spend money. It is my hope that I will be able to reduce this item very materially.

Fittings and general supplies and furniture, $100,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: What are the fittings intended for?

Mr. CARVELL: This item, together with a number that follows, relates to the public buildings all over the Dominion. Demands arise, it may be for filing cases, or furniture of some kind, or it may be that a building has been partly destroyed by fire and the furniture has to be repaired.

Heating, $305,000.

Mr. CAHILL: How do you figure out reducing the cost of heating when the cost of coal is going up so much?

Mr. CARVELL: A great number of land offices have been closed in the West, and we will pursue a system of consolidation as far as we can. We have been giving this matter very careful consideration, and we have come to the conclusion that we can make a saving in this important item. I am informed that last year's vote was abnormally high because the department had got behind, and a pretty large amount was provided in the supplementaries to pay off the bills. Now we have practically a clean sheet, and believe that we can keep the expenditure down to the amount we are asking for.

Rents, $840,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Why have the rents increased so much? Does this amount provide for the whole of Canada, or is it limited to the city of Ottawa?

Mr. CARVELL: It includes buildings throughout Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: There is an increase of $65,000, what is the reason of that?

Mr. CARVELL: Every body who rents buildings in Canada will find that rents are going up. I do not know of any way of keeping them down.

Salaries of caretakers, engineers, firemen, etc., $600,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Are the janitors supposed to live in these buildings as a general rule?

Mr. CARVELL: It is intended that they should.

Mr. CHISHOLM: They do not always do so.

Mr. COPP: Does this vote apply to the whole of Canada?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Yukon Public Buildings—Rents, repairs, fuel, light, water service and caretakers' salaries, $55,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I am asking for that amount of money although I am very sure indeed that by the arrangements we have made we shall be able to reduce it. I think it will be possible to close up entirely one building at Dawson, and bring the offices into what is called the Administration building. The cost of maintenance of buildings in Dawson City is abnormally high, they have to be heated pretty nearly all the time, and, of course, salaries are necessarily larger there than anywhere else in Canada.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Barrington's Cove, Sydney Mines—partial reconstruction of wharf, $1,100.

Mr. McKENZIE: In a terrific gale a certain block of this very useful structure was carried away. Does the minister think the vote is sufficient to finish the wharf?

Mr. CARVELL: This is an estimate that was given to me by Assistant District Engineer Cunningham on January 18 last. He gives the items, so many creosoted logs, so many poles, stone ballast, and so forth, and he puts the amount at $1,100.

Mr. McKENZIE: The block to which I refer was driven ashore and possibly can be got back into place again at a very small cost. Will the repairs be done by day's work.

Mr. CARVELL: The amount is so small I do not believe it can be done otherwise. It merely consists of putting in here and there a few logs and poles, and things of that kind. I think it must be done by day work.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would suggest that the work be attended to as soon as possible, otherwise the usefulness of this wharf will be impaired.

Mr. CARVELL: It will be attended to. Just as soon as the money is voted it is the intention to proceed with all these works at the earliest possible moment.

Feltzen South — Repairs to breakwater, $1,100.

Mr. DUFF: I regret to say that this item should not be necessary. This breakwater has been completed only five years. In my judgment, if the work had been properly done in the first place, by persons who understood the construction of a breakwater, it would not be necessary to spend this amount of money five years after its completion. Tenders were called for this work about six years ago, and a tender was put in for about $12,000. For some reason best known to the department that tender was not accepted. New tenders were called for, and the contract was awarded, I think, for $15,000. In addition to this, after the work was started, some changes were made, and the total cost amounted to $17,000. I might say that the reason the work is not satisfactory is because the contract was awarded to a tailor, the foreman was a mason, and the inspector a shoemaker. That is how the public money was spent. I was very pleased to hear this afternoon that the Minister of Public Works is making a change in the way such work will be done. I might say, as far as the engineer at Halifax, Mr. Morrison, is concerned, and Mr. Freeman, the gentleman who generally has charge of work in Lunenburg county, both are excellent men, and the minister is safe in taking work of this kind out of the hands of politicians, myself included, and leaving it in the hands of competent engineers. I would suggest to the minister that, on account of the conditions under which Mr. Freeman, the engineer, has had to work in the last few years, explicit instructions be given him not to notice politicians on either side. If that is done, it will satisfy me, and be in the public interest.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to assure my hon. friend that the engineer was notified some four months ago to do exactly the things that he is suggesting to-night.

Jamesville — Completion of breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is an old friend of the minister and myself.

Mr. CARVELL: I don't recognize it, I am sure.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to know what he is doing about this breakwater. It was never any good, and never will be. It will have to be born again before it will be of any service to the country. I have always said to the minister that any expenditure on it should be dropped under its present plan of construction, and that it should be rebuilt. We had some correspondence about this work last winter, and last summer I had it up in this House. I stated then that there was no use spending money on it until there was a different plan and a new beginning. Last winter, whatever remained in the water of that magnificient structure was thrown over, and there is nothing at all standing there now, as I am informed by the people in that community. I advise the minister to get proper plans prepared, and to go about the work in a businesslike way. It was always too small a structure for the purpose intended. A proper plan was prepared in 1910 or 1911, and a vote put in the Estimates, as will appear in the records of the department. After the change of Government, the matter was dropped altogether. For political reasons, it was found necessary, in 1914, I think, to erect something that would look like a breakwater, and a small vote was put in the Estimates, and a frail structure was planned by the advice of some politicians, and that thing was put in the water. But the Bras d'Or lakes were not in sympathy with political connivings, they were unwilling to stand for any camouflage or fooling of that kind and the force of the tide smashed the structure. I ask the minister to go back to the proper plan of 1910. The work

is a necessity as a shelter for the good fishermen of that portion of Bras d'Or lake. I would advise the minister not to spend more money on the 1914 plan, which is absolutely no good and serves no useful purpose.

Mr. CARVELL: I do recognize this as an old friend, now that my hon. friend calls attention to it, and have before me some discussion which took place in this House last September. I find from the records of the department that after the discussion a copy of Hansard was sent to Mr. Bernasconi, the engineer in charge of the work in that portion of Cape Breton Island, and the following is the answer which he sent:

With reference to the remarks made by Mr. McKenzie, M.P., on this subject, when discussing Public Works Estimates on the 4th September, 1917, I beg to say that the only portion of the breakwater which has gone to pieces is the unfinished section of the work, and with regard to the stability of the work, I fully believe that when properly completed it will be sufficiently strong to stand the pressure to which it will be subjected, bearing in mind that this work is on the shore of the Bras d'Or Lake and not on the Atlantic shore.

I am very much obliged, indeed, to my hon. friend for calling attention to it. Of course, he will understand that we are compelled to take the advice of the engineer of the department on matters of this kind, unless we receive information which shows us that the engineer's judgment is wrong. I should be very glad, indeed, to receive any information which the hon. gentleman, or any other member, can give us, because I do not want to spend money, even if it be a small amount, unless it is properly expended. There has been a great deal of correspondence over this matter, and really there is nothing to do but to stand by the engineer until I am satisfied that he is not worthy of my support.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will ask the engineer for another report he will find that what I have stated took place since that report was written. What he has reported to the minister to be all right has gone to smash since.

Mr. CARVELL: Since last September?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, sometime in the early part of the winter.

Mr. CARVELL: That is news to us.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was news to me when I heard it first, but it is not news to me now. I knew then I was right, notwithstanding the fact that the engineer is so devoted to his baby. He made a proper plan first in 1910, but he was forced to make a different plan, and the correspondence in the office will show that when Mr. Bernasconi was asked to make a plan of a breakwater there that would cost $5,000, he said it could not be done; that for $5,000 you could not put anything there that would serve any useful purpose. Political pressure was brought to bear upon him, and he was forced to make a report for a structure there to cost $5,000. He was driven from his original position. Now he is staying by his last report; he is trying to protect it. Since he wrote that report, I am informed by people in the community, the balance of this structure has gone to smash and I have no hesitation in putting myself against the engineer by stating that what remains of that structure cannot be of any service. I ask the minister to get an independent report on the structure if Mr. Bernasconi says that is going to serve any useful purpose. It will not; it is no good. That is the opinion of everybody in the neighbourhood. The minister can readily understand that Mr. Bernasconi, having been forced from his first position by political pressure of some kind, and having been obliged to report on this, is now standing by it. I am not blaming him for doing so as long as he can. He does not wish to admit that he was forced to advise the building of a structure that was of no use. Since he wrote that report a more violent gale has smashed the structure so that it is worse than it was before. That is the condition it is in to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: I can assure my hon. friend that independent advice will be taken upon the matter, and I shall see that no money is expended there until it is expended on a wharf that will be as permanent as a wharf of that kind can be made under those conditions.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is all very well to speak of this being on the shore of Bras d'Or lake. It is on the shore of the lake at a point where the lake is about 25 miles wide, and it is exposed to the full wind that you get over such an extent of water. That is no sheltered mill-pond.

Margaree harbour—repairs and improvements, $10,900.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What are these repairs and improvements?

Mr. CARVELL: This amount of $10,900 is asked for by District Engineer Bernasconi for works described as follows:

(a) To complete the construction of a square timber block, 200 feet long and 10 feet wide, back of weakened portion of breakwater, com-

menced during 1917-18. The sum of $4,800 was voted for 1917-18, for the construction of this work, but owing to the lateness of the season when the expenditure was authorized, it is not expected that more than one-half of the work will be completed during the present fiscal year. The estimated cost to complete is $2,400.

(b) The construction of a sand groin off beach on eastern side of harbour to arrest sand and prevent shoaling up of channel, work to consist of round timber cribwork, 550 feet in length and from ten to thirty feet in width. The estimated cost of the proposed work is $8,500.

The two items make a total of $10,900.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the intention of the minister to go on with this sand groin immediately?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Have the repairs on the breakwater been completed?

Mr. CARVELL: No; $4,800 was voted at the last session of Parliament, and only about one-half of that amount has been expended. The engineer estimates it will take the remaining $2,400 to finish the breakwater, and $8,500 for the sand groin.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Every session for the last five years I have endeavoured to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the expenditure of money in the following year. I made, of course, no impression upon him. He proceeded every year to spend the money down there in October. Anybody, knowing anything about the shores of Western Cape Breton during the latter part of September, October and November, knows it is impossible to get fifty cents worth of work out of a dollar spent. The former Minister of Public Works knew this. I repeatedly told him, both privately and on the floor of the House. Last fall they began to spend this money in October. They proceeded with the work during the winter months. I think the greatest exhibition of incompetency I ever saw was the method pursued by the foremen on the work during last winter. Two or three foremen were there and half a dozen workmen. They were doing the best they could under the circumstances, because men would not go to work at that time of the year. They were working even in the severest weather, or at least attempting to work. When I left my home they were at work. Since then, I understand, they have ceased work. This method of procedure is absolutely absurd, and I cannot understand how the officials would permit it. I do not blame the minister because this is a small matter, and he cannot be expected to watch every corner and creek in the country. What I find fault with is that the officials of the department would allow this work to go on at this time of the year. I particularly blame district engineers, who are in charge there. There are engineers travelling back and forth. I made inquiry, and I was told that more work could be accomplished in the winter than in the summer. I am not an engineer, but I know something about the coast and about the work. I know that such a statement is absolute nonsense. I knew what would happen. The work is not finished, and it will not be finished for a while, but the money was spent, and I fear that the work already constructed will be carried away by the storms if not properly ballasted. The ice is the greatest safeguard we have for this work just now. A great deal of the new work is not ballasted, and any one knowing anything at all about work of that kind along the coast knows the danger of the whole work being carried away. I know I am appealing to a minister who will listen to me, and a man of business instincts, and I know he will see that those expenditures are not made at a time of the year when it is impossible to do the work and get value for the money expended. I protest for the sixth time against this method of expending the appropriation at this time of the year. I have repeatedly informed the department this fall what was going on with respect to this work but surmise the minister was not informed, and that my complaints were not put before him.

9 p.m.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first time I have heard of this matter, and it is, of course, a surprise to me that work should be carried on under such conditions as my hon. friend has described. There again, I suppose we are compelled to rely upon the engineer until we are satisfied he is not competent. If evidences like this multiply sufficiently, drastic action may be required. I can, however, assure my hon. friend that this matter will be thoroughly investigated, and whatever work is to be done there in the future will be done in the summer time if men can be obtained. I do not know to what extent delay may be caused on account of the labour question. If the work cannot be done in the summer time, it will not be done at all; work will not be done in the winter time. I can also promise my hon. friend that in the future no foremen will be engaged on that work without labourers under them.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would also ask the minister for his assurance that this fearful creature "patronage" will vanish from that part of the country.

Mr. CARVELL: I think my hon. friend had some evidence a few months ago that patronage had vanished so far as I was concerned.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I reported to the minister what went on down there, and he sent instructions to the foreman, but the foreman did not act on those instructions as faithfully as I desired, and carried on his patronage as usual both in the matter of labour and in the distribution of lumber. Favouritism in the selection of labour was quite evident, although pretentions were made that an effort was being made to carry out the minister's request. This lumber might very well have been supplied by the people around, but instead of that the job was handed over to two merchants and they controlled the distribution. It might, perhaps, be said that these men were more capable of supplying the lumber on short notice, but that is not true. The people who could supply it on the shortest notice were the people in the immediate vicinity, but these men were not given a chance to furnish the material. I regard this policy as unbusinesslike and partisan.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I would like to ask the hon. member for Inverness if any improvement has been made in the little harbour of the little island immediately opposite Port Hood. I had occasion to visit there several years ago, and I saw a very beautiful natural little harbour in the island being gradually filled up at the entrance. I took some interest in the matter and endeavoured to get the channel opened, but did not succeed at the time.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I must thank my hon. friend for his assistance at that time; I had his very active co-operation. There was some dredging done there, but very little. It is a natural harbour, and of great service to the people around there. My hon. friend is not likely to forget it, because he had an unpleasant experience there and lost a very valuable piece of property. There has not been as much work done at this place as either I or my hon. friend would like, but I have a strong feeling that something will be done in the near future. I am promoting the matter. I am also endeavouring to get the work of finishing the closing of the northern entrance of Port Hood harbour and am assured that this work will be resumed just as soon as the finances of the country will permit.

Mosher's Bay — Repairs to breakwater, $1,300.

Mr. DUFF: I see by the Auditor General's Report for 1917 (page V—151) that $3,697.61 was expended on this work last year. I see that S. G. Rawding rented his dory for ninety-four days at 25 cents a day; tools, June-October, 120 days, at $1.50; gasoline boat, 65 days, at $5. I really cannot see why it was necessary to hire this dory and gasoline boat. I do not know of any work they could be used for. I might also say, after reading some letters I received from my constituents last week calling my attention to the fact that this gentleman figured in certain tenders for logs for a breakwater in the county of Lunenburg, that in my opinion the logs could be purchased at a much lower price if new tenders were called for.

Mr. CARVELL: What is the tender price?

Mr. DUFF: I only have the information given in these letters.

Mr. CARVELL: I should like to have the information, and then I will certainly follow it up.

Mr. DUFF: I shall be very pleased to write to the minister about it.

Ross' Ferry—Repairs to wharf, $750.

Mr. McKENZIE: How will this work be done?

Mr. CARVELL: This is to renew the top of the outer block of the wharf built by the department in 1896-97. It consists of a small amount of round creosoted timber, native timber, etc. I imagine that the work will have to be done by day's labour. I doubt very much if it would be economical to have specifications drawn for a small work like that.

Mr. McKENZIE: There may be some difficulty in drawing specifications, but the wharf is in a very public place and it is easy of access. I have no objection to everybody getting a share of work of this kind in a country place like this, but I do fear that unless specific instructions are given to Mr. Bernasconi he will fall into exactly the same line he always finds it convenient to fall into. He is a very good engineer, but we have heard of a good man in the old days who had the leprosy although he was a very excellent gentleman. Mr. Bernasconi has the political

leprosy; he cannot be anything else but a fearful Tory; that is what he is from start to finish, from Sunday morning until Saturday night.

Mr. CARVELL: We will try to make a benevolent Unionist out of him.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have never seen a benevolent Unionist yet, and until I do, I will not ask for the reconstruction of any one in that mould. I am not finding fault with Mr. Bernasconi; he thinks that nobody else is right unless he is a Tory; that is his religion; he was brought up that way. The minister might as well give up saying that patronage is abolished if he leaves matters in the hands of Mr. Bernasconi, because that gentleman will favour his old friends in the same old way. If Grits and Tories alike get this work, I do not object, but I am not satisfied that the old system should be followed while pharisaical professions with regard to the abolition of patronage are being made.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Bernasconi has received and will receive instructions which will convert him and make him a new man. I have no doubt that I have the power of persuasion to cause him to be converted, and that henceforth no cause for complaint will be found.

Mr. JOHN C. DOUGLAS: I agree with the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) that there is evidence of patronage in Mr. Bernasconi's office. For instance, the foreman of the Jamesville wharf had been a Conservative, but a few months ago, when Mr. Bernasconi had occasion to continue the work, he appointed a foreman who had acted in that capacity under the Liberals. If my information is correct, the recommendation for the latter's appointment came from the member for North Cape Breton.

Mr. CARVELL: It did not come from my department. I do not know what took place in Cape Breton; they have peculiar ways down there.

Mr. McKENZIE: The member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Douglas) is misinformed if he believes that I had anything to do with naming the gentleman who carried out the small repairs to the breakwater at Jamesville. In September last, before the present minister assumed office, and when the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) was Acting Minister of Public Works, I made the statement in the House that the work was not being properly conducted—and that was when I could not possibly hope to exercise any patronage in that connection. I was given to understand at that time by persons from that part of the country that the deficiency in the work was due to the fact that a man named McNeill, who was a good blacksmith, but knew nothing whatever about building wharves, was in charge of it. When there was talk last winter about starting the work again, Bernasconi told me that he had been asked to take on the same foreman. He admitted that this man did not know anything about building a wharf, and I said: I am not going to recommend a man; I do not know anybody in that district who is a wharf builder. He then suggested that a man named Campbell be appointed, who had been the first foreman on the work and had been originally given the position by the Tories. The member for South Cape Breton knows that not a log, a stick or a stone had been put on the foundation of this wharf in our days, and that he himself is the author—and possibly will be the finisher—of this Tory, picayune work that is going on in such a haphazard, incomplete and incompetent way. Campbell had been appointed under Tory rule, on the recommendation, I assume, of the member for South Cape Breton, who was running the machine in Victoria county at that time. For some reason, this blacksmith had been able to outdo Campbell and take the job from him—one Tory took the job from another. Campbell knew how to build a wharf, but McNeill did not. When Bernasconi suggested that Campbell be given the job, I said I did not care whether he was a Campbell or a Macdonald or what he was; that a good man should be obtained; so Bernasconi took Campbell on in connection with the small expenditure that was made last year. I had nothing whatever to do with it; he was no friend or supporter of mine and never had been.

Mr. CARVELL: A re-arrangement of the engineering services in Nova Scotia will be made in the very near future. I cannot say what will be done, because the department has not arrived at any definite decision. But I assure members of the Committee—Liberals, Conservatives, Unionists, Opposition—that if Mr. Bernasconi or anybody else cannot get along without playing the patronage game, I will move him somewhere where he will not be bothered with that sort of thing.

South Ingonish—To repair and reconstruct beach protection, $1,900.

Mr. McKENZIE: I say the same thing about this item: I hope that care will be

taken to ensure a proper expenditure of the money.

Mr. FIELDING: May I be permitted to renew a request which I made of the minister some days ago? This list of repairs, so far as it goes, is all right, but it is quite obvious that the list is inadequate and incomplete. It was prepared some months ago, and since then later reports of the engineers covering damage during the severe winter, have been received by the department. I should be obliged if the minister would see that the later reports of the engineers are examined, and if additional urgent works and repairs are found to be needed, that—on the strength of the engineer's report, not because I ask it—the work be done.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a reasonable request. I am informed by the deputy that some works have been so reported on, and if it be found on investigation that the $60,000 voted for harbours and rivers generally, is not sufficient, I will ask Parliament in the Supplementary Estimates to make the necessary provision for the additional expenditure. Without some protection it is impossible for fishermen to carry on their vocation, and I am much in sympathy with the maintenance of these small public works. While I should not care to promise that any large sums of money will be expended, I will have investigation made and will ask Parliament to vote such additional sums as may be really necessary.

Prince Edward Island—Harbours and rivers generally, repairs and improvements, $14,000.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I assume that the minister will make the same promise with regard to Prince Edward Island that he has made with regard to Nova Scotia?

Mr. CARVELL: Most certainly. If it be found really necessary to do so, I will not hesitate to ask Parliament to grant money for the maintenance of the present services or the making of needed repairs.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Who is doing the dredging at the new Port Borden? Is that under the Public Works Department or the Railway Department?

Mr. CARVELL: That is under the Department of Railways and Canals.

Miminigash Harbour—Repairs to breakwaters, $2,000.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: What are they going to do at Miminigash? My information is that the breakwaters there are

[Mr. McKenzie.]

in pretty bad shape. I do not know what the repairs will cost. Have you had a report from the engineer lately?

Mr. CARVELL: The report which we have comes from the district engineer, Mr. Hyndman. He says that $2,000 is asked for repairs to the south breakwater and to reconstruct the inner portion of the northern breakwater. He states that the greater portion of the Miminigash breakwater is of very old and indifferent construction, going back to 1878. There are various items, such as covering planks, piles, timber, floor stringers and things of that kind.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Is that a recent report?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, as late as January 30, 1918.

Summerside—Repairs to breakwater, $750.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: What are you going to do in connection with the Summerside breakwater?

Mr. CARVELL: This is to repair damaged and worn portions of the outer block, which is exposed to running ice—hardwood sheeting, piles, iron bolts, and some other items.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: What is the date of that report?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not seem to have the date in my notes.

Mr. BUTTS: Would the minister put into the Estimates a small allowance for a wharf that was destroyed at Sydney mines in December or January? It was built a few years ago. It is in the constituency of my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) but it is very near my house.

Mr. CARVELL: I will settle this right off—we will build it.

Mr. BUTTS: Repair it.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, repair it.

Mr. BUTTS: That will do.

Mr. McKENZIE: I might remind my good friend, neighbour and constituent that we dealt with that this evening.

Mr. BUTTS: I was not in.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad to remind my hon. friend that I did not forget his front lawn while he was outside.

Mr. CARVELL: You see, I was overgenerous.

Cape Bald — Repairs to breakwater pier, $3,100.

Mr. COPP: What do you propose to do at Cape Bald breakwater?

Mr. CARVELL: An appropriation of $4,000 is asked by District Engineer Stead to construct four large concrete caissons to be placed about the outer corners of the pier, to reinforce the work which is partly broken there, and ten smaller caissons to protect the face of the work. The estimated cost of the four larger caissons is $400 each, and the total amount proposed to be voted is $3,100.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister the names of the gentlemen who have charge of the work?

Mr. CARVELL: I could not give the name of any one except Mr. Stead, the district engineer.

Mr. COPP: You have not the names of the foremen?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Richibucto Beach—breakwater—repairs, and improvements, $800.

Mr. LEGER: Is this supposed to be for the North Beach breakwater or the South Beach breakwater?

Mr. CARVELL: That is not the "sawdust wharf" you are referring to?

Mr. LEGER: Sawdust? No, the South Beach breakwater.

Mr. CARVELL: I beg your pardon.

Mr. LEGER: That sawdust wharf belongs to the old order and I would not refer to it here to-night. I am surprised that it is mentioned by the minister.

Mr. CARVELL: This amount of $800 is asked by District Engineer Stead who states that the ends of both breakwaters are being cut into by the ice and it is proposed to put in stone at a cost of $600, and also to build some breastworks to protect the beach works. He says that the appropriation for 1917-18 was $1,600. I do not think any work was done last year at all. Is this not the work that has been referred to so many times in this House as the "sawdust wharf?"

Mr. LEGER: The work is on the beach and it is three miles away from the "sawdust wharf." Are these the only items recommended by the district engineer for the county of Kent? The sum of $800 seems to be a pretty small provision to meet the public works which have not yet been completed in that county. For example, Richibucto Cape, Buctouche Beach and Kouchibouguac Beach breakwaters yet remain unfinished. There is also Little Gully breakwater, for the construction of which a large sum was voted three or four years ago. A large amount of material in the shape of stone and timber and other stuff was hauled to the spot and left there. This winter part of the stone was hauled to Richibucto Cape breakwater, a few miles away, and the timber was hauled away for firewood. There are lots of works needing attention along the shore, and I hesitate to believe that the reason why these works have not received attention is because of the change made in the representation from the county of Kent. I prefer to think it is due to war-time necessities.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as I know, this is the first request that has been made to me or to the department for any further expenditure of money in Kent county. I am not in a position to state what the engineer may have reported, or what may have been stated to the engineer. I take the items as I find them, and this is the only item which I find for the county of Kent. I would, perhaps, take it that public works have been so well looked after in the county of Kent of late years that probably no necessity exists for making further expenditures at the present time. There is a general vote of $40,000, which will cover small repairs for which necessity may arise during the season, and if any accidents during the winter have necessitated repairs I give the hon. gentleman the same answer that I have given to other hon. gentlemen to-night.

Mr. LEGER: I do not know what the expenditure on Richibucto Cape breakwater has been, but work on it was undertaken last winter and was in progress when I left in March to come to Ottawa. I agree with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) that it is a poor policy to undertake such work in winter time; it is simply money thrown away. I do not think it is fair to limit the expenditure for work of this kind to $800 for the whole county when there are sixty miles of shore needing attention, many of which remain uncompleted. If the Government have determined not to proceed with these works all well and good, but as the representative of the county, I consider myself justified in asking that something be done to keep them in good repair. I do not blame the minister for neglecting to take proper mea-

sures; it is the district engineer who is responsible for all this work. That officer should have visited all these places and reported as to what was necessary.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope the voters in the county of Kent will not blame their member. I have not heard anything from him until to-night, but we will try and make a proper distribution of the blame. I hope he is willing to take his share. I am perfectly willing to take mine, and I presume the engineer is in the same boat.

Mr. LEGER: The only reason the minister did not hear from me was that in view of the abolition of the patronage system I thought any representations which I might make would have very little effect.

St. John River and tributaries—To provide full and final contribution to local government, not to exceed one-half cost of certain wharves built by it in tidal waters, $5,923.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the item for?

Mr. CARVELL: For a great many years there has been a sort of partnership existing in the province of New Brunswick between the federal and the provincial authorities, under which each authority contributed one-half towards the cost of these works. During the past six or eight years however, a number of works were built wholly by the local government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In connection with the lumber business?

Mr. CARVELL: No, they are wharves on the St. John river and its tributaries. These wharves are used for steamboats which ply on the St. John river during the whole time the river is free from ice, which is about seven months each year, and every wharf was a necessary landing place for the steamers. A number of these wharves were built and the contributions were not made by the Dominion. When I assumed office I came to the conclusion that the work should be assumed entirely either by one Government or the other, and I take it that trade and navigation are matters within the purview of the federal authorities. I met the Minister of Public Works for New Brunswick, and we came to a settlement under which we agreed to pay them $5,923 to close up the transaction, and the wharves now belong to the Federal Government. The provincial authorities will pass the legislation necessary to confirm the title, and we will get rid of this hybrid partnership which has not produced very much benefit in past years.

[Mr. Leger.]

Quebec, Anse aux Gascons—Repairs to wharf, $10,600.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just a word, and then there will be a landslide with respect to all these items. I happen to represent one of these maritime constituencies, and found during my visit last fall that many of the most important works built along the coast had been partially washed away by the seas during heavy storms. I would not, under present circumstances, ask the minister to reconstruct all of these works.

During the past six or seven years the county has been very much neglected. I would not care to ask for the reconstruction of all those works that have gone to waste. But there are two works of vital importance to that coast to give the fishing community necessary shelter. I draw special attention to the wharf at Percé, which has cost the Government nearly $100,000. Half that wharf has been carried away. If a little patchwork had been done on it two or three years ago, the wharf would have been saved. Perce is the shire town of the county, and I would ask the minister to see that some repairs are made so that the steamers plying between New Brunswick and Gaspé will find proper accommodation there. The other point which is of special interest to the fishermen is called Anse au Beaufils. This harbour has been in existence for several years, but owing to the action of ice and storm, part of the work has been washed away lately. This harbour is a most useful shelter not only for the Gaspé coast fishermen, but also to those from Miscou, Caraquet and other places on the coast of New Brunswick. A few thousand dollars, a very few, would put this harbour in good condition. I make no plea at present for any other works, though the coast of Gaspé extends over a distance of two hundred miles. I emphasize the two works I have mentioned, the Percé wharf and the Anse au Beaufils shelter. From the general appropriation, the minister can spare a few thousand dollars, and his local engineer, Mr. Bertrand, a most painstaking and conscientious officer, can give him all the information on the subject.

Mr. CARVELL: The matter which my hon. friend refers to is, of course, unknown to me personally, but I certainly will give it my consideration and go as far as I possibly can, although, if it amounts to $40,000 or $50,000, I fear it would be a pretty serious undertaking. However, I will promise him that I will give it the very best consideration I can.

Chicoutimi—Repairs to wharf, $2,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Near Chicoutimi, the Northcliffe interests have put up a very large sulphite mill, at a point called Ha! Ha! Bay. The company has spent something like three or four million dollars. One of the works it has constructed is a wharf, but in ordinary times steamers cannot moor there. A company which has established such a large industry, and which has built a wharf of its own, is surely entitled to a little dredging around that wharf so that steamers can get as close to it as possible. I must say that the department, through the deputy minister, has always received favourably the requests of the company. They are employing I do not know how many hundred people, and are a source of wealth and abundance to that district, and the Department of Public Works should not be too chary in letting that industry have the use of one or two dredges on the river Saguenay to facilitate the landing of freight and the loading of sulphite on board the steamers.

Mr. CARVELL: This is the first I have heard of this matter. I am informed that the Government did the dredging at the site of the wharf. I will be glad to go into the matter, and do whatever is possible.

Harbours and rivers generally—Repairs and improvements, $75,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I would like to ask the minister to include in the Supplementary Estimates, or in this item, a sum for the partial reconstruction and repair of the wharf at Vercheres. In the spring of 1917 the wharf was carried away by the ice-shove. Since then, no repairs have been made. This wharf serves a farming community, which produced, last year, 300,000 bushels of grain and about 30,000 tons of hay. The boat that plies between Montreal and Sorel used to stop at Vercheres, and it is certainly a hardship for the farmers of that district to be deprived of steamship service. Vercheres is about thirty miles from Montreal, and it is practically impossible for the farmers to bring their products to Montreal in any other way than by boat. If the minister could find a way to set aside the sum of $6,000, the work could be done. I understand the district engineer, Mr. Dansereau, made a favourable report on March 23 last.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has spoken to me about this matter on a number of occasions, and if the wharf is not built, his constituents cannot complain that he has not been diligent, or that he has not done all that he possibly could. Now, there is a report in the department, and I want to confess to my hon. friend that I have never found time to go over it. He can understand that the ministers have been very busy. But, before the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, I intend to go over all these matters. Although I have no particular knowledge about it, it seems to me that the request of the hon. member is fairly reasonable. I assure him that I will give it consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister should remember that Vercheres is a historic spot. The statue of Madeleine de Vercheres is there.

Mr. CARVELL: This is a pretty cold-blooded proposition over here.

Laprairie protection works—maintenance and repairs, $20,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Is $20,000 enough to complete the work? Has the amount of $85,000 voted last year been expended? As the minister will know this is a very important matter for the people of the district of Montreal and the people on the South Shore. The work has been supposed to be in progress for some years. We have been waiting for two or three years for its completion, and we should very much like to have it completed.

Mr. CARVELL: This work, I shall admit, has been progressing for a long time, and really I have had very grave doubts in past years whether the federal Parliament was justified in expending money on a work of this kind. The principle, however, has been adopted; the work is very nearly completed, and I am going to see that it is completed so far as it is necessary to complete it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand the minister went there.

Mr. CARVELL: I went there, and I think I shall be my own engineer for the finishing up of this work; and I hope I shall please my hon. friends opposite and the people of that vicinity. I cannot understand why it has taken three or four years to build a dyke such as I found across the low lands at Laprairie.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The elections were postponed from year to year.

Mr. CARVELL: There may be something in that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the only reason. Look elsewhere.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot understand some of the methods by which it is being constructed. The work, however, is going to be of very great convenience, not only to the people of Laprairie and that portion of the South shore of the St. Lawrence, but to the general travelling public. I was there about a month ago, and at that time it would have been almost impossible for people to reach Montreal by ordinary means of conveyance if that highway were not there, because, after all, it is simply a dyke seventeen or eighteen feet high, upon the top of which is a highway. In going over it, I was impressed by a few things. The first was that I did not believe in the method of construction. I do not understand why it was necessary to build a concrete face up and down the whole length of that dyke, which must be a mile long, as a protection against the ice shock. If it had an ordinary rock embankment about one and one-half to one, that is all that would be required.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The best rock is Roch Lanctot.

Mr. CARVELL: On the river side, two-thirds of it I suppose, is now finished. Another thing that impressed me was that it was a great pity the embankment was not made two or three feet wider. It ought to be sufficiently wide to admit of a street railway track. It may be possible even now to put a track on the top of the embankment, but that would, to some extent, interfere with the ordinary highway for vehicles. That, however, is largely a matter for the Provincial Government and the people of that community, because, once this work is constructed, if I remain in this position, I think I shall have to take the position that it is purely a local work which rightfully belongs to the municipal or provincial authorities, and I would feel very much like washing my hands of it. I do not think, however, we would be justified, under present conditions, in carrying out the plans to their minutest details and putting a concrete covering over the whole surface of the road, especially when the road on either end of it is merely a macadamised road. It should be constructed up to the highest standard of a macadamised road to conform with the general conditions of the road on either end of it, so that if a man goes along in an automobile, he can make just as good time over the dyke as over the highway. When that has been accomplished, the Government of Canada will have pretty nearly done its duty.

10 p.m.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

I want to assure my hon. friends that we intend to prosecute that work just as soon as we can get through with this session of Parliament and I can look around and satisfy myself as to the most economical and business like methods of finishing it. We shall not put off until the autumn, we shall finish it up at once, and we shall give the people of that community just as good a road over the dyke as they have on either end of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend takes the right view of the whole situation. Many years ago Laprairie was a very interesting town. The first railway built in Canada started from Laprairie. One of the two old wharves which my hon. friend saw, was the terminus of the first railway built in Canada, in the forties. It ran from Laprairie to St. Johns. Then Laprairie ceased to be the terminus by the construction of the Grand Trunk. There was a time when this village was very thriving. There were two banks, and there was quite a big trade, and two steamers were plying between Montreal and Laprairie. Then the Victoria bridge was built, and one of the steamers disappeared. Later on, the Dominion Government gave the Grand Trunk new subsidies to rebuild the Victoria bridge, but unfortunately they gave the Grand Trunk powers to charge the poor farmers such tolls that I consider them being mulcted. From all those considerations, therefore, something is due to the people of that community. The land, as the minister has noticed, is very low. The river St. Lawrence forms a bay from the Lachine rapids down to the Victoria bridge, and every year Laprairie is flooded. I could not give an estimate of the property damaged or lost as a result of those annual floods. For years past, under the old Conservative Government, under the Laurier Government, protection works have been erected, but they never were completed. The present work will complete what was started very many years ago. The trouble is that this amount has been in the Estimates since 1911, but through purely political considerations the works have been postponed from year to year, because the elections were not forthcoming. The minister has now visited the district, and he intends to apply this amount, and to make the dyke as useful as possible. Let him finish the work as speedily as he can. Not only the people of Laprairie, but the people of Montreal will benefit by it.

Matane—Repairs to breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. BUTTS: I may be out of order, but can the minister say whether the St. Paul, which is reported to have overturned in an Atlantic port, was in Halifax harbour at the time.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not guilty. The boat was certainly not in Halifax harbour.

Murray Bay—Repairs and improvements to wharf, $2,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Murray Bay and myself are very deeply interested in these improvements. Murray Bay has become quite an international watering place. During four months of the year there is a big influx of American and Canadian tourists and the population increases I would say by at least two thousand in the summer. The improvements made by the late Administration were certainly necessary, and I hope they will be completed at the earliest opportunity. Several steamers call at Murray Bay. There is the Government steamer between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay, which is nearly always full of American and Canadian tourists, and then there are the Richelieu boats, now known as the Canada Line boats. The wharf, in the busy season is jammed not only with passengers but with vehicles of every kind, for the cliff is very steep, as its name implies,—Pointe-a-Pic—and carriages are necessary to take the passengers up the hill. The wharf, which was too narrow, has been widened, but now the railways occupy a portion of it with their tracks, and I hope my hon. friend will lose no time having the improvements completed.

Mr. CARVELL: We certainly intend to proceed with these improvements the moment we have the money. The improvements include pine sheathing, flooring and things of that kind. We will go on with the work at once and finish it up.

Pointe à Elie—Repairs to breakwater—wharf, $1,200.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this in the Magdalen Islands?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What I said a moment ago about Gaspe applies equally to the Magdalen Islands. The county of Gaspé is composed of the peninsula proper, the main land, and the Magdalen Islands. A peculiar feature is that the county member, in order to reach a portion of his county, has to pass through the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. There is a thriving population of from six to seven thousand on the islands, and many good harbours, but the wharves and piers have been sadly neglected during the last two or three years owing to the absence of the representative of the county. The storms have been more numerous and severe during the last two years than ever before, and I am informed by many letters and telegrams that repairs and improvements are absolutely necessary. When the minister receives a report from the resident engineer I would ask him to see that the population is treated fairly.

Mr. CARVELL: I have his report before me, and I am carrying out his suggestions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Improvements are not only required at Pointe à Elie, but also at Amherst, Grand Entry, and at another point which I cannot recall at the moment. These places should all be looked after by the resident engineer, and I hope that if he asks for a few small amounts for repairs and improvements at these places, the people on the Islands, who are isolated for six months of the year, will not be neglected.

Rimouski—Harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How far have you got with the new works at Rimouski?

Mr. CARVELL: My information is that this vote will finish the Rimouski wharf. We were reluctant to spend such a large amount of money, but in view of the fact that Rimouski is the landing port for ocean steamers on the St. Lawrence, it has been considered necessary to finish up the work, and we shall complete it as rapidly as possible.

St. John's—Reconstruction of booms, $1,300.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Which St. John's is this?

Mr. CARVELL: St. John's and Iberville, on the Richelieu river.

St. Laurent, Island of Orleans—Repairs to wharf, $2,700.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is this the full amount estimated for repairs and improvements?

Mr. CARVELL: The engineer asks for this amount for general repairs to the wharf —fenders, hardwood sheathing, cribwork, and so on.

Yamaska—Reconstruction of dam, $1,500.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand that the Federal Government has offered to cooperate with the provincial government in

the construction of a bridge across the Batiscan river on the highway between Montreal and Quebec. My information is that the Federal Government offer to pay a certain proportion of the cost on condition that the bridge be built about a quarter of a mile above the road, while the provincial authorities want to build it directly in line with the road. In the press of yesterday it is stated that the provincial authorities and the people of Quebec are offered help by the Federal Government in this matter, and I should like to know what information the minister can give me with regard to it.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no knowledge that the Federal Government ever made an offer of that kind to the provincial government. They may have done so before I assumed office.

Mr. BUREAU: Approaches have been built there by the Federal Government.

Mr. CARVELL: They are possibly for ice protection. I never could understand why the Federal Government should build bridges across rivers within provinces. The Federal Government has assisted in building interprovincial bridges, but it would be opening a very wide door to start building bridges across ordinary rivers within provinces.

Mr. JACOBS: You built the Quebec bridge.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a different matter. We built a bridge across the Ottawa river many years ago, and now we are paying the penalty because we are being asked to assist in rebuilding it. If we violate this fundamental law, we will have to pay the price. I was approached by a high official of the Quebec Government about this matter some time ago, and as he was a good lawyer, I mentioned some of the difficulties that appeared to me to be in the way. If any promise was made by the Federal Government, it is unknown to me.

Ontario—French River—In full and final settlement of all claims of Jennings and Ross in connection with their contract for the construction of the substructure of the Big Chaudière Dam, including interest thereon at 5 per cent., $5,800.

Mr. CANNON: What claim did these contractors make?

Mr. CARVELL: They made a claim of $16,000. It was thought that if they were entitled to receive $5,115.97 three years ago, they are entitled to interest on it. I understand that an Order in Council was passed authorizing the payment of the money, and we are now asking that the necessary amount be voted to carry that arrangement out.

Sheguindah—Repairs to wharf, $1,000.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Has the department in contemplation any investigation of the conditions surrounding the wharves on the waters of Manitoulin Island and in the north channel adjacent to Manitoulin island having regard to the Government taking over what are now privately owned docks? My information is that many of these harbours have, within recent years, become important from the fact that the country has rapidly developed and is now very largely agricultural where it was formerly simply lumbering. The docks were purely private and many of them are still privately owned. This works a very considerable hardship owing to the fact that the man who owns the dock naturally controls the shipping. Has the department had that matter under consideration and, if not, will the minister undertake to have the engineers of the Public Works Department make an investigation and report on the advisability of the Government taking over the docks where the traffic that formerly was private has become public?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not heard of it before, although it may have been brought to the attention of my predecessors in the department. I could not promise my hon. friend (Mr. Nicholson)that I would ask the engineers to make a report or that I would act upon it, because that would be a question of policy for the Government to decide. However, I will go into the matter and give it the best consideration I can. It seems to me that there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says but, knowing so little about it, I really could not express an opinion.

Wendover—Repairs to wharf, $1,000.

Mr. EULER: Before we leave harbours and rivers in Ontario, I note that there is no appropriation included here for repairs to the wharf, or dredging in the harbour at Port Dover, or what should be the harbour of Port Dover. Port Dover is not in my constituency, but the improvement of that harbour will affect very materially the cities and towns north of that point right up into Waterloo county, including Brantford, Galt, Kitchener, Waterloo, Elmira, and various others. The minister will recollect that two or three weeks ago

a large delegation of manufacturers and others from central western Ontario had an interview with him and pressed this upon him. The minister very kindly promised to take the matter into his consideration, but I find no appropriation and I would like to ask him whether he has looked into the matter further and whether we may expect anything in the Supplementary Estimates. The object of the request for the improvement of this particular harbour is this: Within the last two or three years a very efficient railway has been constructed from Galt to Port Dover. It is proposed to use that road for the carrying of coal. Coal can be brought directly across Lake Erie to Port Dover and distributed to the industrial towns and cities of central Western Ontario, including those which I have mentioned. As the committee knows, the cities and towns of central Western Ontario are very largely of an industrial nature. They are great manufacturing centres, and coal is absolutely necessary. During the last few years, and especially last winter, we have had a great deal of difficulty in obtaining coal, and we obtain it at a much greater cost than would be necessary if this harbour were placed in such a condition that coal could be brought across the Lake, discharged at Port Dover and then transported northward to these centres by this new road. The people of that section do not ask for any unnecessary capital expenditures, but they do ask that that harbour be put in such a condition, if only for the coming season, that it will facilitate the bringing in of coal at a much less cost. If the minister can give us any assurance on that point —possibly he has—he will remedy a very trying situation in Western Ontario. I cannot see from these Estimates that Ontario especially central western Ontario— is enjoying the expenditure of a great deal of money in matters of this kind. Port Dover offers the very best facilities for harbour purposes on the northern shore of Lake Ontario.

Mr. CARVELL: It is true a representative and very influential delegation waited upon me some time ago with regard to this very important harbour. I am not in a position to state what will be done, but I think I can state very frankly the position of affairs. Apparently in 1872, by some sort of an arrangement, this harbour became the property of the Grand Trunk Railway company with the provision that the Government could take it over at any time by Order in Council. The Grand Trunk have done practically nothing towards developing it, and fairly large sums have been expended by the Government from 1870 down to recent years. Some portions of the works are somewhat in decay and disuse. I have no doubt that everything that my hon. friend (Mr. Euler) says about the importance of developing the coal carrying trade over that electric road is in accordance with the facts. I will go so far as to say that I intend to ask my colleagues to take over this harbour under the terms of the Order in Council, and make it a public harbour. I think it will require $6,000 to put it in such a condition that it may be utilized during the coming year. I want my hon. friend to realize that if we attempted to carry out the plan suggested, it would take $300,000 or $400,000.

Mr. EULER: Only $260,000, I think.

Mr. CARVELL: No, my hon. friend is in error. It would be more than that if we carried out the whole scheme, and we simply cannot afford to spend that much money at the present time. It would take probably a couple of years to do so, and then you would not get the coal. Furthermore, I want the hon. gentleman to realize that there are four other big coal ports on lake Erie, and thus there is a pretty good inlet for the coal destined for that portion of Ontario, in addition to which there are the bridges across the Niagara river. However, I was very much impressed with the fairness of the delegation. It looked to me like good business, and I am at least making a start. I am proposing to take over this harbour, put it on the same general plan as the remainder of the harbours on lake Erie, and do whatever work may be necessary in order that vessels may go in there at the present time. I can only hope that when financial conditions again become normal we will be able to go on and develop that harbour, and meet what seems to be the very reasonable request of that portion of the province. While the hon. gentleman claims that the province of Ontario is not getting a very large amount of money, he must remember that that province is not a maritime country, in the sense that the eastern and western portions of Canada are. While they have the lakes, yet these do not approach in importance the Atlantic or the Pacific oceans, and if he figures up the amount he will find that Ontario is being very well treated. That province in these expenditures is getting more than all the Maritime Provinces put together, and about the same as the prov-

ince of Quebec. I want to assure my hon. friend that in making up the Estimates, the question of whether this or that province was getting more or less appropriation never entered into our minds for a moment; it was purely according to what we considered the transportation necessities of the country.

Mr. EULER: I would regret very much if the minister felt that I was indulging in criticisms on the ground that other provinces were receiving an undue share of the public appropriations, because that was not my intention. I brought the matter up so that it should be decided purely on its merits, and for no other reason. I do not understand, however, from what the delegation announced when they interviewed the minister, and from other information in my possession, that the amount of $6,000 would put the harbour temporarily into condition, but in that view I may be wrong. If investigation has been made, and that amount of money will serve, we will certanly be all the more satisfied.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what our engineers report.

Mr. EULER: Then I will not go behind that report. I do not think it was the intention of the delegation to ask the minister now to expend the amount of money that would be required to put the harbour permanently into the condition in which it should be, but that something should be done this year to make use of the facilities that we would have, through the railway in question, to import coal. So far as other ports on Lake Erie are concerned, I do not think that for the importation of coal into the manufacturing centres, they are of any particular value. I think practically all the coal that now comes in comes across the bridge at Niagara Falls.

Mr. CARVELL: I think my hon. friend is correct. The delegation, according to my recollection, asked for the expenditure of about $70,000.

Mr. EULER: About $60,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, about $60,000, or $70,000.

Manitoba—Harbours and rivers generally—Repairs and improvements, $15,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is this item for?

Mr. CARVELL: It is a general vote for the province just the same as has been voted for all the rest of the provinces. If any unforeseen expenditure becomes necessary, we have this small vote out of which to pay the expenses.

Mr. CAHILL: I hope the minister is not asking for this money just because it has been voted before, but because it is absolutely necessary. There does not seem to be any great number of harbours and rivers in Manitoba.

Mr. CARVELL: There are important wharves and works upon the Red River and upon Lake Winnipeg. I am not a judge of exactly how necessary those works are, but they must be kept in repair. If an accident happens unless we have a vote of this kind we have no way of meeting the expenditure.

Mr. CAHILL: Was the amount voted last year spent?

Mr. CARVELL: No, last year only $2,805 was expended.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $20,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Can the minister state how much money was spent last year?

Mr. CARVELL: The sum of $2,377 was spent last year.

Mr. KNOX: In view of the size of the territory covered, have the points been defined where this money is likely to be spent?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is just a general vote taken for the purpose of safety. We hope that it may not be necessary to expend the money.

British Columbia—Fraser River (Lower)—Improvements, $21,500.

Mr. STACEY: The term "Lower Fraser" has a varied interpretation. Sometimes in certain circles it means that portion of the river below New Westminster city, and sometimes in other circles and under other circumstances it means that portion of the river below Hope. What interpretation does the department give, and how much of the Fraser river is actually covered by the vote?

Mr. CARVELL: This is what is called the "snag" vote, and the stretch to which it applies extends to Chilliwack above New Westminster.

Dredging—New dredging plant—Ontario and Quebec, $6,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. CARVELL: This is for what is called the shipyard in Ottawa, the place at the

upper end of the town where dredges, scows and things of that kind are repaired.

Dredging—Maritime Provinces, $200,000.

Mr. LEGER: Does this item include dredging in small rivers?

Mr. CARVELL: It includes all dredging, except where otherwise specially provided for. This vote is principally for the purpose of operating departmental dredges, not for contract work. It takes in river work, and all sorts of work. I may say that there are recommendations from our engineers for the expenditure of an amount of money that would stagger the House if I were to give it. With all these demands, it is a question of picking out those absolutely essential. I cannot tell now where this money will be spent. It is a general vote, and will be used only where absolutely necessary. The requests that have been made by engineers for dredging in the three maritime provinces alone would involve an expenditure of $3,315,000. Of course, it is impossible to comply with all of those requests.

Mr. LEGER: The reason I asked the question is that in the past year a certain amount was voted for dredging and breastworks in the Aldouane river in the county of Kent, N.B., to facilitate the taking by the farmers of mussel mud for fertilizing purposes from the bay up the river. I understand that there is much dredging yet to be done, and there is no other way of getting that fertilizer transported the five or six miles to where it is used except by water. By doing a little dredging, the farmers can get their oyster shell and mussel mud fertilizer from the bay onto the wharf built some years ago. Only a small amount will be necessary to do the work in this river, and the same also applies to the St. Charles and St. Louis rivers. There are certain parts of the St. Louis river, near the mouth, where the land is flat, and some dredging was done last year and the year before so that at low water boats could get through. I understand that last fall the channel had filled up in some places, necessitating further attention from the Government to facilitate fishing. My desire is to facilitate as much as possible the work of the fishermen who have long distances to go, and also to help the farmers to get as much fertilizer as possible. There may be no recommendation by the district engineer on this subject. He has spent a good deal of money in the past on these rivers, and if the minister called his attention to it a certain amount might be spent on this work.

Mr. CARVELL: I have never heard of this matter before, but it is out of a vote like this that such important works as my hon. friend refers to are paid. I shall certainly have the matter investigated.

Mr. LEGER: I thank the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to remind the minister that in my riding, at the mouth of the arm of the sea called the Little Bras d'Or a very large amount of money was spent in dredging, in the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, and some of the work is still unfinished. What is left unfinished consists of ridges here and there through the channel. It is a splendid channel in some places, but these ridges constitute a danger to shipping. I think a very small amount of money would finish up the work. If the minister has not a report on it, I would like him to get a report of the exact condition of that work, as I do not think it is available to navigators.

Mr. CARVELL: I will make a note of it, and see that it is investigated.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is principally a harbour for a coal mine which is becoming important now, and it would be very much in the interest of the production of coal if they would get their shipping in.

Dredging—Ontario and Quebec, $200,000.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: How much of this will be spent from Montreal to the sea? This vote represents a large decrease compared with last year, when $550,000 was voted. How much is asked by the engineer of the department, and does the engineer think that it is safe to spend only $200,000 to keep the St. Lawrence channel open? As the minister is aware, the channel fills up quickly with sand.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps my hon. friend will pardon me. He is not an old member of the House, and there is what may seem to him an incongruity in the fact that the St. Lawrence ship channel is entirely under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department and not of the Public Works Department. Therefore, no portion of the money we are asking for now has anything to do with the St. Lawrence ship channel. It is very much along the line of the similar vote for the Maritime Provinces, namely to maintain dredging plants which are owned by the department itself, which are sent around to places where work is needed, usually in small ways. It pays

salaries, wages, coal, repairs, and everything of that kind. It would have nothing to do with the St. Lawrence ship channel. In answer to my hon. friend's question as to whether or not the engineers have been remiss in their duty, they have suggested that there should be over $4,000,000 worth of dredging done in Ontario and Quebec. I am only sorry that I am unable to accept all their suggestions.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: That money, I understand, was to be spent in Ontario and Quebec. Where is it to be spent?

Mr. CARVELL: It would take me, I was going to say, half an hour to read the names of the places, but they all want dredging done. It would be of great advantage to the transportation of the country if we could give them the dredging, but I am afraid we cannot comply with the request.

Nova Scotia telegraph and telephone lines—Cape Breton telegraph system—renewal of poles between Eskasoni and East Bay, $700.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I do not know that this is an opportune time to ask a few questions with regard to the policy of the Government concerning telephones. The minister will remember that last year we had a discussion on this subject in which he participated. There is only a limited mileage of telephones in Nova Scotia, but before now the telephones were distributed just where they would suit the politician. I made that statement last year; I made it the year before, and I make it again now. It is absolutely unfair, where a telegraph service has been converted into a telephone service, not to distribute the boxes wherever they are most needed. I shall illustrate a case. There is a line in the county of Inverness going through the districts of Upper Margaree, East Lakes, Ainslee and Whycocomagh. There is a doctor there who has to attend professionally the settlements all around. That doctor cannot get a box.

Mr. CARVELL: What is his name?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Dr. McDonald.

Mr. CARVELL: Tell him to wire me in regard to it.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Very good, I shall stop talking. If last year the former minister had done that, I would have been satisfied. In every case in which a man is prepared to pay for a box, why in the name of common sense does he not receive it at a reasonable rental, or free, as may be the policy of the Government?

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: Tell him to send a wire and he will get a box.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Very good. Now I am satisfied that justice will be done in this matter of telephones in my county.

Mr. BUTTS: I feel like asking the minister to be a little more generous. I notice that only $700 is to be appropriated for the telegraph system in that beautiful county, Cape Breton. I wish to call the attention of the minister to two very important matters that have for years been discussed among the people of Cape Breton county. One is the question of Glace Bay harbour. Perhaps the minister is not as familiar with the history of it as we people of Cape Breton are, but some years ago, through some action of this Parliament, Glace Bay harbour was taken away from the Government and given to the Dominion Coal Company, and since then it has remained practically a private harbour.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. gentleman referring to the installation of a telephone system there?

Mr. BUTTS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is out of order. I regret very much to call him to order.

Mr. BUTTS: I am nearly always out of order, but you, Sir, always look after me. Perhaps you might be a little generous with me.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman will be the cause of my being obliged to be very generous to other hon. members, and I shall, therefore, have to ask him to desist from his argument.

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps I shall be able to get in under the roof in some way. It is in regard to this matter of $700.

Mr. CARVELL: Would it not be a good thing if the hon. member had a telephone line to Glace Bay?

Mr. BUTTS: It would be a great deal better if the minister would take over Glace Bay harbour and make considerable improvements.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I am very sorry, but the hon. member is not in order.

Mr. BUTTS: I bow to your ruling. I was going to suggest to the minister that perhaps he might increase the amount.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this the total amount for telephone system in the Maritime Provinces? Last year there was a general appropriation of a considerable amount.

Mr. CARVELL: I might shorten this discussion by making a general statement. The telephone system has been a matter of evolution. A great many years ago it became necessary—and, I think, quite properly so that the Federal Government should construct telegraph lines to outlying districts which were entirely out of touch with the rest of the world unless some means of communicating were provided for them. That went on for many years, and, like many other matters, I presume it was to some extent abused. What may have been a necessity forty or fifty years ago ceased to be a necessity five years ago, but those telegraph lines were Government institutions, and it was pretty hard to get rid of them. Of late years they have all been converted into telephone lines, and a telephone line, if properly operated, is very much more useful to the average person living in an out-of-the-way district than is a telegraph line. I have never had the experience of living alongside of a Government-owned telephone line, and I do not believe they are necessary in many portions of Canada. Last year I listened to a great deal of discussion about the condition of affairs in Cape Breton Island. I have listened to the discussion here tonight. I know something about the condition of affairs in a small line in the province of New Brunswick. I am told that there are in the province of Alberta and Saskatchewan lines that are absolutely useless because they are practically paralleling telephone lines owned and operated by the governments of those two provinces. There is no doubt that these telegraph lines were necessary when they were originally built, and it is a pity that as settlements became more numerous some arrangement was not made by which this Government could have sold out or handed over the system to the provinces and thus get rid of this annual expenditure. In the northern part of British Columbia an entirely different condition of affairs prevails. The Government telephone system there brings people in touch with the outside world who otherwise would be completely isolated. This question is so big that I would not profess to express an opinion on it. I do believe, however, that there are other portions of British Columbia where there is no necessity for a Government-owned telephone system. I may as well state to the House frankly that I intend during the coming summer to have one of the best telephone experts in Canada go over the whole Government telephone system in this country and give me a business report, upon which I shall try to act in a businesslike way. I personally believe that all the Government telephone systems in the Maritime Provinces should be disposed of; either sold to the existing companies or given away to them if necessary; let us get some one to take them off our hands. I would certainly sell out the system in New Brunswick were it not for the fact that I am largely interested in the company that would probably have to do the buying. Therefore, I suppose I would not be justified in doing that. What I have said of New Brunswick is true of Nova Scotia. I do not know exactly what the telephone system is in Cape Breton Island, but it seems absolutely ridiculous that the Government of Canada should operate a telephone system in that island. The system should be operated by a local company, or by the Maritime Provinces Telegraph and Telephone Company, or by somebody else who would do it on business principles. In Quebec, I think an even worse condition of affairs prevails. We have telephones there in two counties, the county of Dorchester and the county of Quebec, and I think Quebec is a great deal worse than Dorchester. There are miles and miles of Government-owned lines in Quebec; I do not know what in the world they do with them all. There is one fellow down there who goes on building and takes his chances of getting his pay; you cannot stop him from building telephone lines. But we are going to try and make an impression on him in two or three weeks in order to get him to call a halt. In Ontario there is the Pelee Island cable. I do not know that there are any Government lines in Manitoba, but in Saskatchewan and Alberta there are important lines. Just think of the Government operating a telegraph or telephone line from Qu'Appelle to Edmonton through one of the most thickly-settled and richest portions of our great Northwest. Three other telegraph lines parallel that wire which may have been needed at first but it certainly cannot be a necessity now. To sum up, I can only say that I intend to have a business report made, and I am going to try and act on it from a business standpoint. I hope the House will pass the items which I am proposing. I am not going to promise to expend this money, but I can assure the House that if expended it will be expended under proper conditions, and with the firm belief that the expenditure is necessary.

11 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope the minister will not act with any degree of harshness in the county of Victoria, which I have the honour to represent and where I must speak with the greatest deference and respect of the Government—owned telegraph lines. In the old county of Victoria we have a settlement extending along the rocky Atlantic coast for about one hundred and ten miles, dotted here and there with fishing villages, and with no communication with the outside world, particularly in winter time and in the fall of the year, except by means of this small wire that was strung through the settlement some years ago by the Government of Canada. It serves a splendid purpose for these fishermen, because they can telegraph to Halifax and Montreal and other commercial centres about the price of fish. Nobody else in the world would build a line there, unless we got a railway down there, and then of course the telegraph would follow. Until there is something better coming to the people in northern Victoria than the small accommodation that this Government telegraph line affords, I hope the minister will not interfere with it, but will keep it in good shape and improve it as much as possible. There is a tendency to convert this telegraph line into a telephone line, and part of the line through the county of Victoria is part telephone and part telegraph. Personally, I think for that part of the county of Victoria, if we are to have either one or the other, the telegraph line is the best, because the fish merchant at the northern part of Victoria could then send a telegram from his fishing establishment to any part of Canada and he could not get the same service out of a telephone.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope my hon. friend did not understand me to say that I propose to take away from any people the privileges which they now enjoy. What I would like to do is to dispose of many of the lines that are unnecessary and put the rest of them on a business basis. If the Government is going to operate telegraph or telephone lines they should regard them as public utilities, and operate them on a business basis, and the people who use the service should pay something for the accommodation commensurate with what people in other portions of Canada are paying where they have to look after their own affairs.

Mr. CANNON: I see by last year's Estimates that the sum of $3,500 was voted for the construction of a telephone line through certain parishes in the county of Dorchester. I should like to know what amount of money was expended on the construction of these lines, and how far the work has been carried. I noticed when I was going through these parishes that the poles were up, but no wires and no boxes, and it is needless for me to insist on how useless the line is in that condition for the people of those parishes.

The parishes of St. Louis de Gonzague and St. Cyprien have no communication with the outside world, and telephone lines are of great service to the people who live there. As the lines are at present, however, they are absolutely of no use; the money spent last year will have been wasted unless the work is completed this year. Last year mention was made of the conditions in the parish of St. Luc—situated behind St. Germain—the people of which have no outside communication. When they wish to engage the services of a doctor, they have to drive thirty-four miles. If the minister intends to spend any money this year on telephone lines he ought to make some arrangement whereby St. Luc will be connected with St. Germain, because these parishes are in the same position as the other two in which work was begun last year.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no intention of spending more money this year on completing telephone lines in Dorchester county, but I do intend to put the wiring on the poles that have been erected and to carry out the arrangements made last year. The wire has been purchased, and must be on the poles by this time. Any new settlement in Canada has as much right to ask the department to erect telephone lines within its bounds as have the parishes my hon. friend has referred to. In my own province over one thousand settlers have gone into the country along the Restigouche river within the last four or five years. They are simply crying out for land; they are overflowing from the river St. John on the south to the St. Lawrence on the north. These people built their own telephone lines and made their own arrangements; they are not asking the Government to do it for them. They come to an understanding with existing telephone companies, or they organize local companies and obtain connecting rights with the larger telephone concerns. Think what a door was opened last year, and what a door I should open if I went on with further work of this kind this year.

Mr. CANNON: The principle laid down last year may be bad; I do not say it is good. As a matter of fact these telephone lines were started simply because they were promised during an election.

Mr. CARVELL: The election is over now.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, but the fact that the Government started to build these lines prevented local companies from doing the work. Any reasonable agreement proposed by the department to local companies would, I believe, be accepted.

Mr. CARVELL: I make this sporting offer to my hon. friend: if he can organize a local company we will sell the whole thing out for half what it cost.

Mr. CANNON: What is it worth?

Mr. CARVELL: I will tell the hon. gentleman what it cost and we will give it to him at fifty cents on the dollar.

Mr. CANNON: Before considering the minister's offer, I wish to point out that the gentleman who built this line last year—his name is Martineau—

Mr. CARVELL: The same gentleman, I think, who operated in Quebec county.

Mr. CANNON: Perhaps so. This gentleman actively engaged in building the lines, but he forgot to pay the men who did the work. Who is responsible for that, the Government or Martineau?

Mr. CARVELL: Martineau.

Mr. CANNON: What arrangement was made between the Government and Martineau I do not know. In any case, they have a complete telephone line in Dorchester now, and the people who worked on the construction of it have not been paid.

Maintenance and operation of water storage dams on Ottawa river and tributaries—surveys in connection therewith and settlement of land damages, $125,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I propose to make a thorough investigation of this matter before the money is expended.

To pay Western Dry Dock and Shipping Co., Limited, of Port Arthur, a portion of the fifth payment of subsidy due them upon their completion of the work covered by the agreement ratified by Chap. 57, 3-4 George V., 1913, notwithstanding that the work is not completed, $35,641.50.

Mr. BUREAU: I notice that it is proposed to pay this company notwithstanding that the work is not completed. Is the work behind?

Mr. CARVELL: The work was not entirely completed and therefore we are paying them less than the amount that we would be required to pay them by statute. For that reason we are taking a special vote. Otherwise the department would go by statutory authority.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it almost complete or in a fair state of completion?

Mr. CARVELL: There are just a few machines that have not been placed but it is not completed to the extent that the engineer could give a certificate that it is finally completed.

Public Works chargeable to collection of revenue—slides and booms, $53,900.

Mr. BUREAU: Are these booms in the Upper Ottawa district?

Mr. CARVELL: That is in the same category as the Upper Ottawa Improvements. I intend to make a pretty careful investigation of this matter. It is an old custom under which the Government of Canada practically takes charge of transporting all the lumber down the Ottawa river. It may have been necessary a hundred years ago and it possibly may be necessary to-day but I would like to know a little more about it before we branch out to any great extent.

Graving docks, $68,300.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where are these?

Mr. CARVELL: There is the Champlain graving dock at Levis, the Levis graving dock and the Esquimalt graving dock.

Harbour and river works, $40,700.

Mr. EDWARDS: What position are you in with regard to the removal of the temporary bridge at Kingston?

Mr. CARVELL: We have taken out the draw and I think there was an arrangement made to sell the material to the city of Kingston at a pretty reduced price. It is practically understood that the city will take the material but we are getting something out of it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is the department pulling up the piles?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, we are removing the piles and selling the material to the city. There was a delegation from Kingston here. I do not know that we concluded an absolute contract, but still I think it was pretty well settled between us.

Mr. BUREAU: I see that under the head of harbour and river works, there are the river Yamaska lock and dam, and Riviere

du Lievre lock and dam. Are these locks and dams for navigation or for logging purposes?

Mr. CARVELL: My information is that they are for navigation purposes.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: With reference to the item, "Burlington channel bridge," has this anything to do with the Burlington revetment wall for which a contract was awarded and in regard to which, I understand, the balance has been more or less in dispute.

Mr. CARVELL: That is at Hamilton, Ont.?

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: This amount of $5,800 is required for staff maintenance and repairs in connection with the Burlington channel bridge which is to provide a crossing over the ship channel for vehicular traffic and the cars of the radial railway from Hamilton to Oakville and intermediate points. There are repairs, renewals, painting, staff, bridge tender and three assistants, etc. These items make up the total of $5,800.

Telegraph and telephone lines—land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and Martime Provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, $202,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a place called White Point in Victoria county, a very considerable fishing village, and it is about nine miles from the nearest telegraph line. They have never been able to get connection with the Government telegraph system. In summer time they can come from White Point in a boat five miles to a place called Dingwall, but in winter time they have to travel around the mainland about nine miles before they can send a message. For years they have been trying to get the line extended from Dingwall to White Point.

Mr. CARVELL: Are there any settlements between the two points?

Mr. McKENZIE: There are scattered farming settlements and the village is out on the point. They have been writing to me. When we had power ourselves, I made an effort to get this thing done, but I did not succeed. I had always hoped that I would be able to overcome the difficulty. This must appeal to the minister. Here is a little community placed out on this point and it is desired that they shall have communication with the outside world. A very small amount of money would string a line along the shore down to White Point and give them a telegraph office.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. CARVELL: It is very hard to resist my hon. friend's pleading, but I could not make any promise. I want to remind him that this vote is not for construction purposes, it is purely for maintenance. This illustrates the statement I made sometime ago when I said that it is costing this country $766,000 to operate these telephones. Of course there is some revenue, I do not know exactly how much, but nothing like sufficient to meet operating expenses, let alone interest on the investment. However, I will take into consideration what the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. McKENZIE: The expenditure involved is very slight, considering the accommodation it would afford to a deserving community.

Mr. CARVELL: It would involve the expenditure of about $1,000, I think.

Mr DECHENE: Does this vote take in telegraph lines starting from Quebec down?

Mr. CARVELL: This takes in the lines extending away down the St. Lawrence river, I think, to Chicoutimi and Belle Isle, as well as the line in Dorchester and Quebec counties.

Mr. DECHENE: Does it take in the quarantine telephone and telegraph lines at Grosse Isle?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. DECHENE I see that last year the District Superintendent, Mr. G. B. Pouliot, received $1,000 for salary, and there was also a payment made to him of $129.47. Apparently Mr Pouliot draws two salaries.

Mr. CARVELL: It looks that way.

Mr. DECHENE: Did the same man receive both payments?

Mr. CARVELL: It may be his wife, I am not sure.

Mr. DECHENE: It cannot be his wife, or the designation "Mrs." or "Madame" would have been used.

Mr. CARVELL It must be a payment for travelling expenses.

British Columbia—Mainland telegraph and telephone line—General repairs and improvements, $3,300.

Mr. CARVELL: This vote will probably have to be expended this year, but we intend to have a pretty careful investigation of the telegraph system of the Yukon made by competent authority, and various suggestions made with a view to effecting economies will be taken into consideration. In the first place, the line from Fort George to,

I think it is, Fort Fraser, a distance of about one hundred and fifty miles, is now paralleled by the Grand Trunk Pacific. It would seem unnecessary that there should be two telegraph lines running through a country with as little settlement and business in it as that district has. Then from Fort Fraser to Atlin, a distance of over three hundred miles, I am told, there is only one place where there is any business whatever, I think, on the Skeena river, a small trading post with only one or two merchants, and it requires an enormous amount of money to keep up that line. It is not so much the pay of the operators—although they have to have special residences built and stations are needed every twenty miles with a rest station between them again—but in the spring-time, when the ice and snow come down the mountain sides the poles are carried away and need renewing practically nearly every year over a large part of the line. Surely there must be some way of getting rid of a large amount of this expenditure and placing these lines on a business basis, and therefore I am going to have the whole matter thoroughly investigated.

Progress reported.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. CARVELL: I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that the name of Mr. H. J. Mackie, member for North Renfrew, be added to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the House adjourned at 11.43 p.m.

Friday, April 26, 1918.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 67, respecting The International Bridge and Terminal Company.—Mr. Manion.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Hon. Mr. CALDER moved:

That the motion adopted by the House on the 24th instant adding the name of Mr. Pardee to the Special Committee to consider and report on the Pension Board and Pension Regulations be amended by adding at the end thereof the words "and that part of Rule 11 limiting the number of members to 15 be suspended in relation thereto."

He said: I might explain that the name of Mr. Pardee was added to the committee the other day, but there is a rule of the House which provides that there shall not be more than fifteen members on a special committee, and as there were already fifteen members on that committee, this motion is proposed.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DRAFTEES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I observe that new regulations have been adopted by Order in Council with respect to the Order which was ratified by us some few days ago, providing for leave of absence to draftees and temporary leave of absence to farmers and farm labourers in categories lower than A. I would suggest to the Government that, either to-day or Monday such an important matter as this be brought up in some way—better, perhaps, in Committee of Supply—so that the public may be instructed as to the effect of these regulations.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) intimated that he would make a statement explanatory of the provisions themselves on some suitable occasion, not to-day, but probably on Monday.

MEDICAL SERVICE AND FORESTRY CORPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a cable despatch of a very serious nature published in this morning's Montreal Gazette. There seems to be a charge against the Canadian Medical Service to the effect that our wounded soldiers are not properly cared for in Canadian hospitals, and also in relation to the forestry corps, whose staff, according to this cable, is ridiculously overmanned. I shall read only one sentence about each of these charges.

There seems to be a lack of co-ordination in the medical services and too much deference to precedent, a fault everywhere in military services, where those are in power whose services antedate the outbreak of hostilities.

With regard to the hospitals:

There is a marked revival of the demand that Canadians be treated in Canadian hospitals.

Pre-war military training and services have not proven of great value in the Canadian Medical Corps.

Then, in regard to the forestry corps:

The Forestry Corps Staff is ridiculously overmanned. Sir Edward Kemp forced a slight reduction but more drastic action is required. It is felt the Forestry Corps staff is a refuge for personal friends of those in higher command, and appointments and promotions are not given for practical or technical knowledge or success in work.

Has the Minister of Militia and Defence read this cable from the special correspondent of the Montreal Gazette? Will action be taken to prevent any such treatment of our wounded soldiers as is indicated here? Will any report be made as to the forestry corps?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): That is the first intimation I have had of it. I do not see the Gazette, but I will be very glad to peruse the despatch and take whatever action may be necessary.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—ALLEGED UNLAWFUL DETENTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I call the attention of the Government to a paragraph which appeared a few days ago in a paper published in this city, the Ottawa Evening Journal. It appears that some police officers were after some young men who were supposed to have deserted the service, or failed to report, and the paragraph to which I call the attention of the Government reads in this way:

Several other little farm-houses were visited but without results. A father whose two boys were supposed to be defaulters was brought to Pembroke and held as a hostage until the boys report.

Of course, it would be an absolutely illegal act to take a father as a hostage for the appearance of his boys. I would ask the Government to get some report upon that.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not observe the item. I should be very much surprised to find that it was correct, but I shall have it looked into.

Mr. HERBERT J. MACKIE: May I add a word of explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to say that the only thing that can be done on the Orders of the Day is to address a question to the Government. It is not in order to have any discussion, and if the hon. member were permitted to make a statement it would be a discussion. His only opportunity would be on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

VISIT OF MINISTERS TO WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Earlier this week the newspapers announced that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), and the hon. the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. A. K. Maclean), were at Washington and New York. This morning's, and last evening's, papers announced that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) had gone down to either of these cities to confer with them. May I inquire from the leader of the Government if any unusual condition has arisen necessitating the presence of these three members of the Government in the United States, and if so, whether a statement can be made to the House?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The Acting Minister of Finance has not left the city and the item as regards him is quite incorrect. The Prime Minister is absent, but I do not think that there is any unusual circumstance that has necessitated that absence that could at the moment be stated to the House.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 65, to amend the Companies Act.—Hon. Mr. Doherty.

Bill No. 20, to amend the Inspection and Sale Act (Hay and Straw Inspection).—Sir George Foster.

PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice) Bill No. 21, to amend the Penitentiary Act, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Definition of "Inspector" amended.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the minister kindly state in a few words the object of the Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are substantially two provisions in the Bill. The first is for the purpose of remodelling the system on which the penitentiaries are administered to the extent of providing for a superintendent and inspectors, instead of two inspectors. The second provision is a necessary consequence of the first, substituting

"superintendent" for "inspector" where necessary, and defining the duties of the respective officers. The Bill also confers power to make regulations by which it will be possible to provide for the better employment of the convicts in each institution by the establishing and carrying on of suitable industries. The provision further makes it possible, where as a result of arrangements made to that end it would be found desirable and means were put at the disposal of the authorities for the purpose, to make some allowance in the way of remuneration to convicts for the labour they perform. While the Bill merely contains that empowering provision, what is contemplated is—if the system of useful employment should, by means of disposing of the products exclusively to other departments of the Government, produce a revenue—to make a certain allowance to convicts payable to dependent relatives, if they have any, and if there are no dependent relatives to enable the funds to accumulate in the interest of the convict himself, so that when he leaves the institution he may make a start in life with some little savings behind him.

Mr. MURPHY: That is what my hon. friend means by "providing remuneration to the convict?"

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: Derived from the work which has been assigned to him?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Appointment of superintendent:

Mr. PROULX: Whom does the minister intend to appoint as superintendent?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the appointment were in the hands of the minister he might have an intention in that regard and be able to state it, but the hon. member must know that appointments are now required to be made upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. It is, therefore, not possible for me to have an intention as to whom I am going to name, because the appointment does not rest with me.

Mr. PROULX: I suppose the Governor in Council will act upon the recommendation of the minister?

Mr. DOHERTY: Ultimately it is a matter for the Governor in Council, but the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission is essential, and I cannot undertake to say what they may have in mind.

Mr. PROULX: Will an examination before appointment be required by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: It rests wtih the Civil Service Commission to prescribe the methods governing the determining of their own recommendations. I am not in a position to say what determination they have made, or, indeed, whether they have prepared a regulation which would apply to an appointment of this kind. However, the requirement that their recommendation is essential to the appointment would apply in this case as much as in any other.

Mr. PROULX: The section says that the superintendent shall be an officer of the Department of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Then I suppose the person recommended will already have acted as inspector?

Mr. DOHERTY: I repeat that the recommendation does not rest with the Minister of Justice, but with the Civil Service Commission. It is, therefore, quite impossible for me to announce what the view of the Civil Service Commission will be as to who is the best man to appoint for the position.

Mr. PROULX: But if the Civil Service Commission is requested to give a certificate to a certain gentleman, and if that gentleman has been an inspector, I suppose they will be satisfied that he is properly qualified.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no reason to doubt that the Civil Service Commission may consider that the gentleman who has been an inspector has the proper qualifications. But, again, it is not a matter of the minister recommending somebody to the Civil Service Commission, it is a matter of the Civil Service Commission recommending somebody to the minister, that recommendation to be transmitted to the Governor in Council. I cannot anticipate what the view of the Civil Service Commission will be as to the best method of procedure with regard to this or any other office.

Mr. PROULX: I am told that it is the intention to appoint Brigadier-Genral Hughes, who was inspector of penitentiaries prior to going overseas, and who is now drawing double salary as inspector of penitentiaries and as brigadier-general. I un-

derstand he is not now acting as brigadier-general on the other side.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am quite glad to learn what the intention of the hon. gentleman on that subject is. For my own part, I have reached no decision, and could have no intention. I have not heard from the Civil Service Commission that they had made up their minds as to their intention, without even waiting for this legislation to pass. I would be surprised if they had decided.

Mr. PROULX: Will the hon. minister say that Brigadier General Hughes will not be appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot possibly say what the Civil Service Commission will do. I have no knowledge whatever whether or not the name of the gentleman who is mentioned has ever occurred to the Civil Service Commission. I should be surprised if they have made up their minds on a matter of that kind even before the legislation is passed.

Mr. PROULX: We know very well how these appointments are made—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman that this discussion is entirely out of order. The appointment of any officer to administer this Act should be discussed on the estimates of the department. This appointment has nothing to do with the terms of the Bill itself.

Mr. PROULX: This Bill provides for the appointment of a superintendent of penitentiaries.

The CHAIRMAN: It does, but it has nothing to do with any particular person being appointed to that position.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is quite in order to discuss the policy of the Government with respect to any Bill; and the policy of the Government under it will be a strong element as to whether this House should pass the Bill or not.

Mr. EDWARDS: It seems to me that the course which will be followed in regard to this matter will be apparent to everyone. The Government has adopted as its policy, and there is no question about that, that the Civil Service Commission shall recommend men for positions. If that body, in their wisdom, see fit to advertise for applications for country postmasters to draw $50 a year, when it comes to selecting men for the positions under this Bill they will advertise in all the papers, they will be flooded with applications, and then they will make a selection, and some lucky man will get the job. There is no question about what the course will be.

Mr. BUREAU: Heretofore there were two Inspectors of Penitentiaries who saw to it that the law was observed and that the penitentiaries were properly conducted. If I may use the expression, they had concurrent jurisdiction, that is, there was no chief or senior inspector. I see by this Bill that the minister will have power to appoint not more than three inspectors. Will he tell us it will be the duty of the proposed superintendent to look after the inspectors, or will he himself act as an inspector by supervising all the penitentiaries and making to the minister such recommendations as to changes as he may think advisable? I have not ascertained by reading the reports of the Department of Justice that the penal population has increased of late in such proportion as to justify the appointment of three inspectors and a superintendent. I have not heard, either, that under the old system there was any complaint made against Mr. Stewart, or against Mr. Dawson, when he was inspector, that they did not perform their duties, or that there was any laxity in the administration of the penitentiaries. The work in the various penal institutions of the Dominion must be less than it was when construction was not well advanced, six or seven years ago. I understand that the inspectors had a great deal of work at that time, when many attempts were made by the convicts to get away. There were some escapes, and there is one name that comes to my mind, the famous Bill Miner, whose case kept the House sitting for a couple of days at that time. The work must be decreasing as construction is being completed, and I would like to have from the minister a definite statement as to the necessity for having this increase, and of having a superintendent when we have always got along well with two inspectors. The inspectors were thoroughly qualified, and no doubt the excellent results achieved are due to the good work they have done. When conditions seem to be improving, and the prison population does not seem to be increasing, can the minister justify an increase in the staff?

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards the number of inspectors, that is provided for by another section. If the committee is of the opinon that they are too numerous, I shall be open to consider that. The present sec-

tion involves a change of systems, not necessarily an increase in the number of officers. We had two inspectors, and they had two functions which, I think I am correct in saying, were distinct functions. They had the inspection of the penitentiaries and they had the superintendence and direction of the carrying on of the penitentiaries. That created a situation that those two officers, not having the work divided between them—to one the inspection and to the other the superintendence and direction —were equal in authority and charged with this double function. Now, the necessities from the point of view of superintendence rather called for the presence here of the person or persons carrying on that direction, and the constant supervision by them of what was going on in all the different penitentiaries. The work of inspection, on the other hand, called for men to be absent from Ottawa to keep in touch with what was actually going on. Now, eliminating for the moment any question as to the number of officers, the principal idea is to separate those two functions, which, I think, on reflection, the hon. member will see are two perfectly distinct functions; and to have one officer who will have, under the deputy minister and the minister, the power of decision and the responsibility for the decision, instead of having two gentlemen of equal authority, with the possibility always that they might not agree, and with a situation in which no one person was responsible for the action ultimately taken. I submit that all the balance of advantage is in the direction of having one responsible head, some one person doing the deciding, so far as the deciding properly belongs to an officer of that class, and responsible for the decision come to, rather than in that of having two gentlemen who, if they happened to be here both together might not agree, and who, as they could not always be present together might have to decide successively upon questions coming before them. I do not desire to criticise the personal action of gentlemen who have been inspectors of penitentiaries; this proposal rests simply upon the considerations which I have pointed out. No one occupying the position that I do could fail to see the disadvantages that result from this anomalous and unusual situation.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister has not yet convinced me that he is right. This superintendent is being appointed to receive reports of inspectors, decide what action is necessary, and be responsible for the results of that action. Under the present system the inspectors report to the minister, who is the proper man to bear the responsibility of any action that is taken. If extra assistance is required in connection with the penitentiaries, by all means obtain it; but let the responsibility for action taken in the administration of penitentiaries not be saddled on any one other than the head of the department. Penitentiaries constitute a very important branch of the administration of justice, and repeated discussions have taken place in the House with regard to their management. The late Mr. Monk repeatedly brought forward resolutions regarding the segregation of convicts with a view to improving their lot. If one inspector is required, or if a division of the work of the inspectors is necessary—say, by provinces or districts—well and good; but I do not see why a superintendent of penitentiaries should read the reports of inspectors and then tell the Minister of Justice how he ought to think. This matter of the management of penitentiaries will have to come before the House in the near future with a view to a change of the whole system. I shall not go into that now, but I wish to emphasize my belief that the superintendent in this case should be the Minister of Justice, and that action taken by him should be based not on the report of a superintendent, but on the facts contained in the reports made by the inspectors.

Mr. EDWARDS: I rather favour the idea of appointing a superintendent for all penitentiaries in Canada, but I cannot see the wisdom of appointing three, or even two, inspectors. Defining the duty of inspectors, the Act says that they shall, under the direction of the superintendent, " visit, examine and report upon the state and management of the penitentiaries and the suggestions which the warden or officers in charge thereof make for the improvement of the same."

The CHAIRMAN: Order. If the hon. gentleman would allow us to reach that clause before he discusses it the procedure would be more regular.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not agree with your view, Mr. Chairman, but we must abide by your decision.

The CHAIRMAN: The rule is clear; all speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS: I understand that. I do not interrupt other members when they deviate from the rule by broadening out the

discussion, and if I am to be kept in line with the rule, every other member should be kept in line also. In discussing this matter I intend to exercise my privileges as a member of the House, even though I am not a Cabinet minister. When a Cabinet minister or any other member deviates from the clause under discussion by making a general statement, I have the same privilege as he has.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman may appeal from the ruling of the Chair, but he may not discuss the ruling after it has been given.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have said all I want to say on that point; if necessary, I will appeal from the ruling of the Chair. A discussion of the appointment of a superintendent naturally involves also the question of the appointment of two or more inspectors. In the past we have had two inspectors, and we now propose to change the system. In my judgment, two inspectors are unnecessary. An inspector who is sent around to look over the seven penitentiaries of Canada can spend one month in each and still have five months to spare. What are two men going to do? Two inspectors are unnecessary when we have a superintending head at Ottawa. I am strongly in favour of a change in the whole system of penitentiaries, which will inaugurate a new era in the management of these institutions.

I have on former occasions suggested the advisability of doing some of the things which the minister purposes doing under the new system. It is really too bad that the innocent have to suffer when the criminal is taken to the penitentiary. We should avoid that as far as possible, and endeavour to ameliorate this situation so far as it is in our power to do so. I am, therefore, in entire accord with what has been suggested by the minister, namely, that a price be put upon the work of the convict. A price of so much a day is put upon his work now. I agree, if you like, that the first charge on that shall be his maintenance; but when he leaves the walls of the penitentiary, if he has not any one dependent upon him, he should be able to look forward to having a small sum of money which will keep him for a period while he is endeavouring to obtain honest employment. If, when he goes within the walls of the penitentiary, he leaves a wife and family behind him, a part of the money he makes in prison should go to the support of that wife and family. I see no reason why that should not be done, and I see many reasons to commend its being done. I believe it will have a magnificent effect on the convict's conduct. It will do more than any other thing one can mention to keep that man, while he is within the walls of the penitentiary, under control. He will know that, in being deprived of his liberty, he is being punished, and he will have an incentive to conduct himself properly, so that some of the money he may make by his work in the penitentiary will go to the support of his family to keep them from want. That suggestion is all right.

I welcome this idea of a superintendent for another reason. I think it was the late Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice or Prime Minister of this country, I do not know which, who conceived the idea of a separate institution for the boys, the young convicts imprisoned for the first offence. I am not sure that I am correct, but I think I am, in saying that he even went so far as to purchase a piece of land about midway between Kingston and Montreal, and some work was done on the foundations of a new building, but the work was not proceeded with. I am confident I am right in saying Sir John Thompson had in mind a separate institution in which the young convicts, the boys of sixteen, seventeen and eighteen, who were "first offenders," would be incarcerated. That is something which I have brought up in this House before, and which ought to have the attention of every hon. member in this House. Money spent on such a project would be money well spent. Even in the worst of men there is some good, if you have only tact enough to bring it out. May I be permitted to place on Hansard a letter which, I think, proves what I say. It may arouse the interest of some hon. members who, perhaps, look upon this penitentiary question as something not worthy of their consideration. I appealed to the minister some time ago, I think it was in 1917, to liberate a convict by the name of Alex. Rose. Rose was liberated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How old was he?

Mr. EDWARDS: I should judge, roughly speaking, he was a man about thirty years old.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should think so. He was a comparatively young man.

Mr. EDWARDS: He said that if he were liberated, he would join the forces and go overseas and try there to redeem his past.

He went overseas. This is a letter from the front addressed to the mother of this former convict:

France, March 31, 1918.

Dear Madam:

It is with the deepest regret that I write to advise you of the death of your son, Sapper A. Rose, on the 28th of March, 1918. He is greatly missed in the unit on account of his cheery disposition and willingness to help out any situation no matter how hard. He has proven himself a man worthy in every way to wear the King's uniform. He was always fearless in the face of danger and his coolness inspired confidence in all who came in contact with him.

He was laid to rest in Barlin British cemetery on the 29th of March, and all his comrades stood by the graveside paying their last tribute to the brave. A minister was in charge of the burial arrangements and the Last Post was sounded by a trumpeter surrounded by the officers and men of the Company standing at the Salute. A dedication service was held today in a Y. M. C. A. hut where special hymns were sung and prayers said for your loved one and those who are left to mourn the loss of a brave fearless Canadian soldier.

A cross is being specially prepared for the grave and a wreath will be bought to forever commemorate the sympathy of the officers and men of this Unit for one who fell in action while doing his all to help a righteous cause.

Our sympathies go out to you so many miles away in your sad bereavement, and also my pledge that every one of us who are left will fight to the utmost of our ability to crush the fiend who has caused such deep bereavement to be suffered by the innocent ones in our dear home land.

All personal belongings which have been saved will be sent you as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

R. McKillop, Captain,
O. C. 13th C. L. R. O. Co'y.

I read that for two reasons: First, I think it is no more than fair to pay that tribute to a man who formerly had misconducted himself so that he came within the walls of the penitentiary; secondly, because it bears out what I say, that of those men behind the walls of the penitentiaries there are none who are not worthy of our sincere consideration in trying to better their conditions and make men of them. This man went overseas and did his bit and received the commendation of all with whom he was associated. He was honoured by his officers and comrades for his conduct in this war.

I wish the Government would seriously take into consideration a separate institution for the young convict, the young fellow of seventeen or eighteen, who has violated the laws of the land and who is sent to the penitentiary. It is positively criminal on our part to place that young fellow alongside of a man who has spent, perhaps, one-half of his life in penitentiary, cracking stone, day after day, week after week, and month after month. When we allow that sort of thing to continue in this country, I do not think we can consider ourselves guiltless, for I firmly believe there is some good in even the worst convict, and especially is that true of the young fellow who is sent to the penitentiary for the first time. Such a young man should receive some consideration. He is not getting a fair show when he is put into the penitentiary alongside of men who have been criminals for one-half of their lives. And in so far as we are responsible for not giving him a fair show, that is something not to the credit of hon. members of this House. A good deal could be done in these institutions to uplift these men. I have, on a former occasion, called attention to the great number of men engaged in nothing better than breaking stones—and at the same time breaking their own spirits. Why should this be? Only last night in this House we were passing Estimates and considering the cost of furniture for this, that and the other building throughout the country.

Why should we not have standard furniture for the several classes of offices? When post offices and custom houses here and there throughout the country require furniture, why should we depend upon the whim of an official who prefers this kind of furniture to that kind? Why go out and advertise for tenders on things like that? It has been said that if these articles were made by the convicts it would interfere with free labour, but I do not think that that argument will hold water for one moment. If you like, place upon the convict's labour a price commensu-

4 p.m.

rate with the prices paid outside; I would rather do that than let him sit in idleness within the walls of the prison. I maintain that there are many things used in Canada and paid for by the Government, such as office furniture, mail bags, rural route post boxes, and a dozen other things, that could be made by convict labour to the financial advantage of the country and, certainly, greatly to the advantage of the convict. I think that is something which is deserving a very serious consideration, and I would like to see it done. A superintendent with supervision over all these institutions must necessarily be in Ottawa a great part of his time, and I think it would be a good idea to have a man to generally supervise all these institutions. He could have an inspector to visit the several peni-

tentiaries from time to time, report to him on the conditions and get his orders. Perhaps two inspectors might be required, but I am certain three would not be necessary; however, I do not hold that opinion so strongly that I am not prepared to change it for good reason. The minister may have reasons which may induce me to favour the appointment of two inspectors, but at the present time I see no reason why a superintendent and one inspector could not do all the work.

The CHAIRMAN: The address just delivered by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) would have been perfectly in order upon the second reading of the Bill. Fearing that he might attribute a second interruption to personal animosity of some kind, I have waited until this moment to make a special request to all the members of the committee to assist the Chairman in securing a strict observance of the rules. Upon many occasions during the present session, the second reading of a Bill has been carried without debate and attempts have been later made to discuss the principle of the Bill in committee. This practice is in direct violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the minister intend to confer any additional powers or vest any additional functions in the superintendent beyond those now existing in the case of the inspectors?

Mr. DOHERTY: The powers are specified in a subsequent section of the Bill. I do not know that they go beyond those presently existing in the case of the inspectors. I have endeavoured to make clear to the hon. gentleman that the purpose is to separate two functions, which, in my judgment and in that of the inspector of penitentiaries, with his many years of experience, could be better administered by different officers. With regard to what the hon. member for Frontenac has said, both upon the subject of the number of inspectors and with regard to the work that might be done by convicts in penitentiaries, and as to developing what is good in all of these men—and I quite share his view that there is no man so bad that there is no good in him—I should like to say a few words, but in order not to depart from the ruling of the Chairman I would suggest that what I desire to say be deferred until we come to a subsequent section with regard to the powers of the superintendent, which will give me an opportunity to make some observations on the remarks of the hon. member as to the general system.

Mr. EULER: The minister stated that these appointments can be made by the Government only on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. Has the Government discretion to accept or reject the recommendations that may be so made, and could they continue to reject them until a recommendation was made that was satisfactory to them?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that there is any absolute provision either in the Order in Council or in the proposed legislation further than the provision that the appointments are to be made on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. The position that would be created in such a case would be that the Government would either have to leave the positions vacant or act upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. If for some reason there might be very serious objection to the party recommended, to which the attention of the Civil Service Commission might be called, I suppose it would be within the function of the Government to make that representation, but I think I may safely say that the intention was to make the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission necessary before any individual could be appointed. While I am not aware that there is a provision imposing the absolute obligation upon the Government, certainly it is the duty of the Government to fill the vacancies in the public service so that public business may go on, and when there is a provision that the vacancies are to be filled on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission I do not believe there is reason to apprehend that their recommendations will not be acted upon.

On clause 15—Inspectors:

Mr. MORPHY: Is the minister going to put in a provision that these appointments shall go to returned soldiers? I notice a great many appointments being made all over the country in connection with various boards and commissions, and I understood that these appointments were to be given to returned soldiers, but the big-paid fellows are not returned soldiers. I should just like to clinch the matter here and get the minister's views.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I pointed out, the appointments will be made on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission who will follow, no doubt, their usual pro

cedure. In the Order in Council making provision for requiring the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, wherever feasible, as the result of competitive examination, it is expressly provided that preference is to be given the returned soldier, even to the extent of over-riding the purely competitive feature. The provision runs—I am speaking from memory—that where several people have passed the examination, the returned soldier may be put at the head, and, in fact, I think, shall be put ahead, of those who have a greater number of marks, providing he has passed his examination in a manner to indicate that he is competent to fill the position.

That gives a distinct preference to the returned soldier. These positions, as all positions in my department, will be subject to the rule laid down, that this preference is to be given. There are occasionally positions for which the returned soldier available does not happen to be suited. I am sure no hon. gentleman would suggest that we ought to put a returned soldier into a position for which his previous training, education, or occupation, have not made him reasonably fitted. But with that exception, I understand it to be the absolute rule that preference is to be given to the returned soldier. That will be a matter in future to be dealt with by the Civil Service Commission.

Sir SAM HUGHES: By "returned soldier", I presume you mean one who has faced the music. There are returned soldiers, and returned soldiers. There are a great many gentlemen who are occupying very nice positions across the water, but who have never been in the trenches, and I certainly would not recommend any preference in such cases. I have never seen any difference between the man who is eating his heart out in Canada because he cannot get an opportunity to go, and the man who has crossed over and who occupies some clerical position in England. I think that the fellow who has been forced to stay at home and who is anxious to go has just as much right to consideration as the man who has never been at the front. But the man who has faced the music and has risked his life in the firing line is the one I would recommend to special consideration when we are speaking about returned soldiers. There are a great many officers and men who have not been able to go across, and I have known men who have worried themselves almost to death because they could not get over and who are just as much entitled to recognition as those who have sailed across and remained in England.

Mr. MANION: As a representative of the returned soldiers in this House, I would like to support very strongly the ideas expressed by the two hon. members who have just addressed the Committee, and particularly that expressed by the hon. member for Victoria, Ont. (Sir Sam Hughes) that preference be given to returned soldiers who have faced the guns of the enemy at the front.

Mr. BUREAU: Without prejudice to my right to rise again in discussion, I desire to ask a question in order to obtain information. We are now discussing Bill No. 21, and the sections of the Bill are numbered. We are discussing section 4.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 3, section 15.

Mr. BUREAU: It is section 3 until it becomes section 4. I see section 4 on page 3, and under section 3 the minister has seen fit to change a lot of sections in the old statute. What I want to ascertain is this: Are the numbers of the sections of the old statute to govern, or is the Bill under consideration to govern? If it is the old statute, we have to take the sections one by one, 14, 15, 16 and so on. If it is the present Bill, we would consider all the sections together. A number of the sections contained in clause 4 deal with the duties of the superintendent and his powers over the inspectors. They come one after the other, and it would make the discussion easier and quicker if we were to take them up together rather than if we were to follow the order of the Bill as it stands, and discuss section 3.

Mr. DOHERTY: Section 3 of this Bill repeals sections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Repeals sections 14 to 23 and re-enacts them.

Mr. DOHERTY: And re-enacts them. We might have followed our regular course of dealing with these proposed sections, 14, 15 and so on, as distinct sections. It is only to abbreviate that the repealing clause is all put in one section. We might have proceeded by saying that "section 14 is repealed and replaced by the following," and made another section. And so with the others. In effect, section 3 deals with a number of sections, repealing them, and substituting a new section for each section repealed. Our regular course would be to

deal at the present moment with the proposed section 15.

Mr. BUREAU: This is section 3 of the Bill. What is under consideration before the Committee is a Bill, and section 3 of the Bill which provides that sections 14 to 23, inclusive, of the Act as it now reads, shall be amended. I want to be sure whether the numbers of the sections in the statute are going to rule, or whether the Bill under consideration is going to rule, before the Committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: My submission is that we should consider the proposed repeal of each separate section of the Bill and the substitution of a new section as being a clause to be dealt with by itself.

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that clause 3 being a re-enacting clause, each section of the Act which it proposes to repeal and replace by a new section, should be considered separately by the committee. It is, however, the privilege of any hon. member to move that any number of clauses or re-enacted section be considered together. If the hon. member for Trois Rivières (Mr. Bureau) wishes to so move, I will be pleased to submit the motion.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not desire to offer any obstruction or create embarrassment, but my contention is that we have a right to discuss with section 3 all the re-enacted clauses. We have to consider the Penitentiaries Act only because that Act is referred to here in this Bill, and sections 14 to 23 of that Act are included in section 3 of this Bill, and my contention is that while we are discussing section 3 all these sections are one and the same for the purposes of this discussion. I suppose I could move that all these clauses be considered together, but I cannot make any motion having reference to anything except the clauses as they are numbered in this Bill. I am not going to move that clause 14, or clause 15 of the Penitentiaries Act be considered. I can only move with reference to the clauses of the Bill as they are numbered and submitted to the committee at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has a perfect right to move that all the sections re-enacted by clause 3 be considered together.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member, without discussing whether he can make a motion or not, thinks that all these separate substitutions should be made by separate sections, or if he says that any advantage would be gained by taking them altogether, I have no objection. I have not the slightest objection to anything that, within reason, will appear to facilitate a thorough understanding of this measure. But it did seem to me, and it still seems to me, that it would be more convenient and we would get our work through with a perhaps clearer understanding of it, if we should take the Bill with these proposed substituted sections of the Act one by one. But I have no desire to insist upon it if the hon. gentleman thinks it will be an advantage.

Mr. EDWARDS: Subsections 14 to 23 were put into one section for the reason, I suppose, that they were related one to the other, but I find a difficulty in undertaking to discuss a matter which should properly come under section 3 of the Bill when I step outside of the sub-sections referred to. The very fact of the two subsections in question being included in one section seems to give weight to the argument of my hon. friend that the whole section should be opened up. Will the minister kindly state what salary the inspectors receive at present?

Mr. DOHERTY: The present inspectors, whose duties, of course, are different from those of the old inspectors, have both, I believe, reached the maximum of their class in which the salary is from $2,800 to $4,000. It is obvious, I think, that the new office of inspector will not be nearly as important as the old office was, because there is withdrawn from the office the duty of direction and superintendence, which is perhaps the principal duty.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know just how both the inspectors attained the maximum $4,000. I can understand how that happened with one inspector, because he has been in the service for a long time. In the case of the other, doubtless, duties performed by him in other capacities in the penitentiary branch were taken into consideration and had to do with his advancement. I have already said that I could not exactly see the necessity for appointing two more inspectors, and one reason is this: For the last two or three years one man has been performing the work of inspector and that of superintendent also, while the other inspector has been overseas. In other words, all the work which will, under this Bill, be divided between a superintendent and two or more inspectors, has for the last two or three years been performed by Inspector Stewart. That being the case it seems to me that one superin-

tendent, with one inspector to visit the institutions, would be sufficient.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no desire to insist upon the appointment of three inspectors but let me point out that the provision is not that there shall be three inspectors, but that the minister shall have power to name not more than that number. I would like to give the reasons why it seems to me we ought to have an inspection force larger than, looking at it purely as an inspection force, was required in the past. If the regulations, for the making of which power is asked in section 18, are carried out, it will involve the carrying on of operations which, I hope, will, in the not very remote future, assume some considerable importance in the different penitentiaries, and which are likely to call for closer and more frequent inspection of the different institutions and render necessary, perhaps, a more absolute keeping in touch with them. Under the plan which it is proposed to adopt, the superintendent will do the directing from the administrative centre here. There is one power conferred to go and look into conditions in any penitentiary, but that, properly, is not his function. The new conditions render it important that he—and through him the department and the minister—should be kept informed, and adequately informed, as to what is going on in the different penitentiaries. I do think—and I may say that I have so felt since I have been charged with the ultimate responsibility of the administration of these institutions—it is highly desirable that those who have that responsibility should, so far as possible, be kept in touch with the conditions as they exist. I would say that that should be done from day to day. Perhaps that is an exaggerated requirement, but it indicates the importance that I attach to the necessity of those at the administrative centre being kept, so far as possible, informed of and in touch with what is going on in the different institutions.

It was the anticipation of making the inspection of these proposed industries more important, and the value that I myself attach to the necessity of those who are here at the centre, and who are responsible, dealing with these matters with knowledge, and knowledge that is up to date, that led me to suggest that the minister should be empowered, if as a result of future operations that was found necessary, to appoint as many as three inspectors. The observation has been made that for the last two or three years one gentleman has been carrying on the inspection duties. That is true, but I am perfectly free to say, without intending any criticism of the individual, that it has not been a satisfactory system. It is not satisfactory to myself, as being responsible for what is going on in these institutions, that two or three years should be allowed to elapse without having a thorough inspection. Now the duty of superintendence and direction really does take the time of one man, and it will be difficult to carry on operations if one man is to be continually going through the country on the necessary duties of inspection. Whether as many as three are or are not necessary, I am not prepared to say, except to this extent, that I did not have it in contemplation at present to appoint that number. My idea was to appoint two, but I had thought that it was well worth while, when we were dealing with the subject, to take the power, in case the development of the work we are looking forward to should make it necessary, to appoint a third inspector. However, I have no desire to insist upon that if the committee is of opinion that there should be only two inspectors, or for that matter only one, although I think we could hardly work out the scheme satisfactorily with only one inspector. In connection with the work of inspection, and as a further reason for the number contemplated, let me say that if you have but one inspector you infallibly have a system under which the movements of that inspector will necessarily become known. That being the case—I am not making any suggestion with regard to any officer, but we know the tendency to "window-dressing" characteristic of human nature—when an inspection is anticipated the natural desire is to have all things look as nice as they can. There is, at all events, a temptation to have things look better than, perhaps, they do every day in the week, when they know the inspector will come. What I had in contemplation with regard to these officers was that the whole of their time would be on inspection, going at irregular times, not necessarily taking the penitentiaries in regular order. I would not assign a particular district to either inspector. I would have, through the superintendent, either inspector sent when a case presented itself, and if thought desirable, to any of the penitentiaries. One of the reasons for having men to do nothing but inspection is that I do feel very strongly that close contact on the part of those responsible in the department, and, as far as possible, close contact

on the part of the minister, with what is going on, is a most essential thing, a thing which also will prevent the growing up of abuses which are very likely to grow up under the administration of men when they fall into the routine of running an institution of which they are the heads and naturally get to be quite satisfied with their own view—unless they feel that there is some one constantly keeping an eye upon them. Now, these are all the reasons, and I submit their sufficiency to the consideration of the committee, that led me to think it wise to provide for the possibility of appointing three inspectors if the work developed. I did not for a moment contemplate appointing more than two, and if the committee think it wiser to substitute two for three I shall not insist on the provision as it stands.

Now, while I am on my feet, I will refer to what the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said as to the desirability of diversifying or increasing in number the useful employments to which the convicts may turn and the good effects that we may hope for from providing some remuneration for their labour, and of arriving at a system whereby the younger and less confirmed criminals should be separated from the influence of the older, or at all events the more confirmed criminals. The views which he has expressed have my thorough sympathy. I may say that it has occurred to me that it would be a better method to attain that result if, instead of seeking to make special provision for the less hardened, we considered the advisability of gathering together in one, or say two, institutions, those of our convicts who may be looked upon as falling principally under the designation of hardened criminal, and then endeavouring to conduct the other institutions on lines that might be more suitable to the case of the younger offender or, in any event, the less hardened. I would be disposed to believe that the greater number might fairly enough be classified among the less hardened; and, if we had one or two of the institutions set apart as the prisons in which were to be detained and punished those with regard to whom—I would not like to say we have no hope—but those for whom we have less hope, we might then regulate the respective institutions in view of the character of the criminals detained within them. I do not think even with the best thought that can be given to it—and that has been generally agreed to—so long as you have all sorts of criminals within the same institution, it is practicable to segregate them into classes in such a manner as to produce any real effectual result. If we had some classification of institutions, that would seem to me a very desirable thing, and that is one of the things which I hope to be able to get started, at all events, and in practical operation. A difficulty in the way, which explains the delay, is, of course, the question of expense. To build separate and distinct new institutions involves the immediate expenditure of money. I have some hope that we may be able to do without additional institutions involving the immediate expenditure of money. I have some hope that we may be able to do without additional institutions by classifying the present ones and setting apart one or two, and so arrive at the desired result, or, at all events, to set such a system in movement.

Mr. MORPHY: I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. minister. If I may be permitted to use the expression, he seems to be begging the question to some extent. I appreciate that this is war time, and that we are really at war. The minister brings in what he conceives to be, and chooses to call, a reform as the basis of his justification for asking for authority to put upon the Civil Service list of Canada two or three extra men as penitentiary inspectors at a time when the country is demanding in every other department the most rigid economy. While the minister attempts to justify this under the guise of a reform, he has not shown us clearly enough that that basis exists for an increase of expenditure. I am led to believe—and if I am wrong the minister, I hope, will correct me—that the penitentiary population of Canada to-day is not nearly as large as it has been on the average for a long time past. I would like to ask the minister if that is so.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand there has been a reduction in the penitentiary population.

Mr. MORPHY: To what extent?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think about 20 per cent.

Mr. MORPHY: Then it does seem to me a most unfortunate and inopportune time, when the country's resources are so tremendously strained, for the minister, on a declining penitentiary population, to introduce a reform which is going to require money, not only in the meantime, but forever. The probabilities are that the

discipline which our population has suffered under the Military Service Act will curb the criminal tendencies of the people in the future, and the number of convicts will be lessened rather than increased. While I am on my feet, that is one reason why I suggested that there should be something definite and specific provided in the Bill to ensure the appointment of returned soldiers of proper capacity to undertake such positions as these. Men who have seen the horrors and experienced the rigours of war will have their hearts touched with more or less compassion on account of what they have seen. Therefore, I believe that out of the returned soldiers' class the very best kind of inspectors could naturally be secured. They would know how to enforce discipline with kindness. How is the country to know exactly what view the Civil Service Commission will take in appointments of this kind? What is there in the Bill to assure that a returned soldier, in every way competent to perform these duties, will not be debarred because of his failure to spell some word correctly? I have every confidence and every faith in the Civil Service Commission. I believe they are men of large parts and keen observation. But what I want to get from the minister, if I can, is something more specific than the abstract suggestion that, as a matter of course, soldiers will get the preference.

There is no object in giving a returned soldier the preference for a position if he has to pass an examination which has no relation to the duties which he will have to perform. I suggest that the minister insert a provision in the Bill with regard to this, or give his assurance that if it is within his province or power he will request the Civil Service Commission to provide such examinations for positions of this kind that it will be easy for competent returned soldiers to obtain them.

Mr. DOHERTY: It will not be any more the law if I put it in this statute than it is already the law, as being of general application. Certainly I shall be glad, so far as I have anything to say in the matter and when I have occasion to deal with appointments, to call the attention of the Civil Service Commission to the consideration that should be given to returned soldiers in the matter of appointments.

Paragraph 15 agreed to.

On section 3, paragraph 17—ex officio Justice of the Peace:

Mr. DENIS: Will these inspectors have jurisdiction all over Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: This clause is a reproduction of the existing clause, and confers upon inspectors powers similar to those which they now have. The purpose is to give them these powers in connection with the performance of their duties. Gentlemen who are fit to be inspectors of penitentiaries would necessarily be fit to be justices of the peace, even if they did exercise jurisdiction regarding matters not directly pertaining to penitentiaries.

Mr. DENIS: Are these inspectors to reside in some particular place, or may they reside where they choose? Further, will the territory subjected to their inspection be defined in the Act or elsewhere?

Mr. DOHERTY: Inspectors will not be allocated to any particular territory; they will be under the orders of the department to go where they are sent. At first glance it might seem convenient that they should reside in Ottawa, in order that they may be available when required, but circumstances might be such as to permit them to reside outside of Ottawa.

Mr. DENIS: Will these inspectors receive fixed salaries and travelling expenses?

Mr. DOHERTY: The statute provides a salary of $2,500. Any one travelling on the business of the Government has his expenses paid.

Mr. DENIS: Would it not be expedient to provide that these inspectors shall reside in certain localities as near as possible to the territories which they are to supervise? Otherwise, inspectors living in Ottawa might be sent to Vancouver, Halifax, or all over the country, at the expense of the Government, and their travelling expenses might be higher than their salaries.

Mr. DOHERTY: If you assign one inspector to certain penitentiaries, you rely absolutely on that one man with regard to those particular penitentiaries, and you have no check on his work. To make inspection efficient it is desirable that an inspector shall not be attached to a particular penitentiary, but shall be available to go to one penitentiary to-day and to another next month. When one man has inspected a penitentiary, it should be open to us to send another for the next inspection so that what may have been overlooked by one inspector may receive the attention of the

other. Whether any material difference in the amount of expenditure involved would result from interchanging inspectors, it is difficult for me to say offhand. A man travelling frequently throughout a small district may spend as much money as if he went occasionally on a longer journey. Probably it would be somewhat less expensive to attach one man to a particular district. For the sake of economy, however, you would lose the most substantial advantage of the plan which is projected.

Mr. EDWARDS: If you have one inspector he can inspect each of the penal institutions seven times a year and spend one week on each inspection. If you have two inspectors, fourteen visits a year can be made, of a week each. But here is another feature of it. Portsmouth and St. Vincent de Paul penitentiaries contain about as many convicts as all the rest put together. If you divide the time of two inspectors according to the convict population, one inspector would spend practically all his time in visiting these two institutions; he would virtually become another official of the penitentiaries in question, and lose his usefulness as an inspector. That seems to be something worthy of consideration. The value of the minister's plan, as I understand it, is that this man shall be, not "the" inspector, but "an" inspector who will drop in at unstated times—to-day at Dorchester, next week at Stony Mountain, and so on—making unexpected visits. Therein will lie his value as an inspector. But if you have so many inspectors that their time is necessarily cut up, they must be practically like additional officers at one or two of those institutions.

Mr. COPP: The minister is asking for pretty large powers in requiring that every inspector of a penitentiary shall be a justice of the peace and have the powers of a justice of the peace in every city, town and parish in the Dominion of Canada. It may be perfectly right to allow him to act as a justice of the peace in connection with the business of the penitentiary which he is inspecting, but it is going too far to allow him to go into any locality and act as a justice of the peace in criminal matters.

Mr. DOHERTY: This is merely a reproduction of the existing law.

Mr. COPP: If the law is wrong, it should be changed.

Mr. DOHERTY: The section confers the powers. That is one thing. The time to go and exercise them is another. When we appoint an inspector we shall certainly take all of his time and pay him his salary, and as our officer he will not be allowed to go devoting himself to other business. The purpose of the section is that he should have those powers simply that he may be able to exercise them when occasion arises in the performance of his duty as inspector of penitentiaries. This has been the law practically ever since we have had an inspector of penitentiaries. I am not aware of any instance in which an inspector has tried to exercise his powers except on occasions on which it may be useful for him to exercise those powers in connection with penitentiary business.

Mr. COPP: While it has never been expected that an inspector would act as a justice of the peace in different localities in which he may happen to be, and while an inspector may never have so acted, still, if it is necessary for him to have the powers of a justice of the peace in connection with his office as inspector, those powers should be limited entirely to what use he may be required to make of them in connection with the penitentiary, and not in a general way, as is left by this section.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the minister define what is meant by "district" in this section?

Mr. DOHERTY: In different parts of the country you have the country divided into districts, counties, cities, towns and so forth, and you have mgaistrates for such a district or for such a county. The purpose in the enumeration is that the inspector should find himself, in whatever place he may be, vested with the powers of a magistrate in that locality, whether the magistrates who are in that locality be magistrates for a district, or magistrates for a county, or magistrates for a town.

Mr. MORPHY: The only thing that occurred to my mind was that it might not apply to what is known as an unorganized district which is part of the country in which an inspector might frequently want to exercise his duties.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should be disposed to think that the mere fact that the district was unorganized does not alter the fact that it is a district. Of course, the places in which there is reason to anticipate there may be occasion to exercise those powers are practically the places in which the peniten-

tiaries are established, so that I do not know that any great evil could occur. An inspector of a penitentiary will rarely find himself in an unorganized district, because all of our penitentiaries are situated in thoroughly organized portions of the country.

Paragraph 17 agreed to.

On paragraph 18—superintendent to make rules:

Mr. FIELDING: Is this a new clause or a repetition of the old clause?

Mr. DOHERTY: The first paragraph (a) is a repetition of the old clause, which provides that the inspector shall, subject to the approval of the minister, make rules and regulations for all of the purposes mentioned in paragraph (a). Paragraph (b) is new. The purpose of it is to give power to make regulations for the purposes specified in it. I am not quite clear that it was absolutely essential that we should specially be empowered to do the things that are provided in this new paragraph, unless it be the provision for power to grant allowances to the convicts by way of remuneration for labour. The others I think might very possibly have come under the general power to manage, direct and control the penitentiary. To that second paragraph I may say I attach a great deal of importance for the reasons I have endeavoured to explain. In that regard I think I am reechoing what was said by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I do think the great need for the future is the provision of useful employment for the convict, employment that he will realize is useful and that will bring to him some measure of advantage by way of remuneration. That is important, in my judgment, from the point of view of the effect upon the convict, and the matter of making an allowance by way of remuneration is important also from the point of view of those who, in so many instances, although they are absolutely innocent, suffer more grievously by reason of the crime than does the criminal himself—I mean the absolutely dependent wife and children or other persons whose livelihood is cut off, and who, in many cases, are left in destitution and misery, because of the imprisonment of the criminal. That is important for their benefit, but it has also a further importance. When we are dealing with the question of clemency, the question of issuing tickets-of-leave, of allowing men out on parole, there are not a few cases in which, although one feels that the prisoner is undeserving of consideration, nevertheless, it is difficult, if not impossible, to steel one's heart against the representations that are made with regard to the abject destitution and misery of dependent wives and children. This provision will not only work as an improving influence upon the convict, in that it means benefit coming from labour, but will send him out after his years of labour, not with the feeling that his work has been a punishment and that he is going to do as little work as possible in the future, but with some sense that his work has started him on the path in which he may derive benefit from it, which I think is invaluable from the point of view of what we may hope for in his reformation. Then there is the effect that it should make it easier, I think, to maintain discipline within the penitentiary, because you might hope for less of a spirit of sullenness among the men you are dealing with. And then there is to my mind the very important consideration I have pointed out, that it will afford us the means of alleviating at all events, the suffering of those innocent ones who in so many cases have to suffer for the crime of those upon whom they are dependent.

Mr. FIELDING: I quite sympathize with the view of the minister; it was not to take any exception to the clause that I asked the question. What struck me was that the minister and the superintendent—practically, it means the minister only—is to have a very large power in making regulations. If that is the existing law and it has worked out well we do not want to be fussy, but as a general principle where regulations are to be made for the carrying out of an Act I think it is the part of wisdom that the power should not rest entirely in the hands of the minister but be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. That would be a protection to the minister himself, because, although going to the Governor in Council for approval in matters of this kind may largely be a matter of form, it sometimes gives a regulation greater strength and helps the minister to enforce it. But if that is the existing law I do not want to propose a change.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is the existing law. The only difference is that previously it read, "the Inspector" instead of "the Superintendent with the approval of the minister."

Mr. MORPHY: Would it not be better to use the word "granting" instead of "allowing" in the 27th line?

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite agree. I was going to submit to the committee an amendment to that section—it will also have the effect of meeting my hon. friend's suggestion—because I think the present wording implies that the remuneration to be granted shall be allowed to the particular convict engaged in the industry in which the money was earned. Now that was not the idea I had in mind. If we did that we would create a situation where those convicts who were fortunate enough to be working on something that we could dispose of and receive money for, would get remuneration, while the other man who might be doing work just as useful but which was to be used in the penitentiary would get nothing. The real purpose was that we should have power to remunerate convicts generally for their labour, and I therefore beg to move that section (b) of clause 18 be amended to read as follows:

The establishment and carrying on of any work or industry at any penitentiary as may be thought desirable for the useful employment or training of the convicts, for the employment of the convicts therein, for the disposal of the products thereof, and as well for allowing subject to such conditions as may be prescribed and payable in the manner and to such persons as may be designated by the regulations, remuneration for the labour of convicts.

Mr. BLAKE: Did any profits accrue from the work of the prisoners in the penitentiaries last year?

Mr. DOHERTY: We have not had any general system of industries in the past with a product of which it has been possible to dispose, and we are now taking specific powers in order to be able to develop a system of that kind. But even under the administration which we have had, we have found the opportunity to earn some money by means of the labour of convicts in the past year. We have had a very considerable agricultural production—I have not the figures—which has enabled us to provide in large measure for the wants of each penitentiary, and in some cases for the wants of others. Apart from that, we have done a certain amount of work in the way of providing clothing for the camps for interned enemy prisoners; we have furnished those institutions with goods amounting in value to $17,611.39, consisting of overalls, trousers, shirts, smocks, boots, repairs to boots, socks, suits, clothes and other work presently in progress. We have also produced for the Indian Department a considerable quantity of clothes consisting of some 212 suits, 220 shirts, 868 pairs of pants, 207 pairs of boots, and 207 belts. In addition to that, the women of the penitentiaries have done a considerable amount of work for the Red Cross Society, consisting of the making of pyjamas, socks and bandages. But all this has not been done under any regulated system by which we have received payment which would enable us to provide for an allowance, and the purpose of this amendment is to put us in a position where we can carry out that work upon a regular system, disposing of the articles exclusively to departments of the Government—we do not wish to interfere in any way with outside labour—and receiving the normal prices therefor, which would be applied in a measure to the upkeep of the institution and to which we would look for the means to provide this allowance for the convict.

Mr. BLAKE: I think one very important point arises out of what the hon. Minister of Justice has said. A prisoner is put at work, and the profits of his work are sent back to his dependents. The Minister of Justice says that the product of his labour will be sold to these different departments of the Government. The man is sufficiently penalized, as well as his wife and family, by his being imprisoned, without further penalizing them by not giving them the best return that can possibly be obtained from his labour. That is a point that should not be lost sight of. These products, no matter what they are, should be disposed of in the open market, free to any person who will offer the best possible price, because the wife and children of that man have as good a right to be protected as any industry or manufacturer. I think these products should be sold, not only to the departments of the Government, but to anybody who will pay a just and proper price for them.

Mr. DOHERTY: It will not affect the price if we sell to the Government, because if the hon. member had had experience of the prices Government departments pay, he would know that they do not get goods cheaper than anybody else. They never get them except at the highest price that can be got.

Paragraph 18 as amended agreed to.

On paragraph 19—annual report.

Mr. DOHERTY moved:

That the section be amended by striking out the words "copies of the annual" in line 40, and substituting the word "such"; by striking out

the words "by such" in line 41; also, by striking out the word "June" in line 34 and substituting the word "September."

He said: it is represented to me that it is not possible to have the financial statement ready in June.

Paragraph 19 as amended agreed to.

On section 7—superintendent added to and replacing inspectors.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to move to insert, after clause 7, and as clause 8, the following:

Section 53 is amended by inserting the words "or imbecile" after the word "insane," whenever said word "insane" appears therein.

He said: This is merely to meet a difficulty as to the certificate with reference to different kinds of insanity.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—superintendent substituted for inspectors.

Mr. DOHERTY moved:

That section 8 become section 9 of the Bill.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 5 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1918

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ques.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abitibi, railway facilities, 558

Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 5, 13

Adjournment moved to discuss matter of urgent public importance
- Mr. Currie, Quebec disturbances, 239, 336, 380, 463

Adulteration of food. *See* Food.

Advances to provinces, ques. 208, ques. 741. *See also* Finance

Advertising. *See* Government advertising

Advisory Arts Council, 1195

Aeroplanes. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps
- Presentation of to British Government, ques. 740

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code amendment

Agriculture. *See also* Food; Animal Contagious Diseases; Inspection and Sale
- Animals
  - Breeding, 2301
    - Distribution of, 151
    - Sherbrooke, at, ques. 870
    - Shipments of in Quebec, ques. 869
  - Cattle, British embargo on, ques. 565
  - Contagious diseases among, 800, 850
  - Horses, remounts, ques. 869, 904
  - Live stock industry, 2379
  - Sheep, protection of, 1055
- Apples. *See under this head,* Fruit
- Butter. *See under this head,* Dairying
- Canning and packing houses, 1056
- Dairying, 2298. *See also* Inspection and Sale; Oleomargarine
  - Butter, packing of, 1214
  - Cheese and condensed milk, prices, 1129
  - Exports, 307
  - Generally, 2298
  - Milk, ques. 872, 1129, 1214
  - Product in Canada in 1917, 290
- Department of
  - Estimates, staff and salaries, 151, 2375
  - Expenditure, 1917-18, 573
- Destructive insects and pests, 2298
- Eggs. *See also* Inspection and Sale.

Agriculture—*Con.*
- Inspection and grading of, ques. 1201, 1205, 1209
- Exhibitions, 2376, 2380
  - Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
- Experimental farms and demonstration stations, 2290
  - Lennoxville, ques. 743
  - Spirit Lake, ques. 744, 2293
- Flax, 1231, 2381
- Food production campaign, 903
  - Memorandum of Minister of Agriculture, 25-27
- Fruit and Fruit Marks, 2245. *See* Inspection and Sale
  - Apples, ques. 287
  - Distribution of, ques. 287
- Grain, milling value of, ques. 2399
- Hay. *See* Inspection and Sale
  - Inspection and grading, 1078
  - Levis county, purchase of, in, ques. 740
- Implements
  - Duties and drawbacks, ques. 50, ques. 465, ques. 872, ques. 1203, ques. 1204, 1274, 1277
  - Tractors, ques. 467
    - Admission of, duty free, 54, ques. 467
    - Purchase of by Government, 1693, 2388
- Indians, amongst. *See* Indians
- Labour for. *See* Labour
- Leave-of-absence boards, agricultural representative, Mr. Tucker, appointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873
- Meats. *See* Meat and Canned Foods
  - Cold storage, in, ques. 1302
- Mill feeds, ques. 206, 2298, 2300, 2304
- Oleomargarine, 288
  - Licenses to manufacture, ques. 286, ques. 1201
- Seed, 2381, 2537
- Vegetables. *See* Inspection and Sale
  - Distribution of, ques. 287
  - Duties on, 1339

Agriculture and Colonization. Committee on, 106, 1175, 2308, 2382, 2550

Aiken, Mr. G. O., ques. 2238

Air Service. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps

Aliens, 1694
Asiatics in British Columbia, 973-1026
Enemy, conscription of for labour, 974
Treatment of, 1007
Galicians, 980
Interned
Austrians, 1020
Mindheim, Siefreid H., ques. 207
Position of in Canada: Discussion of motions by Messrs. Clements, W. F. Maclean, and G. B. Nicholson, 973
Taxation of, 1001
Toronto, number of, in, 1000
Trades unions amongst, 2547
Treatment of in England, 1022

Allies
Military force arrangements with, 1071, 2194. *See also* War, Military Service

Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 890, 896

Alpine Club of Canada, 2227

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Brazeau Collieries Bill, 1691
Budget, 1282
Domestic loans, 1286
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Patriotic Fund, 1292
Port Hood dredging, 1158
War expenditure and taxation, 1283, 1287, 1291, 1683-1688

Amherst drill hall, 1137

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Winnipeg Centre)
Canadian War Record, 913
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1878

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amendment Bill. Res. 800. 1r., 803. 2r., com., 3r., 850

Anse aux Beaufils, 1162

Anse aux Gascons, 1162

Anti-loafer law, 377, 2387.

Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237

Apples. *See* Agriculture, Fruit; Inspection and Sale

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 18 (for 1918-19, $26,282,144.31). Res. 84, 1r., 85. 2r., com., 3r., 85
2. Bill No. 38 (for 1918-19, $500,000,000). Res. 463. 1r., 464. 2r., 571. Com., 571, 879, 1027. 3r., 1076
3. Bill No. 111 (for 1918-19, $131,342,638.20; for 1918-19, $46,957,312.68; for 1917-18, $14,034,274.33). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 2549

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Ammunition inspection, ques. 465
Budget, 1627

Archambault, Mr. Jos.—*Con.*
Chambly-Vercheres election, 972, 1304, 1618
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1883
Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982
Diamonds and precious stones, ques. 631
Engineers training depot officers, ques. 740
Flake graphite, ques. 631
Flour milling profits, 2128.
Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481
Hunt, Donald, ques. 1480
Imperial Conference, 1982, ques. 2239
Income tax, 1627
Johnson, Mr. Main, ques. 570, ques. 1303, 2279
Laval military hospital, ques. 631
Military service, 2128
Farmers' exemption, 1632
Habeas Corpus writs, Montreal district, ques. 739
Local tribunals, ques. 740
Munitions, danger of explosion, 1099
Organized labour, conference with, ques. 875
President of the Council, special trains for, ques. 875
Private secretaries, appointments, 2285
Production, 1629
Quebec disturbances, 450
Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875
Saucier, Capt., ques. 740
Soldiers' votes, 2447, 2473
Toronto, Secretarial fund, ques. 875
Victory loan, 1628
War Council, ques. 2239
Women's Conference, ques. 875
Yukon election, 2339

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Daylight saving, 249
Soldiers' homesteads, 253

Argyll House employees, 56

Arichat, judge at, salary of, 2517

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Fruit packing, 2246, 2251
Fuel, 744
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., resignation of, 633
Oleomargarine, 288, 314
Railway Act mendment (Vessel rates) 330
Secret session of Parliament, 2554

Army. *See also* Military Service; Militia and Defence; War
Aeroplanes, presentation of to British Government, ques. 740
Allowances
Assigned pay, 888, 2387
Separation, 63, 888, 2387
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 70
Argyll House employees, 56

Army—*Con.*
Battalions
25th Nova Scotia, ques. 1304
159th and 227th, ques. 2398
249th, ques. 466
Canadian Army Corps, 1305
Canadian War Records Office, 2127, ques. 2241
Civil servants in, pay and allowances to, 864, 1729, 1749, 2315, 2385, 2388
Conscription. *See* Military Service
Demobilization of, 31, 629
Dental corps, ques. 1202, ques. 2398
Deserters, 467
Draftees, and, alleged band of, 632
Reward for arrest of, ques. 467
Engineers training depot officers, ques. 740
Enlistments
British born and Canadian born, ques. 1127
June, 1917, prior to, 942
Labour, from, 978
Military Service Act, 1917, under, ques. 464
Overseas service, for, ques. 109
Voluntary system, under, ques. 1127
Fifth division, 879, 1306
First contingent, leave for members, 883-891
Forestry battalion, officers, 1175, 1305, ques. 2399
French Canadians, in, 1194, 1927
Units of, 927, 953
General statement by Minister of Militia, 578
Medical service, 1175, 1305, ques. 2238
Dr. Bruce, 1368
Military police, 2387, 2516
Mounted police, in, 2285
N.CO.'s., promotion of, 865
Officers
Fifth division, commanding, 1306
Montreal base depot, of, ques. 332
Quebec, ques. 288, 743
Headquarters staff, at, 862
Return of, to Canada, ques. 115
Returned, employment of, ques. 333
For individual officers see their names
Overseas forces
Casualties in, 34, 576, 936, ques. 1842, ques. 2102
Command of, 927
Strength of, 34, 901, 935
Victoria crosses won by, 288
Professional men, utilization of services of, 1539
Recruiting. *See also under this head,* Enlistments
Civil service, from. *See, under this head,* Civil Servants

Army—*Con.*
Military Service Act, prior to, 942
Numbers, 942
Property, leasing of for, ques. 465
Regiment, Amherst at, during election, ques 335
Remounts, purchase of in Canada, ques. 869, 904
Royal Flying Corps, 931, 1368
Enlistments in, at Quebec, 1367
Religious services, for, ques. 1365, 1617
Transfers to C.E.F., ques. 1842
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, in, 2285
Soldiers
Candidates for Parliament, 884
Civil pay of. *See under this head* Civil Servants
Mail matter for, postage on, 2535
Pensions, for. *See also* Pensions
Report of Committee on, 2480
Recruiting, advances for, ques. 1839
Return of
Canada, to, ques. 112
Front, to, ques. 332
Returned
Arrest for loafing, 2387
Employment, for, 1183
Government positions for, 1182, 1736
Imprisonment, alleged, of, 1367
Settlement. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amendment; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Soldiers' Settlement
Sickness of, while on leave, ques. 971
Smallpox among, 1131
Treatment of on transports, 73
Votes, 23, 909. *See also* Yukon election; War-time elections
In last election, 2256, 2400-2475
Motion (Mr. Copp) for investigation into, 2434
For individual soldiers see their names
Transfers from Royal Flying Corps to C.E.F., ques. 1842
Units recruited in Canada and their officers on reaching England, 596
Women's Auxiliary Army Corps, 952
Women's Royal Naval Service, 952

Art
Parliament buildings, new, decoration of, 1104
Canadian War Memorial, pictures for, 1195

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Alien labour, 986
Annual reports in French and English, ques. 971
Dager, Mr. Herman J., ques. 2242
Government railway rates for troops, 2168
Immigration agents, clergymen as, ques. 1203

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Indians in Ontario, 1056
Mail contracts, 2529
Pensions, 2489
Quebec disturbances, 438

Asiatics in Canada, 1002, 1005

Auditor General
Expenditure of, overseas, ques. 1481
Office, appointments in and salaries, 136, 1200
Relatives, appointment of, 1731, 1753

Austrians, interned, in Canada, 1020

Automobiles
"Joy riding" *See* Criminal Code Amendment
Tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Australia and New Zealand steamship service, 2211

Aviation. *See* Army, Royal Flying Corps

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 1357
Public expenditure, 1357
Ross rifle factory, ques. 1072, 1360

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Fruit containers, 2252
Printing Bureau appointments, ques. 1978

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Army
French Canadian units, 928
Officers of units recruited in Canada, 596
Defence of Canada Order, 1917, amendments, 932
Fisheries
Advisory board, 270
Bounties, 283
Commission, 275
Exhibit at Toronto, 280
Guardians and overseers, 270
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Protection service, 354
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 868, 967
Halifax Relief Commission, 2197
Life-saving stations, 357
Light-keepers' salaries, 372
Magdalen Islands steamship service, 70
Marine and Fisheries Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 152, 270
Military service, 2384
Missisquoi Bay, seine-fishing, 275
Montreal Harbour Advances Act Amendment, 80, 132
Naval Discipline Act Amendment, 723
Naval Service Department, estimates and salaries, 148, 363, 366
Orders in Council and Reports, 12
Pilots, 373, 1306

Ballantyne. Hon. C.—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 362
Riviere Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 361
Royal Naval college, 357
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 367
Shipbuilding, 345-354
Simcoe, steamer, 366, 376
Sorel shipyard, 368
Steamers and ice-breakers, 358-360
Wharves, repairs to, 375
Wireless telegraphy, 355
Wrecking plants, 364

Banking and Commerce, Committee on, 106

Bankruptcy, Bill respecting, 1r., 205. 2r., 563. Special Com., 563, 735, 867. Rep. of, 1691

Banks. *See also* Finance.
Business hours of, 2383
Central gold reserve, deposit with, ques. 741
Deposits in, use of for war purposes, ques. 741
Excess circulation, 738
Government deposits in, ques. 742
Subscription to war loans, ques. 741
Victory loan, payments to, ques. 2240

Barre, Colonel, letter to Sir Edward Kemp, 1928

Barrington's Cove wharf, 1154

Bate, McMahon & Co., payments to, ques. 1479

Battalions. *See* Army

Beaufort, Mr. E., ques. 1364, ques. 1840

Beaverbrook, Lord, ques. 50

Béland, Hon. H. S. (Beauce), release from German prison, 7, 1910

Belanger, Mr., (St. Charles River works), 1567, 2375, 2507

Belanger, Mr. F. J., ques. 1841

Belanger, Mr. J. A., ques. 630

Belford, Major J. F., ques. 870

Bellechasse, steamer, ques. 112, 360

Benmore, Government barge, ques. 1617

Bernasconi, Mr., engineer, 1156

Berthier
Exemptions in, ques. 1843
Public works, ques. 467

Berthierville
Excise officers, ques. 113
Post office, ques. 466

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1768
Daylight saving, 189

Beverages. *See* Customs

Bills of Exchange Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2383. 2r., Com., 2477. 3r., 2478

Bird life, protection of, 2223

Blair, Mr. William J. (Battle River)
Immigration agents, clergymen, as, ques. 1203

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Alien labour, 1013
Budget, 1313
Hay, inspection, 1093, 1095
Prison reform, 1190
Taxation, 1315, 1366

Blanchard, Mr. H. Percy, ques. 2237

Blondin, Hon. P. E., Postmaster-General, 2513

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bola Pasha, ques. 1071

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 20; formation of union government, 21; returns under Military Voters' Act, 21; summoning of parliament, 22; conduct of election, 23; voting of soldiers, 23; Military Service Act, 24; food production and control, 25; shipbuilding, 28; prohibition, 30; excessive profits, 30; civil service reform, 30; demobilization of troops, 31; Canadian war organizations, 32; Halifax disaster, 32; railway equipment, 32; fuel control, 32; Military Service convention with United States, 33; trade and finance, 33; woman suffrage, 33; Canadian overseas forces, 25, 34; Russia, 34; progress of the war, 35.
Aliens, 1694
Allied forces, replacement by Americans, 2194
Army Medical Service, 1368
Bankruptcy Bill, 563
Banks, excess circulation, 738
Beaverbrook, Lord, 50
Béland, Hon. Dr. H. S., M.P., release of from German prison, 1910
Canadian cattle, British embargo on, 565
Canadian Daily Record, 898
Canadian Northern Railway, indebtedness, 1424
Canadian Northern Railway Company Bill, 1927, 1994
Censorship of debates, 1767
Censorship regulations, 1837
Civil servants overseas, 2315
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1808, 2132
Civil Service reform, 30
Customs Act Amdt. (control), 81
De Celles, Mr. A. D., 1767

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Demobilization, 31, 629
Deputy Speaker, appointment, 73
Desjardins, "Ti-noir," 1027
Director of Public Information, 899
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 82
Election, last general, 23
Employment offices, 842
Excessive profits, 30
Farmers' delegation, 1837, 1937, 2196
Fisheries Report, 1692
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 1976
Flour milling, 2237
Flying Corps, Canadian, proposed, 1368
Food production and control, 28
Fuel control, 32
Government appointments and parliamentary constituencies, 1305, 1481, 2101
Government employees, compensation for injuries to, 679
Halifax Relief Commission, 32, 2064, 2196
Hanna, late Dr. A. E., M.P., 3
House of Commons
Business of the, 2374, 1420
Adjournment instead of prorogation, 2314
Ascension day adjournment, 1618
Economy in, proposal of Mr. Speaker, 563
Monday sittings, 877, 1026
Morning sittings, 1419
Saturday sittings, 1419
Immigration and Colonization Bill, 103
Imperial Conference, 2239
Independence of Parliament, 683, 845, 878
Labatt, Colonel, 1693
Letter from young patriot, 1125
McMartin, late John, M.P., 932
Military Service, 24
Classes, 938
Deserter, presumed, arrest of, 1076
Deserters and draftees, alleged band of, 633
Exemptions, 1366, 1539, 1843
Fishermen, conscription of, 2315
Hardships under, 2128
Leave of absence, 1076
Quebec disturbances, 236, 284-286, 336, 396, 680
Order in Council concerning, 378
Regulations, ages, 20-22, 878, 933
Rural drafts, 2315
United States, convention with, 33, 54
National Service Commission, 903
Naval Discipline Bill, 725
Navigable Waters Protection, 730
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Orders in Council laid on the table, 12
Summoning Parliament, 11, 21

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Pension Commissioners for Canada, 51
Pensions, Special Committee, 563
Private Bills, suspension of rules relating to, 1766, 1845
Privilege, question of, order in, 315
Public service, re-arrangement of duties of departments, 50, 76, 83
Railways and Canals Act Amdt. (Railway equipment), 32, 548
Railway situation in Canada, 1994
Remounts, purchase in Canada, 904
Royal Flying Corps, 1368
Religious services for, 1617
Rural mail carriers, 63
Russia, 34
Salaries Act Amdt., 683, 845, 878
Secret session of Parliament, 735
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 126
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., resignation, 155
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 610, 625
Soldiers' voting, 23
Speaker, election of, 1
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 524
Titles, 473, 489, 517, 2237, 2342, 2363-2364
Union Government, 21, 25
War
Argyll House employees, 56
Canadian War Memorial Fund, 1195
Canadian War Records office, 2127
Consultation with Imperial Government before outbreak of, 928
Expenditure and Estimates, 571-610, 879-881, 930-932
Accounting and auditing between Great Britain and Canada, 901-905
Forces, Canadian, engaged in, 34, 576
Army corps, 1305
Casualties, 34, 936
Command of, 927
French Canadian brigade, 1195, 1933
Numbers and nationalities, 935, 936
Human energy of Canada, use of, 25, 377
Nurses, Canadian, heroism of, 157
Official news, arrangements for, 1976
Organizations, 32
Progress of, 35, 933
German offensive, 83, 107
Red Cross rules, violation of by enemy, 157
Vote, $500,000,000, 571
War Mission at Washington, 905
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 1475
White, Sir Thomas, statement as to absence of, 50, 55, 736
Winnipeg strike, 2236
Woman suffrage, 33, 88-103, 364, 676
Yukon election, 1835, 2080, 2099, 2338

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Halifax disaster
Claims, ques. 2397
Reconstruction, ques. 1362
Hay, purchase of in Lévis, ques. 740
Lauzon dock, J. B. Paquet, ques. 2238
Military Service
Judges, fees of, ques. 1839
Lévis, officials, ques. 570
Quebec, dredges and steamers at, ques. 868
St. Lambert, liquor stored at, ques. 1127
St. Nicholas quarry, ques. 868
Victoria, B.C., employment at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978

Bowie, Major Henry William, appointed Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Agricultural exhibitions, 2378
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Connaught rifle range, ques. 1981, 2195
Daylight saving, 166, 244
Hay, inspection and grading, 1088

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Animal contagious diseases, 803
Oleomargarine, 292
Rigaud-St. Redempteur mail, ques. 742
Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1303

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1941
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 534

Bradbury, Hon. Senator, services and pension of, ques. 1128, ques. 2397, 2520

Bran, exportation of, ques. 206, 2128, 2301, 2304

Brault, Romeo, ques. 111, 1075

Bremner, Major F. W. D., ques. 1843

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Budget, 1434
Trade and farming conditions in Canada, 1435-1437
War taxation, 1438

British Canadian Insurance Company. *See* United Canadian

Brockville appeal tribunal, ques. 2238

Brouillard, Mr. J. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Dental corps, ques. 2398
Fallon, Bishop of London, ques. 1304, ques. 2238
Fowler, Mr. Robert, ques. 2241
Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 1981
Labatt, Colonel, ques. 1981
Military district No. 4, advances, ques. 1839
Military Service
Central appeal judge, ques. 1840
Duff, Mr. Justice, and Round Table Club, ques. 1841

Brouillard, Mr. J. Ovide—*Con.*
Exemption tribunals, fees, ques. 1073
Kingston deputy registrar, staff of, ques. 2238
Sevigny, Hon. Albert, ques. 1618
Welland canal paymaster, ques. 2397
Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Lethbridge)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2113
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1752
Fuel, 327, 767
Titles, 2370
Buctouche, public building, 1138
Budget Debate, 1253, 1306, 1368, 1429, 1454, 1482, 1541, 1620
Bull, Mr. Harry Cecil, ques. 1842
Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Auditor General's office, 136
Auditor General's report, printing of in French, 135
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1838
Bureau of Statistics, 337
Canadian Daily Record, 915
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 691
Canadian Northern Railway, 1919, 1926
Censoring of debates, 1767
Children, moral protection of, 1705
Chinese immigration, 2272
Civil servants
Conduct of, 2281
Enlisted, civil pay of, 2386, 2388
Civil Service Act Amdt., 721, 1774, 1782, 1813, 1817, 1826, 1847, 1860, 1875, 1891, 1906
Amdt. proposed, 2129
Conservation, Commission of, 2287
Departments, creation of, 844
Director of Public Information, 704
Dominion lands, homesteading, 250, 257
Dominion Police, 2536
Eggs, sale by weight, 1210
Elevators, 2264
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt., 966
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 817, 834
Imperial Conference, 2556
Industrial disputes, 835
Inland Revenue and Customs departments, suggested amalgamation, 149
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt., 1209
Portland cement, 1226, 1230
Interior Department, estimates, 2225
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2280
Judges, exemption from taxation, 1687
Labour Department, staff and salaries, 197, 830
Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt., 789
Military Service
Medical examinations, 1694
Medically unfit men, 1076, 1130
Militia Department
Auditors, 138
Estimates and salaries, 561, 850, 853
Organization, 598
Mounted Police, 2285
Navigable Waters, constructions on, 562, 731, 734
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2480
Parliament buildings, new, Speaker's quarters, 1108
Penitentiaries, 1178, 1184
Portland cement, 1226, 1230
Privy Council Department, private secretary to president, 2274
Railway Act (consolidation), 1909
Railways and Canals, estimates, 1969, 1971
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 835
Railway equipment, 552, 725
Shawinigan Falls bridge, 731
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 610, 625
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 525
Taxation
Automobiles and jewellery, 2121
Tea, 2126
Tobacco, 1984
Three Rivers
Ordnance lands, 2227
Public building, 1149
Public works employees, 141
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198
Trade and Commerce Department, estimates, 344, 2263
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2388
Vice (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1705
Victory loan expenditure, 920
War expenditure, 598, 609, 879
Account of Canada with Great Britain, 901
Auditing of accounts, 905
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2495; amdt., 2496
Water powers, 2267
Woman suffrage, 98, 365, 675
Yukon election, 2086, 2504
Bureau of Statistics. *See* Dominion Bureau
Burnham, Mr. John H. (West Peterborough)
Adjournment instead of prorogation, advisability of, 2313, 2254
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1879
Civil Service law, administration of, ques. 2242
Government appointments, 1305, ques. 1481
Not by examinations, ques. 2101

Burnham, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Labour clearing-houses, 1035
National rivalries and trade, 775
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1129
Rural mail carriers' contracts, 58
Separation allowance, 63
Titles, 502, 2344
Trent Canal construction, 1964
Woman suffrage, 651

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Secretary of State)
Companies Act Amdt., 2256
Demonstration farms, 2292
Fuel, 760
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 760 2541
Meat and Canned Foods, 790
Payment of returning officers, 2512
Soldiers' vote, 2435
Titles, 2367
Zinc bounties, 2501, 2503

Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743

Business Profits War Tax, revenue from, 1261

Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. Res., 1264, 1682. 1r., 1691, 2r., 2142. Com., 2142-2161. 3r., 2245

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Budget, 1640
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1881
Fuel, 327, 780
Glace Bay harbour, 1170
Halifax disaster, 858
Labour policy, 1037
Military Service Act, 1642
Pilots, 375
Political situation, 1640
Soldiers' vote, 2457
Tariff reductions, 1641
Titles, 2372

Cables. *See* Telegraphs

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Banking hours, 2478
Canada Food Board, 226
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2542
Revenues, 685
Canadian Northern Railway, 1196, 1423, 1717, 1913, 2121, 2190
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1862
Dominion Canners, drawbacks, ques. 287
Dominion lands, close settlement, 2221
Employment offices, 1038
Farmers' delegation, 1837
Government advertising, ques. 115
Indian lands, 1049, 1051
Live stock distribution, 2380
Railway equipment, 540, 550, 555
Railway situation in Canada, 2017

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229, 2231
Sweet, Major Edmund, ques. 2399
Thompson, Lieut. Col. A. T., ques. 2399
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1478
Woman suffrage, 98, 669
Zinc bounties, 2500

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Immigration and Colonization Department
Agents, 2270
Bill relating to, 103
Estimates, 205, 2269
Labour, and, 1040
Policy of, 2272
Labour bureaus, control of, 1043
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391

Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1937, 1959

Camp Hughes, employment of Hon. Senator Schaffner at, ques. 2240

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 1541
Copper mining, 1546
Farm implements, free, 1541
Northern Manitoba, 1544
Soldiers and homesteading, 255
Titles, 2364
War taxation, 1541
Yukon election, 2076
Amendment, 2097

Canada and the War, 1951. *See* War

Canada Food Board. *See* Food

Canada Grain Act, estimates, 2263. *See* Grain

Canada Registration Board, 25, 903, ques. 1979
Regulations, 998

Canada Temperance Act, expenses, 2521

Canadian Associated Press, ques. 631

Canadian Aviation Fund, ques. 1481. *See* Army

Canadian Daily Record, 891, 915, 920

Canadian Explosives Company, ques. 465, ques. 1099

Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2542
Coal for, ques. 871
Employees, ques. 206. *See* Civil Service
Equipment, 1918, 2166. *See* Railway equipment
Estimates, 2538
Halifax disaster, 2166
Hudson Bay Railway, 2167
Ice contract, Mulgrave, ques. 876
Minister's summary, 2161
Rates for carriage of troops, 2168
Suspense account proposed, 683

Canadian Government Railways—*Con.*
For individual government railways, see their titles
Canadian Northern Railway
Finances
Assets, ques. 570, 2002
Claims against, ques. 970
General statement by acting Minister of Finance, 1711
Shares, acquisition of, ques. 971
Government policy concerning statement by Prime Minister, 1994
Mount Royal city, ques. 1480
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company. *See that title*
Canadian Northern Railway Company Bill (Indebtedness). Res., 1421. 1r., 1694. 2r., 1913. Com., 1913, 1994, 2102. 3r., 2142
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company Bill. 1r., 377. 2r., 464. Com., and 3r., 969
Canadian Nurses, heroism of, 157
Canadian Patriotic Fund
Statement by Sir Herbert Ames, Hon. Secretary, 1292
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 70
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2064. 2r., Com., 2199. 3r., 2209
Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, work of, 2006
Canadian War Memorial Fund, 1195
Canadian War Mission, 31, 54, 905
Canadian War Record. *See* Canadian Daily Record
Canadian War Records Office, 2127, ques. 2241
Canals, 1963, 1970, 2167
Inland deep waterway, 2219
Tolls, abolition of, 1964
For individual canals see their titles
Canning and packing houses. *See* Agriculture; Meat and Canned Foods Act
Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Breeding animals, distribution of, 151
Chasse, Mr. Noel, ques. 111
Civil Service Act Amendment, 722
Dorchester
Mail contracts, ques. 115
Postmasters in, ques. 113
Telephone lines, 1172
External affairs, 847
Income tax, 2151
Inland Revenue
Employees, ques. 114
Estimates, 151
Labour Department, report by Mr. O'Connor, 204
Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Nichols, Mr., Director of Public Information, 922
Overseas forces, 923
Patronage, Naval Service Department, 148
Pilots, 373
Prohibition, Dominion-wide, ques. 1362
Quebec disturbances, 431
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, affidavit of, 434
Quebec
Mail service, ques. 2397
Post office, ques. 113
Public buildings, 1142
Re-arrangement of departments, 77
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 360
Royal Naval College, 358
St. Lawrence dredging, 369
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 128
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., ques. 206
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 626
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 111
War expenditure, 921-926
Yukon election, 2092
Cape Island district, smallpox in, 1131
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 2173, 2177, 2542
Carillon-Grenville canal, 1967
Carter, Mr. Samuel, M.P.P., ques. 1362
Carvell, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Belanger vs. The King, 2508
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 2543
Electric power, 1069
Georgian Bay Canal, 1836
Intercolonial Railway, 2031
Fire caused by locomotive, 2187
Military Service
Farmers, exemption of, 958
Regulations, 956
Navigable Waters protection, 464, 562, 730, 2476
Parliament buildings, new
Construction, 737, 1100, 1109
Decoration, 1104
Fire protection, 1110
Heating, 1102
Tower, 1101
Public Works
Architects, Horwood and Ewart, 142
Department, estimates and salaries, 141, 1110, 1138
Dredging, 1169
Dry docks, 1116
Engineers, 144
Lake Erie ports, 1167
Ottawa
O'Connor street building, proposed, 1110

Carvell, Hon. F. B.—*Con.*
Rental of buildings at, 1112, 1147
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146
St. Charles River works, 146, 1119, 2508, 2544
St. John harbour, 1115, 2544
Telephones, 1153, 1171
Toronto harbour, 1123
Public Works Act Amdt., 464, 733
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2493-2496
Water powers, development of, 1069

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Abitibi railway facilities, 558
After-war conditions, 1612
Aiken, Mr. G. O., ques. 2238
Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237
Brault and Swan, conviction and release of, ques. 111, 1075
Budget, 1603
Coal, royalties on, ques. 570
Desjardins, Charles ("Ti-noir") ques. 112, 1027, 1075, 1607
Director of Public Information, ques. 1302
Lauzon dry dock, ques. 112
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1073
Military Service
Brockville appeal tribunal, ques. 2238
Medical examiners, ques. 112
Quebec officials, ques. 569
Schaffner, Hon. Senator, ques. 2240
Schuster, Capt. W. E., ques. 1074, ques. 1128
Self-inflicted wounds by men in Toronto district, ques. 111
Newsprint inquiry, ques. 1364
Orders in Council, 1611
Prohibition, ques. 1073
Quebec, attitude of, 1604
Railway freight cars, detention of in United States, ques. 569
Royal Flying Corps, ques. 1365
St. Charles River works, ques. 112, ques. 1479
Soldiers, return of to Canada, ques. 112
Steamers, Champlain and Bellechasse, ques. 112, 360
"The Parasites," circulation forbidden, ques. 1203
War, 608
Taxation, 1605

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Portland cement, 1223, 1228

Casualties. *See* Army

Cauchon, Mr. Noulan, memorandum on deep waterway, 2219

Cement. *See* Inspection and Sale

Censorship
Beaufort, Mr. E., employment of, ques. 1364, ques. 1840
Censors and decoders, ques. 874
Press, ques. 1842
Regulations, 969, 1837
Mr. Speaker on question raised by Mr. Currie, 1910

Census and Statistics, estimates, 2264

Central Appeal Judge. *See* Military Service

Chabot, Mr. John L. (Ottawa)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 7; Imprisonment of Dr. Béland, 7; Halifax disaster, 7; Patriotic fund, 9; War loans, 9; Civil Service reform, 9; Woman suffrage, 10; Casualties among Canadians at front, 11; Patriotism of Canadian women, 11.
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1774, 1776, 1791

Chair, rulings of. *See* Speaker; Deputy Speaker

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Challies, Mr. J. B., allowance to, 2375

Chambly canal, 1966

Chambly-Vercheres election, 972, 1304, 1618

Champlain, steamer, ques. 112, 360

Chasse, Mr. Noel, ques. 111, 150

Cheese. *See* Agriculture, dairying

Chevassu, Mr. J. P. A., 1766, 2128

Chicory, tax on. *See* Customs

Children, moral protection of. *See* Criminal Code

China and Japan steamship service, 2211

Chinese, 787. *See also* Alien labour
British Columbia, in, 1002, 1005
Immigration, 2272
Number entering Canada, ques. 115

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Margaree harbour, 1156
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp steamship service, 2215
Port Hastings, customs collector, 1063
Press censorship, ques. 1842
Telephones, Government, 1170

Civil Engineers. *See* Canadian Society

Civil Service
Appointments, 1759
Circular from Federation, 1768
Civil pay of members in overseas forces, 864, 1729, 1749, 2315, 2385, 2388
Deputy Ministers, salaries, 1757
Law, ques. 2242
Patronage. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Reform, 30

Civil Service—*Con.*
Retirement (superannuation), 2312
For departments, see their titles

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 694, 701, 703. 1r., 723. 2r., Com., 1721, 1732, 1768, 1809, 1847. 3r., 2141.
Amendments proposed:
(1) Mr. Bureau, 2129; lost on div., 2130
(2) Mr. E. Lapointe (Mr. Parent), 2134, lost on div., 2137
(3) Mr. Currie, 2138; ruled out, 2139
Senate amdts., 2477

Civil Service Federation of Canada, circular from, 1768

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for External Affairs)
Printing Committee Report, 2478, 2549

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Budget, 1573
Canada Food Board, 229
Canadian Northern Railway, 2107
Civil Service Act Amendment, 712, 1860, 1862
Daylight saving, 175
Direct taxation, 1575
Experimental farms, 2294
Fuel, 772
Government railways, revenues, 692
Income tax, 1580
Tariff, 1574
Union Government, 1573, 1576
Yukon election, 2095

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Military service, 1602

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Alien labour, 973
Fish canning, 797
French Canadians, conscription of for labour, 976

Clergymen as immigration agents, ques 1203

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, estimates, 2519

Coal. *See* Fuel; Mines

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Budget, 1408
Canada Food Board, 234
Canadian Northern Railway, 1410, 1721
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1725, 1821, 1824, 1827, 1863, 1866
Farm implements, 1416
Fruit classification, 2248
General election, list of candidates sent to soldiers, 898-899, 906
Hay, 1085
Housing to protect morals (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1708
Moving picture films, duty on, 1681
Pensions, 2485

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway situation in Canada, 2051
Shipping facilities, 2260
Soldiers, assigned pay, etc., 888
Tariff issue, 1413
Taxation, 1408
Income, on, 1686, 2148
Tea and coffee, duty on, 1681
Woman suffrage, 101

Coffee, tax on. *See* Customs

Cold storage, meats in, ques. 1302

Committees. *See* House of Commons *and individual titles*

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
(1) No. 65 (Mortgages and Hypothecs), 1r., 968. 2r., Com., 1076. 3r., 1176.
Senate amdts., 1695
(2) (Various particulars), 1r., 2128. 2r., Com., 2256. 3r., 2374

Compensation for Injuries to Government Employees Bill. Res., 677. 1r., 679. 2r., Com., 810. 3r., 834

Concurrence, 2549

Conference of Provincial Premiers, ques. 287

Connaught rifle range, ques. 1981, 2195

Conscription. *See* Military Service
Labour, of. *See* Labour; Alien Labour in Canada
French Canadians, of, 976
Shipyards, employees of, 1118

Conservation, Commission of, estimates, 2287

Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company. *See* Zinc

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Alien labour, 977
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1734
Labour, enlistments from, 978

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland)
Budget, 1510
Civil Service Act Amendment, 2139
Daylight saving, 168
Experimental farms, 2293
Farm implements, 1515
Fish hatcheries, 282
Fisheries, 377
Overseers and guardians, 271
Fuel, 786
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 811, 821, 828
Government railways
Intercolonial
Branch lines, 2183
Patronage on, 2140
Provident fund, 2169
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Military service, 1515
Militia
Cadets, 853

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Patronage in department, 857
Parliament buildings, new, 1104
Reconstruction committee, ques. 335
Penitentiaries, 1188
Privy Council
Private secretary to President, 2281
Salaries, 2273
Quebec disturbances, 680
Shipbuilding, 1516
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 624
Soldiers' vote, taking of in last election, 2256, 2400
Motion for investigation, 2434
Steamer Simcoe, 376
Tax on tobacco, 1986
Union Government, 1511
Van Buren Bridge Company, 341
War finance, 594, 1513
Woman suffrage, 675

Cordwood. *See* Fuel; Inspection and Sale

Couillard, Capt., ques. 1841

Courcelette, steamer, ques. 286

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1784, 1812, 1884
Daylight saving, 167
Fuel, 752
Income tax, 2144
Indians
Commissioner Graham, 1050
Lands, leasing of, 1050
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture
Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 151
Animal contagious diseases, 800, 850
Bran and shorts, 2299, 2300, 2305
Exportation, 2128
Prices, 2309
Canada Food Board, 221
Destructive insects and pests, 2298
Exhibitions, 2376
Experimental farms and demonstration stations, 2290, 2293
Farmers, delegation of, 1837
Farm tractors, Government purchase of, 1693, 2388
Flax, 1245
Fruit, fruit marks and potatoes, 2209, 2245
Furois, Mr. Philippe, 2376
Live stock distribution, 2379
Meat and canned foods, 788, 1056
Millfeeds. *See under this head,* Bran and shorts
Oleomargarine, 307

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
(1) Seduction; Age of Consent; Moral protection of children; Gaming-houses; Theft of motor cars, (No. 69, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 1193. 2r., Com., 1695. 3r., 1767.
Senate amendments, 2491
(2) Punishments (No. 71, Mr. Doherty). 1r., 1419

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Budget, 1306
Bureau of Statistics, 808
Business profits tax, 1309
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 1729
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1819
Domestic loans, 1308
Income tax, 2147
Parliament buildings, new, 1106
Titles, 514
War finance, 1307

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (Minister of Labour)
Budget, 1507
Fair wages, maintenance of in munitions contracts, 832
Fishermen, wages of, 2547
Flour milling profits, 2128, 2314
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 823
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt., 564, 835
Labour bureaus and exchanges, 841, 1028-1046
Labour department, administration of, 198, 1508
Estimates, 197, 829
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., duties and resignation of, 199, 633, 800
Marine trades, strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385
Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices, 841, 1028
Winnipeg strike, 2385, 2546

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, payments to, ques. 1128

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1822
Fuel, 778
Wood, sale of, 1218
Harbours, expenditures on, ques. 970, ques. 1126
Income tax, insurance companies, 2148
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2395

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
The Pas and Dauphin customs revenue, ques. 111

Currie, Sir Arthur, address to Canadian troops, 946

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Aliens and alien labour, 1006, 1020, 1694
Budget, 1643
Canada Food Board, ques. 1361
Canadian Northern Railway, 2102
Indebtedness, 1425
Canadian Press report of speech, 1693
Censorship regulations, 1837
Civil servants overseas, civil pay of, 864
Civil Service Act Amendment, 1734, 1768, 1777, 1786, 1792, 1799, 1803, 1811, 1825, 1833, 1855, 1893, 1951
Amendment proposed, 2138; ruled out, 2139
Deputy Speaker, 75
Food, 1660
Foreign trade, 1658
Free agricultural implements, 1648
Fruit containers, 2249, 2252
Gouin, Lieut., 862
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 810
Great War Veterans Association, 915
Habeas Corpus, resolution regarding suspension of, 2385
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.
Portland cement, 1230
Standard weights, 1227
International Bridge and Terminal Company, 1732
Journals and Votes and Proceedings, consolidation, 2313
Manufacturing industry, 1648
Meat and canned foods, 790
Military Service
Farmers, representations from, 2388
Quebec, in,
Appeals to Central Appeal Judge, 1978
Exemptions, 1252
Overbeck, patent of, 739
Oxford, election, 914
Permanent corps, 863
Printing of public documents, ques. 972
Printing, Joint Committee on, report of, 1691
Quebec disturbances, 239
Notice of motion for adjournment of House, 380
Withdrawn temporarily, 336; withdrawn, 463, 863
Railway equipment, 553
Railway situation in Canada, 1653, 2047
Returned soldiers, Government positions for, 1736
Soldiers
First division, on leave, 891
Parliamentary candidates, 886
Sickness of on leave, ques. 971
Votes of, 2404

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Tax on automobiles, 2122
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1196, 1198, 1477
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2392, 2394

Currie, Miss M., ques. 1302

Customs
Agricultural machinery, duties and drawbacks on, ques. 872, ques. 1203
Department
Dager, Herman J., ques. 2242
Estimates, 1065
Staff and salaries, 148, 1059
Farm machinery, collections on, ques. 465
Farm tractors, collections on, 54, ques. 467
Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Inquiry in Norfolk county, ques. 287
Port Hastings, collector, 1063
Preventive service, salaries, 1065, 1066
Revenue cruisers, 1066
River Port, N.S., officer at, ques. 1200
The Pas and Dauphin, revenue of, ques. 111

Customs Act Amdt. Bills
(1) Temporary control of imports and exports, (No. 16, Sir Robert Borden). Res. 81. 1r., 82. Bill withdrawn, 1767
(2) Revenue (No. 81 Mr. A. K. Maclean). Res. 1262, 1675. 1r., 1690. 2r., Com., 2142. 3r., 2245

Dager, Herman J., ques. 2242

Dairying. *See* Agriculture

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph E. S. E. (Rimouski)
Bradbury, Hon. Senator, ques. 1128, ques. 2397
Budget, 1537
Grand Mere post office, ques. 1481
Quebec disturbances, 452
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 2398
Woman suffrage, 660

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Soldiers' vote, 2420
Yukon election, 2095, 2327

Davis, Mr. Fred L. (Neepawa)
Alien labour, 991
Budget, 1596
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1796, 1803
Daylight saving, 169
Indian lands, 1052
Trade and financial conditions, 1596
War taxation, 1597

Daylight Saving Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., 157-197. Com., 244. 3r., 337
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1692. 2r., Com., 3r., 1913

Debates Committee, 106

Debentures, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115, ques. 287

De Celles, Mr. A. D., 1767, 2519

Déchène, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Bate, McMahon & Co., ques. 1479
Budget, 1548
Crow's Nest Pass Coal, ques. 1128
Experimental farms, 2292, 2296
Food containers, 2255
Grand Mere dam, ques. 2240
Grosse Isle quarantine, 1145
International banking, 2262
Labour
Bureaus, 1043
Shortage of, 1549
Post Office Department, leases in Ottawa, ques. 874
Production, encouragement of, 1549
Railway equipment, 551
Tea, tax on, 2126
White pine blister, 2298
Woman suffrage, 676

Defence of Canada Order, 1917, amendments, 932

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Military service, registrars' offices, ques. 1073

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. Johns and Iberville)
Granby post office, ques. 870
Missisquoi Bay, net fishing, ques. 109, 276
Oil deposits, ques. 1479
Voluntary enlistments, ques. 109
Woman suffrage, 651

Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 1582
Financial conditions, 1583
French Canadians, social and political condition, 1586
Hay, 1088, 1093-1098, 1132-1135
Military service, 1585
Penitentiary inspectors, 1187
Quebec and the war, 1584
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 527
Titles, 2354
Woman suffrage, 641

Departments, annual reports of, publication in French and English, 135, ques. 971

Departments, re-arrangement of. *See* Salaries Act Amdt.; Re-arrangement; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Department of Railways and Canals Act Amendment Bills
(1) No. 42, (Railway equipment), Mr. J. D. Reid. Res. 537. 1r., 559. 2r., Com., 725. 3r., 730

Department of Railways and Canals Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
(2) No. 52, (Stores account), Mr. J. D. Reid. Res. 679. 1r., 680. 2r., Com., 829. 3r., 829

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Appointment of, 73
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Appropriations involved, increasable only by Message, 1898
Motion to report, not debatable, 1991
Principle of, not discussable in Committee, 1182
Private, suspension of rules, 1950
Committee
Motion that Committee rise, not debatable, 1099
Imputation of motives, 2281
Interruptions, 2425
Irrelevancy, 924
Business facilitated by members keeping to question, 2534
Discussion anticipatory of clause of Bill, 1084
Judiciary not to be reflected upon, 1896
Previous debate, reference to not permissible, 2502
Public officials, conduct of out of office hours, propriety of answer by Minister, 2276-2280
Quorum, proceeding without, 2518
Supply—discussion confined to clause before Committee, 2512, 2537
Unanimous consent, 2537

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Budget, 1535
Food, economy in, 1536
Ste. Anne de la Perade, purchase of land at, ques. 744
War
Insurance premiums, ques. 1361
Prosecution of, 1535
Webster, Mr. W. V., ques. 467

Desjardins, Charles, ("Ti-noir") ques. 112, 1027, 1075, 1607

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Budget, 1613
Food, 1616
Letter-carriers' salaries, ques. 1302
Munitions on ships, ques. 1128
Political situation, 1614
War, Canada's part in, 1615
Woman suffrage, 669

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Auditor General, 139

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B.—*Con.*
Beaverbrook, Lord, ques. 50
Budget, 1500
Civil Service Act Amdt., 710, 717, 1780, 1798, 1876, 1889, 1900
Director of Public Information, ques. 57
Economy in Government, 140
Employment offices, 1030
Food
Canada Food Board, 217
Production, 1501
Waste, 200
Imperial Munitions Board, 58
Labour Department, staff, 1031
Military service, exemption of farmers, 1502
Pension Commissioners, ques. 51
Privy Council Department, staff, ques. 466
Railway equipment, 549
Registration, 1507
Returns of last general election, 1366
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1697, 1701
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 530
War expenditure, 560
Woman suffrage, 94, 101
Yukon election, 2069
Amendment proposed, 2321

De Wolf, Mr. Harry C., ques. 1071

Diamonds, importation of, ques. 631

Dickson, Mr. W. H., appointment, 1835, 2127

Dillon, Capt. Gerald, ques. 568, 889, 1897

Dimock, Lieut. Bertram, ques. 1842

Director of Public Information, ques. 57, 699, 706, 719, 891, 896, 1302

Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts in, 2065

Dogs (sheep protection), 1055

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code
Alien labour, 1017
Anti-loafing, 2387
Arichat, Judge at, salary of, 2517
Austrians, interned, 1020
Belanger vs. The King, 2509
Bills of Exchange, 2383, 2477
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1945
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act Amdt., 2064, 2199, 2202, 2206
Children, moral protection of. *See* Criminal Code
Civil Service, appointments, 2527
Companies Act Amdt., 968, 1076
Criminal Code Amdt., 1193, 1696, 2492
Dominion Police, 2536
Belanger, resignation of, 2518
Drunkenness, habitual. *See* Criminal Code
Election, documents in, 972, 1304

Doherty, Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, 2526
Gaming-houses. *See* Criminal Code
Judges Act Amdt., 1836
Mail contracts, 2529
Rural mail carriers, 58
Military Service
Detention, alleged unlawful, 1176, 1367
Draftees, leave of absence, 1175
Enforcement, 1131
Exemption papers, confiscation of, 1367
Military police, 2387, 2517
Tribunals, 2512
Ministers' visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Motor cars, theft of. *See* Criminal Code
Naturalization Act Amendment, 968, 1077
Parliament buildings, fire claims, 2548
Penitentiary Act Amdt., 129, 1176-1191
Post Office
Department
Estimates, 2528, 2548
Vacancies, 2535
Mail contracts, 58, 2529
Quebec disturbances
Dominion police, action of, 2517
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 737
St. Charles river works, 2509
Seduction. *See* Criminal Code
Soldiers, returned, 1182
Soldiers' votes, 2459
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 240, 520, 537, 2198
Yukon election, 2083, 2085

Dominion astronomical observatory, 2218

Dominion Bureau of Statistics Bill. Res. 337. 1r., 339. 2r., 803. Com., 808. 3r., 834. Senate amdts., 1695

Dominion Canners' drawbacks, ques. 287

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1193

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1r., 82. 2r., Com., 85. 3r., 241, 336

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 55. 2r., 249. Com., 250, 257, 343. 3r., 520. Senate amdts., 1695

Dominion Lands and Parks, 2221

Dominion notes in circulation, ques. 334

Dominion Police, estimates, 2536
Belanger, resignation of, 2518
Inspector Military district No. 4, ques. 630

Dominions Royal Commission, 1074, 2265, 2540

Dorchester county
Mail contracts, ques. 115
Postmasters in, ques. 113
Telephone lines, 1172

Double standard of morals. *See* Criminal Code

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Homesteads, abandoned, tax on, 252
Indian lands, 1048

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Bernasconi, Mr., engineer, 1159
Fuel, 768
Glace Bay harbour, 2544

Doukhobors, ques. 1072, 1950

Drunkenness, habitual. *See* Criminal Code

Dry docks, 1116

Dublin Shore, postmaster at, ques. 876

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Bait, cold storage for, 280
Barge Benmore, ques. 1617
Budget, 1468
Canada Registration Board, ques. 1979
Customs, overmanning of department, 1059
Dublin Shore, postmaster, ques. 876
Feltzen South, breakwater, 1155
Financial conditions, 1468
Fishing industry, 1471
Guardians, 272
Indian Point, postmaster, 876
Loans, domestic, 1470
Mosher's Bay breakwater, 1158
Patriotic Fund, 2204
Privilege, statements in Journal-Press, 314
River Port, customs officer, ques. 1200
25th Nova Scotia battalion, ques. 1304

Duff, Mr. Justice, and the Round Table, ques. 841

Dupuis, Mr. J. A., ques. 109

DuTremblay, Mr. Pamphile R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Batiscan river bridge, 1166
Bremner, Major F. W. D., ques. 1843
Budget, 1330
Canadian Northern Railway, 1917, 2118
Cigars, tax on, 1678
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1828
Daylight saving, 178
Dimock, Lieut. Bertram, ques. 1842
Exchange rates, Canada and United States, ques. 465
French Canadians in army, 927, 1194, 1927
Hants county, revising barrister, ques. 2237
High cost of living, 1331
Indian lands, 1052
Industrial disputes, 837
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2284
Labour, employment offices, 1036
Laprairie-St. Lambert dyke, ques. 465, 1163
Military service
Medical examinations, 1693

DuTremblay, Mr. Pamphile R.—*Con.*
Military service—*Con.*
Police, 2516, 2387
Militia Department, patronage in, 857
Outremont public building, 1147
Pensions, Board of, Representation of Veterans—Dr. Laviolette, 2520
Railway equipment, 551
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1169
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 529
Taxation, 1332
Cigars, on, 1678
Income, 2145
Tobacco, 1988
Woman suffrage, 636

East Cacouna wharf, ques. 970

East Peterborough, registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100

Economic and Development Commission, 2225

Editorial Committee. *See* Printing

Edmonton, pavement, Jasper avenue, 1151

Edmundston, post office, 1138

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Budget, 1518
Civil Service Act Amendment, 708, 713, 1894, 2135, 2138
Customs, alleged overmanning of service, 1060
Daylight saving, 173
Dillon, Capt., 889, 1897
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2521. *See under this head,* Taxation, judges
Fuel, 777
Hay, 1083
Military service
Exemptions, 1538
Leave of absence for seeding, 1365
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1303
Oleomargarine, 299
Parliament buildings, new, Speaker's residence, 1107
Penitentiaries
Annual report of, ques. 2240
Inspectors, 1179-1184
Prisoners
Employment of, furniture making for Government offices, 1181
Young, treatment of, 1181
Pensions, 2482
Privilege—statement in Ottawa Citizen, 1982
Quebec disturbances, 428
Rural mail contracts, 60
Separation allowances, 888
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 621
Tariff reductions, 1520
Taxation, 1519
Income, 1518, 2152
Judges, of, 2157, 2160

Eggs. *See* Inspection and Sale; Agriculture

Elaine, steamship, 2213

Elections. *See also* Army; Soldiers' Votes; Dominion Elections Act; War-time Elections
Anti-Unionist candidates, ques. 2237
Chambly-Vercheres, documents, 972, 1304, 1618
De Wolf, Harry C., employment, ques. 1071
L'Assomption-Montcalm returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238
Oxford, 914
Renfrew, South, 884
Returns, general election, 1366
Returning officers, payments of, 2512
Soldiers' votes, sending of candidates' names to England, 906
Yukon. *See* Yukon election

Electrical Development Company. *See* Toronto, Niagara and Western

Electricity, export to United States, 1069. *See* Water powers

Elevators, terminal, 2263

Elgin and Havelock railway, 2542

Elkin, Mr. Stanley E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Fuel, 323
Hay, 78
Temporary control of imports and exports, 81
Zinc bounties, 2500

Employment offices. *See* Labour

Estimates. *See titles of departments, and subjects*

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Military service
Deserters and draftees, alleged band of, 632
Exemption of farmers, 1252
Net public debt, ques. 1364
Tobacco culture, 2297

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 1622
Daylight saving, 179
Excise, collection of, 1068
Farm tractors, ques. 467
Fuel, 1166
Immigration agents, 2270
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 2241
Meat, inspection of, 797
Parliament buildings, new, 1109
Port Dover harbour, 1166
Pringle, Mr. R. A., K.C., ques. 868
Production, 1626
Rural mail contracts, 2534

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
War expenditure and taxation, 1624
Woman suffrage, 98
Zinc bounties, 2502

Excise. *See also* Inland Revenue; Taxation
Berthierville, officers at, ques. 113
Collection, 1068
Duties, changes (Budget), 1261
Liquor, seizure at St. Lambert, ques. 1127
Officers' salaries, 1066

Exhibitions. *See* Agriculture

Explosives 1099, ques. 1128, 2197

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Agriculture, appropriations for, 1601
Budget, 1598
Forestry battalion officers, ques. 2399
Military service
Farmers, exemption of, 1600
Quebec, attitude of, 1601
Production, 1598
Railway equipment, 558
Spirit Lake experimental form and detention camp, ques. 744, 2293

Fallon, Bishop, ques. 1304
Visit to front, ques. 2238

Farm labour. *See* Labour; Military Service

Farm machinery. *See* Agriculture

Farmers' delegation. *See* Military Service

Farran's Point, canal employees, ques. 568

Feltzen South, breakwater, 1155

Fenian Raid pensions, 2519

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Shelburne and Queen's)
Auditor General, 137
Business of the House, lack of opportunity for discussion, 2527
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1948
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 683
Cape Island, Nova Scotia, smallpox in, 1131
Civil Service Act Amdt., 706, 712, 1860, 1866, 1903, 2136
Customs duties on Government imports, 1062
Daylight saving, 190
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2066
Employment offices, 842, 1029, 1042
Fish in cans, weight of contents, 1212
Fisheries Commission, 274
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 816
Government railways
Provident fund, 2170
Revenues, 683, 686
Harbours, obstruction of by ice, 359
Judges and income tax, 1686, 2161

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Lobsters taken in extra-territorial waters, 967
Marine wrecking plants, 364
Ministers, need of election, 849
Moving-picture films, censoring, 1676
Parliament buildings, Speaker's quarters, 1106
Penitentiaries, regulations, 1189
Post Office estimates, lack of time for consideration, 2527
Public works, urgently needed repairs, 145, 1160
Railway equipment, 543
Rural mail contracts, 62, 2534
Shipbuilding, 350
Superannuation, 2312
Titles, 511, 516, 2349
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391
War Mission at Washington, 905
War revenue, excise, 1680
Yukon election, 2076, 2098, 2326

Film service to advertise Canada, 2267

Finance
Advances to provinces, ques. 208, ques. 741
Banks. *See that title*
Department, salaries, 133
Dominion notes in circulation, ques. 334
Exchange between Canada and the United States, ques. 465
Federal advances to provinces
Applications for, ques. 741
Ontario, ques. 742
Saskatchewan, ques. 742
Gold reserve, ques. 334
Loans, ques. 334
Due dates of, ques. 741
Prevention of depreciation, ques. 335
Minister and Acting Minister of, visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Net public debt, ques. 1364
Prohibition, effect on Dominion revenues, ques. 335
Silver money in circulation, ques. 334
Specie, amount of, ques. 741
Treasury bonds, ques. 741
Victory loan. *See that title*
War bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
War expenditure, ques. 335

Firewood. *See* Fuel; Inspection and Sale

Fir Grove-Frampton mail contract, ques. 2397

Fir Grove-St. Odilion mail contract, ques. 2397

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory board, 270
Bait, 279
Bounties to fishermen, 283

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Commission, 274
Conservation, 2375
Department, estimates, 270, 354
Exhibit at Toronto, 280
Fishermen
Conscription of, 1296, 2314
Wages of, 2546
Guardians and overseers, 270
Inspection of pickled fish, 281
Lobster hatcheries and industry, 282, ques. 630, 967
Maritime provinces, value of fishing vessels, in, 1471
Missisquoi Bay, net fishing in, ques. 109, 275
Oysters, 271, 274
Prices, 2375
Protection service, 354
Report, 1692
Salmon fishing, motor boats for, ques. 970
Traps, St. Lawrence river, ques. 330
Transportation, 278
Treaty, 55

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 868. 2r., Com., 3r., 967

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, ques. 330, 1976, 1984, 2155, ques. 2478, 2521, 2536

Flake graphite, ques. 631

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1390

Flax, increased production, 1231, 2381

Flour milling companies' profits, 2128, 2237, 2314

Foisy, Dr. Louis Azarie, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph E. (Hull)
Budget, 1440
Canada Food Board, 228
Military service
Arrangements with allied nations, ques. 1071
Deserter, presumed, arrest of, 1075
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146
Taxation, 1441

Food. *See also* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale; Meat and Canned Foods
Adulteration of, 2537
Campaign for greater production, 25-27, 903, 1272, 1501
Canada Food Board
Establishment of, ques. 1361
Expenses of, ques. 971
Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 2243, 2375
Legal adviser to, ques. 466
Order in Council creating, 208
Salaries, ques. 335
Containers, marking of, 1211

Food—*Con.*
Controller, office of, 28, 52
Eggs, regulation governing sale of, 77
Sale of by weight, 1206
Fish. *See that title*
Inspection of exports and imports, 1057
Prices, fixing of. 1331
Quebec, production in, 1550
Vegetables, sale of, regulations, 77
Waste, 200

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers, Committee on, 107

Forestry corps and medical service. *See* Army

Forrest, Mr. T. M., ques. 1977

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 1462
Firewood, sale of, 1220
Military service
Administration of, 2384
Conscription of labour, 1464
Exemptions, 1253 ,
Leave of absence for seeding, 1475
Production, encouragement of, 1462
War expenditure, 900
Woman suffrage, 634

Fort William harbour, 1125

Foster, Rt Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Bounties, lead and crude petroleum, 2263
Burchard, Dr., report of, 2399
Bureau of Statistics, 337, 803, 1695
Canada Food Board, 212
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1865
Daylight saving, 157, 193, 244, 1692
Eggs, sale, regulations, 1210
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Film service to advertise Canada, 2267
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, 2523, 2536
Food containers, 1211, 2254
Fuel, 782
Controller's office, 12
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt., 634, 966
Grain, milling values of, 2399
Hay, inspection, 78, 1078, 1132, 2198
High Commissioner's office, 2542
Imperial Conference, 1982, 2554
Insurance Act Amdt., 1205
Military service
Administration of Act, 2384
Bank clerks, leave of absence, 2383
Farmers, exemption of, 1912, 2388, 2553
Milk, sale, regulations, 1214
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2382, 2479
Pensions Commissioners, 2520
Pensions, 2520, 2550

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Pictou-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 68
Portland cement, 1221, 1231
Post Office Department, administration of, 2513
Railway Act (consolidation), 2493
Registration, 2555
Salt, shortage of, 1983
Soldiers' vote, 2256, 2471
Steamship services. *See that title*
Terminal elevators, 2263
Titles, 2352
Trade
Development of, 2260, 2262, 2267
France, with, 2257
Russia and Japan, with, 2258
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners, 2257
Department, estimates, 343, 2210
Water powers, Canadian, film exhibitions, 2268

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Alien labour, 1000
Camp Borden, 1962
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1732, 1762, 1797
Daylight saving, 248
Meat and Canned Foods, 792
Portland cement, 1222
Toronto harbour, 1120
Woman suffrage, 658

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1825
Patent Medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1992
Quebec disturbances, 454
Woman suffrage, 637

Fowler, Mr. Robert, Post Office Department, 1983, ques. 2241

France, trade with, 2257

Franchise. *See* War-time Elections Act; Military Voters' Act; Woman Suffrage

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Daylight saving, 168
Fruit containers, 2252
Woman suffrage, 650

Fraserville public building, rental ques. 1202

Freight cars. *See* Railways

French Canadian Brigade, 1194, 1927. *See* Army

French Canadian Ministers, appointment of, ques. 207

French Canadians, conscription of for labour, 976

French religious and the war, 43

French river dam, 1166

French treaty, ques. 1481

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Militia records branch, employees, ques. 113

Fruit. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Fuel
Coal. *See also* Mines
Canadian resources, development of
Armstrong, Mr. J. E., motion, 744
Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, payments to, ques. 1128
Lake Erie, transportation of, on, 1167
Lignite, briquetting, 2546
Quebec, rate from Maritime provinces, 1973
Royalties on, ques. 570
Control, 32, 321
Firewood, 77, ques. 113, 1218. *See* Inspection and Sale
Shortage, motion, Mr. Lemieux, 316

Fulton, Mr. Frederick J. (Cariboo)
Highland Valley, mineral claims, 243
Timber berths on Dominion lands, 262

Furois, Mr. Philippe, ques. 1981, ques. 2243, 2375

Gabard, Mr. Marcel, appointment of, 2313, 2383

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Admendment

Gaspe
Harbours, 359, 1162
Railways, 2185

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Budget, 1429
Fruit and vegetables, distribution of, ques. 287
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 812
Military service, 1431
Production, encouragement of, 1433
Railway equipment, 544
War taxation, 1430

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Témiscouata)
East Cacouna wharf, ques. 970
Fishing traps, St. Lawrence river, ques. 330
Fraserville, rental of building, ques. 1202
Intercolonial branch lines, 2182
Lebel, Mr. Nazaire, ques. 877
Light-keepers' salaries, 372
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1481
Pilots, 1306
Rivière du Loup steamship service, 2214

Geodetic survey, 2218

Georgian Bay Canal, 1836, 2219

German goods. *See* Identification

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Berthier public works, ques. 467

Gervais, Mr. Theodore—*Con.*
Berthierville
Excise officers, ques. 113
Post office, ques. 466
Hay, 1091, 1093, 1136
Mattawin river dredging, ques. 568
Military service, exemptions in Berthier, ques. 1843
St. Barthelemi road, protection dyke, ques. 569
Steamers, Montcalm and Lady Grey, ques. 466
Woman suffrage, 638

Gillespie, Lieut. Col. George, ques. 2239

Glace Bay harbour, 1170, 2544

Gladu, Mr. J. E. O. (Yamaska)
Budget, 1634
Canada's financial position, 1638
Coal situation, 1639
French Canadians, attitude of, 1635
War-time Elections Act, 1636

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Agricultural exhibitions, 2377
Agriculture, publicity for, 2378
Cheese and condensed milk, 1129
Dairying, feeds for, 311
Eggs, sale, regulations, 1208
Flax, production, 1231, 2381
Military service, leave of absence board, ques. 56
Separation allowances, 608
Woman suffrage, 665

Glengarry and Stormont, vacancy, 1071

Gobeil, Mr. Antoine, ques. 1978

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amdt. Bill. Res. 1r., 634. 2r., Com., 966. 3r., 1028

Gold reserve, ques. 334
Central, banks, deposit with, ques. 741

Gordon, Rev. C. W., ques. 2240

Gouin, Lieut., 862

Government advertising, ques. 115, ques. 1072
Film service, 2267
Prince Rupert Journal, in, ques. 1360
See also Victory Loan

Government appointments, relations of representatives of constituencies to, ques. 1305, ques. 1481, ques. 2101

Government employees, compensation for injuries. *See* Compensation

Government railways. *See* Canadian Government Railways

Graham. *See* Sioux Lookout

Graham, Mr. W. M., Indian Commissioner, 27. *See* Indians

Grain. *See also* Agriculture
Canada Grain Act, 2263

Grain—*Con.*
Canadian, and Canadian routes, ques. 1362
Milling values, 2399

Granby post office, ques. 870

Grand Mere
Dam, ques. 2240
Post office, site at, 1481

Grand Trunk Railway
Government acquisition of, ques. 2242
Sir Clifford Sifton, and, ques. 2242

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Acquisition of, statement by Prime Minister, 2004
Aid granted to, 1996

Graphite, flake, ques. 631

Great Britain, steamship service, 2210

Great War Veterans Association. *See also* Army
Alleged election activities, 909, 915
Petition of, aliens, 977, 982
Representation, on Pensions Board, 2520

Green, Mr. Robert F. (West Kootenay)
Alien labour, 996
Zinc bounties, 2498

Grenier, Capt., ques. 1841

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 1145

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1691
Yukon election, 1835, 2209, 2315, 2321, 2505
Motion for adoption of report, 2315

Habeas Corpus writs. *See* Military Service
Resolutions regarding suspension of, 2385

Habitual Drunkenness. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Halifax
Harbour, cost of, ques. 1126
Quarantine station, 1138

Halifax, Canso and Guysborough steamship service, 2211

Halifax disaster, 32, 858
Claims, 2397
Reconstruction, ques. 1362
Relief Commission. *See* Halifax Relief

Halifax Relief Commission Bill. 1r., 2064. 2r., Com., 2196. 3r., 2198

Halladay, Mr. Howard H. (Bow River)
Daylight saving, 245
Fuel, 771
Post offices as labour bureaus, 1029

Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481

Hanna, late Dr. A. E., 3

Hants county, revising barrister, ques. 2237

Harbours. *See* Public Works

Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208

Harrison, Mr. C. R. (Nipissing)
Trades unions and aliens, 2547

Hay. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Alien labour, 1014
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2137
Daylight saving, 163
Railway equipment, 550
Woman suffrage, 644

Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Budget, 1591
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1855
Farm labour, supply of, 2382
Food containers, 1214
Fruit, inspection and sale, 2249, 2252
Indian lands, 1051
Portland cement, 1224
Tariff reduction, 1593
Union Government, 1592

High Commissioner for Canada, office, ques. 971, 2541

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Alien labour, 994
Budget, 1553
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1738, 1806, 1834, 1853, 1859
Daylight saving, 166
French Canadian Ministers, appointment, ques. 207
Fuel, 756
Judges' salaries, tax on, 2158, 2160
Orange Order in Canada, 1553
Post Office Department—Mr. Fowler, 1983
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198

Horses. *See* Agriculture, animals

Hospitals. *See* Military Hospitals Commission

House of Commons. *See also* Speaker; Deputy Speaker; Parliamentary Procedure
Business of the
Adjournment instead of prorogation, advisability of, 2254, 2313
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 1618, 1691
Easter, 83, 157
Mondays for Government orders, 877, 1026
Morning sittings, 1419
Order of, 1026, 2310, 2374
Prorogation, date of, 2382
Saturday sittings, 1419
Wednesdays and Thursdays for Government orders, 156
Wednesday evening sittings, 156

House of Commons—*Con.*
Censoring of debates, notice of motion withdrawn, 1767
Chamber, acoustic properties of, 84, 2479
Committees, select standing, 3, 12, 104, 329, 1071, 1175
For individual committees see their titles
Decorum—at adjournment members to keep their places until Mr. Speaker has left the Chair, 518
Deputy Speaker. *See that title*
Discussion, lack of opportunity for, 2527
Elections. *See that title*
Employees, yearly increase in salary, 329
Estimates, 2519
Internal Economy Committee, 11
Members
Deceased, tributes to, 3, 932
New, introduction of, 1475
Return of, 236
Yukon, for, 236, 2382
Officials
Appointments
Debates Reporters and Translators. *See* Dickson, Gabard, Chevassu
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3, 329
Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Secret Session. *See* Parliament
Speaker. *See that title*
Speaker's quarters in new buildings, 1105
Vacancies, 562, 1071
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, consolidation of, 2313, 2388, 2519

Housing, protection of morals. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Hudson Bay Railway, 2167

Hughes, Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 890, 896
Alpine Club of Canada, 2228
Army corps, 1305
Auditor General, 136, 600-601
Expenditure of, overseas, 1916, ques. 1481
Relatives of in Government service, ques. 1200
Son of, position of, 1731
Budget, 1482
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1943
Canadian Daily Record, 918
Civil servants, civil pay of enlisted, 864, 2386
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1739, 1777, 1863, 1868, 2136
Colonization, 147, 614
Democracy vs. autocracy, 1482
Director of Public Information, 896
Domestic and foreign loans, 1489
Egg imports, 791
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Financial conditions, 1485

Hughes, Sir Sam—*Con.*
Flooded lands in the West, 259
Flying Corps, Canadian, proposed, 1368
French Canadian brigade, 1934
Fruit containers, 2251, 2253
Hay, fraudulent sale of, 1081
Highways alongside railways, 82, 85
House of Commons, Chamber, acoustics of, 84, 2479
Imperial Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 1619
Imperial War Graves Commission, ques. 331
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2282
Judges, retirement of, 240
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 863, 895
Mail contracts, 2529
Medical service—Dr. Bruce, 1368
Military service
Administration of Act, 2384
Exemption of only son, 1366
Ministers and re-election, 77
Moving-picture films, purchases, 1676
Munitions, 1486
Officers, salutes to, 621
Ordnance land at Three Rivers, 2227
Overseas Militia Department, 1488
Overseas service
Army corps and divisions, recommendations as to, 879
Canadian officers, replacement of, 596
Canadian troops, authority over in England, 600
Soldiers, pay of, 601
Uniforms, 602, 603
Pensions, 2481
Private secretary to President of Council, 2279
Quebec disturbances, 407
Registration board, 1487
Returned soldiers, employment of, 1183
Royal Flying Corps, 1368
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 30, 614
Titles, 510
Trent canal, 1966
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2389, 2391
War
Men, raising and saving of, for, 1492
Progress of German offensive, 107
Water-powers, development of, 1070
Woman suffrage, 97
Zinc bounties, 2501

Hunt, Mr. A. B. (Compton)
Budget, 1620
Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743
Daylight saving, 190
Farmers, conscription of, 1622
Lennoxville experimental farm, ques. 743

Hunt, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Production, encouragement of, 1620
Sherbrooke, breeding animals at, ques. 870

Hunt, Donald, ques. 1480, 2275

Hydro-Electric Commission, 1199, 1355

Icebreakers, 358

Identification of traders in German goods, Bill. 1r., 1836

Idleness, Order in Council prohibiting, 377.

Immigration and Colonization
Agents, 2270
Clergymen as, ques. 1203
Belgium, 2272
Chinese, 2272
Department
Estimates, 2269
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869, ques. 2241
Private secretary, 2273
Staff and salaries, 204
Labour, and, 1040

Immigration and Colonization Bill. 1r., 56. 2r., Com., 103. 3r., 129

Imperial Conference and Imperial War Cabinet, ques. 2239, 2244, 2539
Attendance by Canadian Prime Minister, 1619, 2554
British embargo on Canadian cattle, ques. 565
Motion for correspondence, 1982

Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 760, 2539

Imperial Munitions Board
Ammunition inspection, ques. 465
Construction of ships by, 346, 350
Lists of soldiers' dependents, copying of, ques. 58, ques. 1201
Munitions at Beloeil, 1099

Imperial War Graves Commission, ques. 331

Income War Tax Amendment Bill. Res., 1684. 1r., 1691. 2r., 2143. Com., 2143-2161. 3r., 2245.
Senate amendments, 2492

Income War tax, ques. 467

Incubators, purchase of, ques. 1301

Independence of Parliament. *See* Salaries Act

Indians. *See also* Indian Act Amendment
Agents
Crooked Lake, 2232
Commissioner W. M. Graham, 27, 1050
Department of Indian Affairs, estimates, 2232
Dogs, taxation of, 1055
Enfranchisement of, 90
Illegal celebrations of, 1056

Indians—*Con.*
Property devised by will, 1046
Witness, as to, 1047
Provinces, in
Nova Scotia, 2235
Ontario, 1056, 2235
Quebec, 2235
Northwest provinces and territories, 2236
Purchase of live stock for, 27
Reserves
Caughnawaga, 2235
Cultivation of, 1048, 1053
Crooked Lake, 2232
Increased production on, 27
Sarcee reserves, 1054

Indian Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 932. 2r., 1046. Com., 1046-1056. 3r., 1076

Indian Point, postmaster at, ques. 876

Industrial disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 564. 2r., 835. Com., 835-841. 3r., 878

Industrial Reconstruction Association, 1034

Industries, non-essential, 992

Inland Deep Waterway, memorandum *re* economic route, 2219

Inland Revenue. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Excise
Department
Chassé, Mr. Noel, ques. 111
Employees, ques. 114
Estimates, 149
Taxation, patent medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1991
War stamps, cost in connection with, 1067
Weights and measures, 1068

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Res., 1263, 1677. 1r., 1690. 2r., 1984. Com., 1984-1991. 3r., 1991

Insolvency. *See* Bankruptcy

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bills
(1) Vegetables, eggs, food containers, firewood and cement. (No. 19, Sir George Foster). Res., 77. 1r., 88. 2r., 1205. Com., 1205-1231, 2254-2256. 3r., 2256
(2) Hay and Straw (No. 20, Sir George Foster). Res., 78. 1r., 88. 2r., 1078. Com., 1078-1099; Com., 1132-1137. 3r., 1176.
Senate amendments, 2198
(3) Fruit, fruit marks and potatoes (No. 108, Mr. Crerar). Res., 2209. 1r., 2210. 2r., 2245. Com., 2245-2254. 3r., 2254

Insurance
Department, estimates, 134
War, premiums, ques. 1361

Insurance Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 867. 2r., Com., 1205. Ref. to Banking and Commerce Committee, 1421. Bill withdrawn, 1976, 2476

Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, acquisition of in New Brunswick, 2178, 2182, 2542
Patronage, abolition of on, 2140, 2538
Paradis, Mr., claim of, 2186

Interior, Department of the. *See also* Dominion Forest; Dominion Lands
Estimates, 2216, 2218

Internal Economy Commission, 11

Internment. *See* Aliens

Intoxicating liquors
Storage of at St. Lambert, ques. 1127
Illicit, 1989
See also Prohibition

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Bankruptcy, 205
Camp Borden, purchase of land, 1944
Customs brokers, payments to, 1061
Daylight saving, 173
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 824, 826
Income tax, 1688
Industrial disputes, 840
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2282
Ministers of the Crown, their number and responsibility, 604-606
Montreal, land for public buildings, 1148
Trent canal, 1965

Jaffray, Mr. J. P., ques. 869, ques. 2241

Jamesville, breakwater, 1155

Jewellery, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Johnson, Mr. Main, ques. 570, 912, 2236, 2274, ques. 1303. *See* Privy Council

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred. (Last Mountain)
Shipbuilding, 354
Woman suffrage, 672

Joy-riding. *See* Criminal Code

Judges. *See* Justice Department; Military Service, Tribunals; Supreme Court Act

Judges' Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1836.

Justice
Administration of, 2507
Department
Desjardins, bail for, 1027
Dillon, Captain Gerald, ques. 568, 889, 1897
Dominion Police, salaries, 2518, 2536
Estimates, 2539
Exchequer Court
Belanger vs. The King, 2507

Justice—*Con.*
Judges
Arichat, N.S., 2517
Central Appeal Judge, staff of, 331. *See* Military Service
Salaries, and income tax, 1685, 2155

Kay, Mr. W. Fred. (Missisquoi)
Agricultural exhibtions, 2377, 2380
Bran, exportation of, 2128, 2304
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
Food containers, 2256
Lennoxville experimental station, 2295
Meats in cold storage, ques. 1302
Military service
Medical boards, 1306
Tribunals, ques. 111
Milk, bottling of, 1214
Mill feed, bran and shorts, ques. 206, 2301, 2305
Missisquoi Bay, seine fishing in, 275
Mount Royal City, 1480
Public buildings at Ottawa, 1114

Keefer, Mr. F. H. (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1889
Daylight saving, 164
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., railway men's votes, 1193
Fishermen, wages of, 2546
Government employees, compensation for injuries to, 813, 819
Oleomargarine, 297
Rural mail contracts, 2532
Sioux Lookout, 2175

Kemp, Sir Edward (Overseas Minister of Militia)
War, cablegrams from, as to, 157, 238

Kennedy, Mr. William C. (North Essex)
Banking system, 1404
Budget, 1402
Business profits war tax, 1403
Casualty reports, ques. 2102
Customs officials, overtime pay for, 1067
Domestic loans, 1406
Farmers and military service, 1406
Government railways, purchase of coal in United States for, ques. 871
Ships' plates, purchase of in United States, ques. 744
War taxes, 1403

Kent House, use of as military hospital, ques. 1843, ques. 2102

Kent Northern railway, 2542

Killen, Robert Cleland, ques. 1842

Kingston, deputy registrar, ques. 2238

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural fairs, 2380
Budget, 1534
Copper and gold deposits, 1534

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Saskatchewan
Grain production, 1534
Indian reserves, 2236

Labatt, Colonel, ques. 51
Pension, ques. 1201, ques. 1981
Pension Board, appointment to, ques. 1201
Connection with Major-General Mewburn, 1692
Resignation of, 2520
See also Pensions

Labour. *See also* Alien
After-war conditions, 1033
Agricultural, shortage of, 1549. *See* Military Service, farmers
Bureaus
Canada, in, 1030
Control of, 1043
Duplication of, 1033. *See also, under this head,* Employment; Exchanges
Capital, relations with, 1037
Chinese in British Columbia, 1002, 1005
Conference of, ques. 875, 984
Department
Estimates, 829
Secretary to Minister, ques. 1129
Staff and salaries, 197
O'Connor, Mr. *See that title*
Employment
Offices, organization and co-ordination of, 841, 842, 1028, 2546
Victoria, B.C., at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978
Enlistments of, in overseas forces, 978
Exchanges
Appropriation for, 1028
Private and municipal, 1039
Fair wages and inspection officers, 831
Farm, scarcity of, 954, 2382
Fishermen, wages of, 2546
French Canadians, conscription of, for, 976
Gazette, 829-830
Halifax, claim of workmen at, ques. 2397
Reconstruction work, ques. 1362
Immigration department, and, 1040
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 831
Industries, in non-essential, 992
Man-power, 982, 988
Oriental, in Canada, 973-1026
Technical education, 1034
Trade unions, 1010, 2547
Strikes and difficulties
Montreal, Marine trades, 2314, 2385
Sydney mines, 203
Winnipeg, 2236, 2385, 2546

Lachine canal, 1967

Lady Grey, steamer, ques. 466

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques Cartier)
Budget, 1662

Lafortune, Mr. D. A.—*Con.*
Liberal party record, 1671
Montreal exhibition, 1667
Patronage, 1666
Prisoners, enlistment of, 1671
Tobacco, tax on, 1987, 1989

Lake Erie ports, 1167

Lalonde, Mr. Frederick, ques. 1842

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Halidmand)
Business profits tax, 1687

Lanark
Election. *See* War-time Elections
Vacancy in, 562

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Hay, inspection, 1078, 1095, 1134

Lanos, late Professor J. M., 2518

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Advances to provinces, ques. 208
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1858, 1905, 2134
Conservation Commission, 2288
Customs Department expenditure, 1065
Food Board, legal adviser to, ques. 466
Geodetic survey, 2220
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677, 814, 827
High Commissioner's office, lack of French-speaking employees, 2541
Imperial Conference, 2539
Indian lands, 1047, 1054
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2283
Light-keepers' salaries, 371
Military service
Exemptions, 1252
Marriage after July 6, 1917, 1421
Quebec disturbances, 401
Ministers of the Crown, their number and responsibility, 844
Patriotic fund, 2203
Piuze, Colonel, 597
Post Office Department, administration, 2515
President of the Council, private secretary to, 2275
Rivière du Loup steamship service, 2214
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, experimental station, 2290
Seduction, 1701
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Titles, 504
War-time Elections Act, 2496
Woman suffrage, 97
Yukon election, 2078, 2334, 2506
Amendment proposed, 2338

Lapointe, Mr. L. A. (St. James)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1885
Food controller, 52

Lapointe, Mr. L. A.—*Con.*
Fuel, 780
Jewellery, tax on, 2124
Military service, 964
Laprairie protection works, ques. 465, 1163
L'Assomption-Montcalm, returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482, ques. 2238
Military service exemption tribunals, ques. 1838
Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 11; Union Government, 13; War-time Elections Act, 14; general election, voting and returns, 14; military service, 19; war issues, 20
Banks, business hours of, 2383
Banks, excess circulation, 739
Belanger vs. The King, 2510
Bureau of Statistics, 809
Canadian Northern Railway, 1423, 1918
Censorship, 969
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1772
Daylight saving, 246
Deputy Speaker, election of, 74
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2066
Employment offices, 1041
Enlistments prior to June, 1917, 942
Farmers, delegation of, 1912
Farm tractors
Admission free of duty, 54
Government purchase of, 1693, 2388
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance, 2521
Food and Food Board, 208, 944
Regulations, 1207
Forest reserves and parks, private rights in, 85-88
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677
Government railways, suspense account, 688
Hanna, the late Dr. A. E., M.P., 3
Hay, inspection, 78
House of Commons
Business of the House, 563, 1420, 1618, 2314, 2374
Votes and proceedings and Journals, proposed consolidation, 2388
Imperial Conference, 2244, 2554
Income tax, 2143
Lanark election. *See under this head,* War-times Elections
McMartin, the late John, M.P., 932
Marine trades strike, 2314, 2385
Meat inspection, 798
Military service, 19
Administration of Act, 1251, 2384
Exemptions, 1539
Leave of absence, 1076, 1175, 1475
Quebec disturbances, 238, 390
Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Regulations, ages, 20-22, 878, 940
Treaty between Great Britain and United States, 52
Unlawful detentions, alleged, 1176
Voluntary enlistments, 943
Mortgages and hypothecs, 1077
National unity, 944
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., resignation of, 800
Orders in Council, concurrence in, 2382, 2479
Parliament buildings, new, 737
Parliamentary procedure
Members present to vote, 2384
Private Bills, suspension of rules, 1766, 1845
Privilege, question of, order in, 315-316
Penitentiaries, inspectors, 130
Postmaster General, position of, 2514
Quebec Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Railway equipment, 547
Railway situation, 2011. *See under this title,* Canadian Northern
Re-arrangement of departments, 77
Secret session of Parliament, 736
Alleged disclosure of proceedings, 2554
Securities, provincial and municipal, issue of, 125
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 611, 612
Soldiers' vote, 17, 2256, 2474
Speaker, election of, 2
Supply—interim vote, 84
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 522, 533
Titles, 499, 1984
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1198, 1478
Tractors. *See under this head,* Farm tractors
Union Government, 13
Victory loan, 632
War expenditure, 593, 610
Vote, $500,000,000, 571
War-time Elections Act, 14
Amendment, 2493
White, Sir Thomas, absence of, 50
Woman suffrage, 91, 102
Yukon Election, 1835, 2082
Lauzon dock, ques. 112
Paquet, J. B., dismissal of, ques. 2238
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 385, 434, 737, 863, 889, 895
Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2026
Champlain market site, ques. 1362
Northwest grain trade, ques. 1362
Quebec
Railway works at, 2188
Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Quebec bridge, 1975
Ross rifle factory, ques. 2397
St. Charles River works, 1119, 1969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E.—*Con.*
Seven Islands steamship service, 70
Transcontinental railway—Quebec shops, ques. 1362
Lead, bounty, 2263, 2477
Lebel, Mr. Nazaire, ques. 877
Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Daylight saving, 179
Hay, inspection, 1082
Military service
Evasions, alleged, ques. 2399
Exemptions, 1540
Oleomargarine, ques. 286
War expenditure, 609
Leger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Buctouche public building, 1138
Daylight saving, 171
Intercolonial branch lines, 2184
Kent county public works, 1161, 1169
Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve, Gaspe)
Aeroplanes, presentation, ques. 740
Alien labour, 979
Anse aux Beaufils, 1162
Anse aux Gasçon, 1162
Anti-loafing, returned soldier in prison, 632
Aylesworth, Sir Allen, 913
Baie de Chaleur steamship service, 2213
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., release of, 1910
Belgium, immigration from, 2272
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837
Correction, Mr. Richardson, 2195
Bernier, Capt., 152
Bird life, protection of, 2223
Budget, 1560; Orange Order in Canada, 1561; French in Canada, 1562; financial conditions, 1565; St. Charles river works, 1567; tariff, 1568; Union Government, 1569; Conscription of farmers, 1570; visit of Ministers to England, 1572
Cable rates, 356
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1937
Canadian Aviation Fund, ques. 1481
Canadian Northern Railway, 1426, 1428, 1716
Canadian Daily Record, 913
Caughnawaga reserve, 2235
Civil servants, enlisted, civil pay of, 864, 1886
Civil Service Act Amdt., 698, 701, 705, 1773, 1790, 1801, 1809, 1831, 1851, 1867, 1873
De Celles, Mr., 1767, 2519
Deep Waterway, 2219
Director of Public Information, 897
Divorce, jurisdiction of provincial courts, 2065
Dominions Royal Commission, 1074, 2265
Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Electric power, export of, 1069
Employment offices, 841, 1033
Farm implements, duties on, ques. 50
Finance Department employees, 134
Financial conditions, 1565
Fishing bounties, 283
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2524
Forestry corps, 1175
France, trade with, 2257
French Canadian units, 1252
French in Canada, 1562
French treaty, ques. 1481
Fuel, 316, 758
Gaspé
Harbours, 359, 1162, 1165
Transportation, 66, 2185
Gouin, Lieut., 862
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 818
Halifax disaster
Avoidance of explosions elsewhere, 132
Relief Commission, 2196
House of Commons
Notices of motion postponed, 1027
Undue haste, 2528
Estimates, 2519
Private Bills, suspension of rules, 1846
Imperial Conference, 2259, 2540
Round Table Club, 2556
Imports and exports, control of, 81
Income tax, 240, 1686, 2245
Indians, money of bands, 1047
Industrial disputes, 836
Industrial Reconstruction Association, 1034
Intercolonial railway, case of Paradis, 2186
Judges' Act Amdt., 1836
King vs. Belanger, 1567, 2375, 2507
Labour
After-war conditions, 1033
Bureaus, 841
Department
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., 199
Laprairie wharf, 1164
Lightkeepers' salaries, 371
Long Sault power development, 732
Magdalen Islands
Harbours, 1165
Steamship service, 67, 283, 2212
Medical service and forestry corps, 1175, 1305
Military service
Exemptions, 1843
Farmers, conscription of, 1570, 1912
Tribunals, 2512
Milk supply, ques. 872
Ministers, visit of to England, 1572
Montreal and Quebec harbour commissioners, 152
Moving picture films, tariff on, 1675

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Naval discipline Bill, 843
Naval wrecking plants, 364
Navigation, aids to, telephones, 375
Newfoundland steamship service, 2210
Newsprint and mechanical wood pulp, export, ques. 57
Orange Order in Canada, 1561
Oyster culture, 271
Parliament buildings
Claims for fire damage, old buildings, 2548
Construction, 1103
Pictures for, 1104
Patriotic fund, 71, 2201, 2199
Pensions, 2520
Perce wharf, 1162
Postmaster General, position of, 2513
Prison reform, 131
Public works, economy in, 1140
Pulpwood limits on Dominion lands, 261
Quebec bridge, 1975
Quebec harbour, Champlain dock, 1116
Quebec (province) harbours in, 1165
Quebec public works, engineer, 1143
Railway equipment, 539, 547, 557, 559, 729
Refrigerator cars for fish, 278
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay service, 360
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Enlistment in at Quebec, 1367
St. Charles river works, 1567, 2375, 2507
St. Lawrence route, insurance rates, 367
Salmon fishing, motor boats, ques. 970
Salt, shortage of, 1983
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701
Sevigny, Hon. Mr., 1767
Shipbuilding, 344, 1118
Simcoe, steamer, 367
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Soldiers' land settlement, 2228, 2230
Soldiers' votes, 914
Sorel, McCarthy estate, 370
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 241, 523, 531, 2198
Tariff, 1568
Technical education, 1034
Titles, 508
Tobacco, tax on, 1988
Toronto postmaster, 2527
Trade, foreign, 2259
Union Government, 1569
Victory loan, ques, 2398
War
Economy, and, 1140
Expenditure, 560, 902
Water power, development of, 1070
Long Sault, 732
Winnipeg strike, 2236, 2546

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Wireless telegraphy, 354
Woman suffrage, 652
Zwingle, Mrs. Wineas, claim of, 70

Lennoxville, farm, ques, 743, 2295

Lesage, Mr. J. E. (Hochelaga)
Belanger, Mr. J. A., ques. 630
Income tax, ques. 467
Military service
Medical examinations, ques. 564, 1540
Police inspector M.D. No. 4, 630
Reward for arrest of deserters, ques, 467
Woman suffrage, 671

LeSueur, Mr. W. S., ques. 1302

Lethbridge postmaster, ques. 1072

Letter carriers, salaries of, ques. 1302

Levis county
Hay, purchase of in, ques. 740
Military service officials, ques. 570

Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1072

L'Heureux, Major J. T. N., ques. 2242

Library of Parliament. *See* Parliament

Life-saving, 357

Lighthouse service, 371

Lignite, experiments, 2546

Loafing, 377, 2237

Loans. *See also* Finance
Due dates of, ques. 741
Foreign and domestic, ques. 334

Lower Ardoise post office, ques. 1841

Loyal Orange Order, 460, 1434, 1553, 1561

Mackie, Mr. H. A. (Edmonton East)
Alien labour, 1004
Cigars, duties on, 1678
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1750, 1794, 1821, 1849, 1867, 1885
Moral protection of children (Criminal Code), 1706
Quebec disturbances, 418
Railway situation in Canada, 2021

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Martin, Col., 887

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Acting Minister of Finance)
Banks
Excess circulation, 738
Hours (Bills of Exchange), 2478
Budget, 1253; revenue, 1254; expenditure, 1254; war expenditure, public debt, trade, immigration, exchange, 1255; victory loan, 1256; financing war and trade, 1257; taxation, income tax, 1260
Business of the House, 2310
Business profits war tax, 1682, 2142
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 684, 690

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway, indebtedness, 1421, 1427, 1694, 1711, 1915, 2120
Civil service, war bonus to Outside, 2547
Civil Service Act Amdt., 694, 715, 1721, 1757, 1772, 1786, 1803, 1847, 2129, 2136, 2138, 2477
Customs tariff, 1675
Debt, 1255
De Celles, Mr., 2519
Exchange, 1255
Excise, revenue from, 1677
Finance Department
Estimates, 133
Government buildings, care and cleaning of, 133
Financing war and trade, 1257
Immigration, 1255
Income tax, 1685, 1689, 2143, 2245
Insurance Act Amdt., deposits, 867, 2476
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Outside service, war bonus to 2547
Railway equipment, 541, 543
Revenue, 1254
Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 123
Supply—interim vote, 84
Taxation, 1260
Tobacco, tax on, 1985
Trade, 1255
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Victory loan, expenditure, 680, 920, 1256
War expenditure, 1255
War revenue, 1679, 1991, 2121
Zinc bounties, 2310, 2498, 2503

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Alien labour, 987
Canada and the war, 1951
Daylight saving, 171
Mail contracts, 2549
Military service—delegation of farmers, 1912

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Military service
Draftees, ques. 969
Enrolments and exemptions, ques. 564, ques. 1617
Railways, observation and private cars, ques. 335
War tax on farm implements ques. 1204

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
Budget, 1310
Daylight saving, 162, 337
Farm implements, 1311
Meat and canned foods, 794
Production, 1312
Tariff questions, 1310
Tobacco, tax on, 1366, 1986, 1988

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 1525
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1899
Daylight saving, 184
Government advertising, ques. 1072
Industrial disputes, 837
Livestock industry, 2379
Military service, 1526
Newsprint, 1526
Public Works Department, overmanning of, 1141
Railway equipment, 553
Railway situation, 1533
St. Lawrence dredging, 370
Sherbrooke post office, employees, ques. 876

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment)
Alien labour, 997
Registration of man and woman power, 998
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 2516

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Civil servants, enlisted, civil pay of, 865
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2134
Daylight saving, 169
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 2516
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
War
Expenditure, 610
Museum, national, ques. 1979

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Experimental farms, 2297

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Fuel, 776

McIntosh, Mr. J. C. (Nanaimo)
Alien labour, 1005

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Budget, 1368
Canada and the war, 1369
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1373
Harbours, 2546
Position of, 1371
Railway, 1374, 2172
Steamship service, 1371
Trade and financial conditions, 1369

McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977

McKellar, J. C., ques. 1129

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Alien labour, 1023
Arichat, judge at, 2517
Auditor General, 140
Bait, cold storage of, 279
Barrington's Cove wharf, 1154
Budget, 1375; trade and financial conditions, 1377; Victory loan, 1381; tariff changes under Liberal government,

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
1383; war profiteers, 1390; report of Mr. O'Connor, 1393.
Camp Borden, land purchases, 1959
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1763, 1819, 1822, 1831, 1881, 1899
Conservation, Commission of, 2288
Daylight saving, 191, 245
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 250
Dry docks, 1117
Experimental farms, 2291
Finance Department, travelling expenses, 136
Firewood, inspection, 1220
Fisheries inspectors, 270, 273, 282
Fruit inspection, 2250
Fuel shortage, 324
Glace Bay harbour, 2545
Harbours, rights and responsibilities of Dominion in, 1121
Hay, inspection, 1097, 1133
Immigration and colonization, 103
Income tax, 2145
Judges' salaries, on, 2155, 2158
Intercolonial Railway, 2191
Branch lines and extensions, 2192
Jamesville breakwater, 1155
Liquors, illicit, 1989
Little Bras D'Or, dredging, 1169
Lobster hatcheries, 282
Lower Ardoise post office, ques. 1841
McGinnis, case of, 1972
O'Connor, Mr., report of, 1393
Patent Record, 2289
Pensions, 2491
Portland cement, 1223
Preventive officers, dismissal of, 151
Printing, public, 135
Public servants, conduct of, 2277
Public works
Caretakers, salaries, 1139
Upkeep, repairs necessary, 143
Railway situation, 1378
Ross Ferry wharf, 1158
St. John harbour, 1115
Supreme Court reports, printing of, ques. 1980
Sydney Mines, labour difficulty, 203
Tariff changes under Liberal government, 1383
Telegraphs and telephones, 1172
Trade and financial conditions, 1377
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2392
Victory loan, 1381
War, the, progress of, 1958
War profiteers, 1390
War-time Elections Act Amdt., 2495
Woman suffrage, 100

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Yukon election, 2070, 2324, 2505

McLennan, Dr., work of (Scientific Research), 2267

McMartin, John, M.P., the late, 932

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Alpine Club, 2227
Budget, 1265; taxation, 1266; trade and finance,1267; Canadian Northern Railway, 1269; national revenue and expenditure, 1269; business profits tax, 1271; production, 1272, 1280; free farm implements, 1274; Canadian military service, 1275; tariff issues, 1278
Canadian Government railways, 689
Civil Service Act Amdt., 697
Customs Department, overmanning, 1059
Daylight saving, 178, 246, 248
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 280
Flags on public buildings, 1065
Food packages, contents marked, 1058
Fruit classification, 2247, 2250, 2254
Fuel, 775
Soft coal, railway rates on, 1973
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 828
Immigration agents, 2270
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Milk products, prices, 2300
Mortgages and hypothecs, 1077
Naval Discipline Bill, 724
Patriotic fund, 2204
Public officials, conduct of, 2280
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1701
Ship building, 351
Soldiers, returned
Arrest as loafers, 2387
Homesteading, and, 254
Soldiers' votes, 2464
Taxation, 1266
Automobiles, on, 2122
Business profits, 1683
Cheques, on, 1067
Excise, ad valorem basis, 1985
Income, 1687, 2146, 2149
Matches, 1993
Parlor car seats, 1991
Patriotic fund, and, 2204
Playing cards, 1993
Tea, 2125
Titles, 486, 2348
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Woman suffrage, 662

McMasterville munitions factory, 1099

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1828, 1849, 1853, 1858, 1864, 1869, 1877
Privilege, report in Journal-Press, 1910
Daylight saving, 169

Magdalen Islands
Harbours, 1165
Steamship service, 67, 283, 2212

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Budget, 1454
Canadian Northern Railway, 2106
Election results, 1459
Farmers, western, condition of, 1454
Fuel, 778
Hay, inspection, 1132
Natural resources, development of, 1460
Prices, 1458
Taxation
Income and land values, 1457
War, 1455
Woman suffrage, 673

Manion, Mr. R. J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Budget, 1324
Civil Service Act Amdt., 714, 1855, 1887, 2133
Daylight saving, 165
Hansard report, correction, 632
Martin, Colonel, 887
Mineral resources, development of, 1325
Oleomargarine 303
Railway equipment, 729
Railway situation, 2053
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 618
Soldiers' land settlement, 2231
Soldiers, returned, 1183, 1887
Titles, 2362
Trade and exchange, 1324

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Exemption tribunals, ques. 565
Bonaventure county, in, 2239

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Dupuis, Mr. J. A., ques. 109
St. Hyacinthe appeal representative, ques. 466

Margaree harbour, 1156

Marine
Benmore, barge, ques. 1617
Courcelette, steamer, ques. 286
Dredges and steamers at Quebec, ques. 868
Icebreakers, 358
Lighthouse and coast service, 371
Meteorological service, 376
Navigation
Obstructions to, 363
Telephones, as aid to, 375
Pilots, 373
Quebec, 1306
St. Lawrence river channel, 370
Ste. Anne de la Perade, beacon site, ques. 744
Shipbuilding. *See that title*
Ships, explosives on, ques. 1123

Marine—*Con.*
Simcoe, steamer, compassionate allowances, 367
Wharves, 375

Marine and Fisheries
Committee on, 106, 1692
Department, staff and salaries, 151, 270

Marine Trades strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385

Marjeson, Major J. W., ques. 970

Marshall, Mr. David (East Elgin)
Canned goods inspection, 793
Fruit imports, 2250
Rural mail contracts, 2535

Marshall, Mr. James Starrat, ques. 875, ques. 970, ques. 1072

Martin, Lieut. Col., 885

Matane, breakwater, 1165

Matches, tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Mattawin river dredging, ques. 568

Mayrand, Mr. H. (Maskinongé)
Hay, inspection, 1093, 1095

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 788. 1r., 800. 2r., Com., 1056. 3r., 1059

Medical service and forestry corps. *See* Army

Medicinal preparations, tax on, ques. 871. *See* Special War Revenue

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs)
Bird life, protection of, 2224
Canadian Northern Railway, 2027, 2121
Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, 1950
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1818
Crooked Lake Indian reserve, 2234
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 85-88, 241-244
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 818, 834, 932, 1046-1056
Doukhobors (Christian Community, etc.), 1950
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 812
Indian Act Amdt., 818, 834, 932, 1046-1056
Interior Department, salaries, 2216
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 835
Soldiers' land settlement, 2228
Yukon Act Amdt., 464, 682
Yukon election, 2072, 2330

Meteorological service, 376

Mewburn, Major-General S. C. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Army
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 864
Fifth Division, 1306
First contingent, furlough for, 883

Mewburn, Major-General S. C.—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
French Canadian brigade and units, 927, 1935
Medical service and forestry corps, 1176, 1305
N. C. O's., promotion of, 865
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Labatt, Col., pension of, 1692
Military service
Ages 20-22, procedure in calling up, 1248
Exemptions, 1252, 1539
Farmers, of, 1027
Leave of absence
Seeding, for, 1366, 1475
Medical examinations, 1306, 1540, 1694
Men medically unfit, 1076, 1130
Militia Council, report, 563
Militia Department
Estimates—salaries, etc., 559, 850, 865, 2518
Quebec Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Ross rifle factory, 929
Royal Flying Corps, 931
Small-pox in Cape Island district, 1131
Soldiers
Returned, alleged imprisonment of, 1367
Treatment of on transports, 73
Separation allowance and assigned pay, 64, 888
Zwingle, Mrs., case of, 72
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 611, 619
War appropriation, general statement by Minister, 560
Expenditure, 578-593, 601-610

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Edmundston post office, 1138
Firewood export, ques. 113
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 811, 834
Indian, white widow of, 1047
Kent House as hospital, ques. 2102
Military service, Quebec officials, ques. 1978
Steamship services, 2213
Van Buren Bridge Company, 80, 268, 339, 518

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 815
Victoria Crosses to C.E.F., 288

Migratory Bird Act, administration, 2223

Military and Naval Defence Bill. *See* War Appropriation Act

Military Hospitals Commission. *See also* Army, Medical Service
Expense, 903
Incubators, purchase of, ques. 1301

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Kent House, use of as hospital, ques. 1843, ques. 2102
Laval No. 6, ques. 631
Orpington, ques. 971
Port Arthur, ques. 466
Quebec, lease of property, ques. 465
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1303
Soldiers, sick while on leave, ques. 971

Military Service. *See also* Army; War
Administration of Act, 2384
Limit of 100,000, ques. 1481
Prime Minister's statement, 24
Quebec, in, ques. 108
Allies, arrangements with, ques. 1071
United States, 33, 52
Amendments
General statement by Prime Minister, 1248
Appeals. *See under this head,* Exemptions
Bank clerks, leave, 2383
Classes, 938
Dental corps, 2398
Draftees and enlistments, ques. 464, ques. 564, ques. 969, ques. 1127, 1175
Enforcement
Arrests, ques. 287
Convictions, Brault and Swan, ques. 111, 1075
Desertions, 1248
Presumed deserter, arrest of, 1075
Detention, alleged unlawful, 1176, 1367
Draftees, alleged band of, 632
Evasions, 960, ques. 2399
Habeas Corpus writs in Montreal, ques. 739
Order in Council No. 3348, release of men under, ques. 111
Police, ques. 109
Military, 2387, 2517
Over-zealous action alleged, 1130
Quebec disturbances. *See that title*
Self-inflicted wounds, ques. 111
Soldiers, returned, alleged imprisonment, 1367
Enrolment, cost per man, ques. 1361
Exemptions, appeals and tribunals
Berthier, ques. 1843
Bonaventure, ques. 2239
Expenditure, ques. 331, ques. 565, ques. 1838
Exemptions, 564, 960, 1127, 1538, ques. 1617
Claims for, number of, ques. 1127
Temporary, 873
Judges, payment of, ques. 1073, 1839, 2512
Chicoutimi and Lake St. John, ques. 2397
St. Hyacinthe, ques. 466

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Exemptions—*Con.*
Papers, alleged confiscation of, 1367
Physical unfitness for, ques. 1617
Tribunals. *See also under this head*, Exemptions
Appointments to by Minister of Agriculture, ques. 111
Brockville, ques. 2238
Central Appeal Judge, ques. 1840
Office and staff of, 331
Quebec appeals to, ques. 1878
Local, ques. 740, 288
Pretended influencing of decisions of, 1843
Purported exemption by ages, 20-22, 1538
Vacancies on, ques. 630
Farmers, and, 943, 958, 1027, 1275, 2388, ques. 2398
Delegation of, 1837, 1911, 1936, 1984, 2196, 2550
Drafts, calling up of, 2315
Leave of absence. *See that title under this head*
Number exempted, ques. 564
Fishermen, and, 2314
Hardships under, 2128
Leave of absence, 1076, 1175
Appeals, ques. 56
Bank clerks, 2383
Boards, Tucker, Mr., appointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873
Seeding, for, 1365, 1475, 2384
Medical examinations, ques. 564, ques. 873, 1540, 1693
Boards, 1306
Pay of, 112
Officers, for overseas, of, 2101, ques.
Revision of, ques. 1071
Naval Service Department, application to, 2384
Officials
Kingston, deputy registrar, staff of, ques. 2238
Quebec, ques. 108, ques. 569, ques. 570, ques. 1841, ques. 1978
Registrars, rental of offices for, ques. 564, ques. 1073
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, employment of, ques. 111, ques. 1978, ques. 2398
Orders in Council
Calling up, ages 20-22, 1248
Men married after July 6th, 1917, 1421
Motion by Prime Minister approving, 933
Agreed to, 966
Amendment proposed
(1) Mr. Molloy, 956
(2) Mr. L. A. Lapointe, 964

Military Hospitals Commission—*Con.*
Orders in Council—*Con.*
Procedure under, statement by Minister of Militia, 1248
Physically unfit men, ques. 564, 1076, 1130, ques. 1617
Provinces
Enlistment and conscription, by, ques. 1127
Quebec, attitude of, 944
Regulations, 878, 933
Rural drafts, calling out of, 2315
Militia Act, power of Governor in Council under, 948
Militia and Defence
Active militia, allowance, 850
Defence works, engineer services, 853
Department
Auditor, 138
Estimates, 850-867
Salaries, 559
Record Branch, employees, ques. 113
Military buildings
Bury, Que., drill hall, ques. 743
Caretakers' salaries, 866
Quebec, leasing of properties at, ques. 465
Staffs, headquarters, divisional and district, 860
Militia Council, 563
Mill feeds. *See* Agriculture
Milling industry. *See* Flour milling; Agriculture
Miminegash harbour, 1160
Mindheim, Siefried H., internment of, ques. 207
Mines and Minerals
Coal. *See* Fuel
Committee on, 106
Copper mining in Northwest, 1546
Department, estimates, 2539
Iron, production, 1325, 1465
Lead, 2263, 2477
Petroleum, 1479, ques. 2263
Zinc
Bounties on. *See* Zinc
Smelters, 2311, 2502
Zinc-lead ores, experiments, 2546
Ministers of the Crown
French Canadian, appointment of, ques. 207
Need of election, 849
Visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Milk. *See* Agriculture
Missisquoi Bay, net fishing in, ques. 109, 275
Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
Daylight saving, 192

Molloy, Mr. John P.—*Con.*
Emerson customs collector, 1065
Hay, inspection, 1080
Indians
Commissioner Graham, 1051
Lands, leasing of, 1048, 1050
Rights of, 1053
Military service
Agriculture, effect on, 954
Resolution in amendment, 956
Prince Rupert Journal, Government advertising in, ques. 1360

Moncton and Buctouche railway, 2542

Montcalm, steamer, 359-362, ques. 466

Montmagny, steamer, 362

Montreal post office, 1146

Montreal-Gaspé steamship service, 66

Montreal Harbour Advances Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. Res., 80. 1r., 81. 2r., Com., 132. 3r., 337

Moore, Rev. T. A., ques. 1362

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Assigned pay and separation allowance, 2387
Canadian Northern Railway, 1921
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1756, 1779, 1782, 1798, 1805, 1850, 1852, 1856, 1882, 1884, 1898
Daylight saving, 246
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, ques. 330, 1984, 2155
Food containers, 1211, 1213
Fruit classification, 2247
Hay, inspection, 1083
Income tax, 2149, 2156
Judges' salaries, on, 2155, 2159
Labour bureaus, provincial, 1032
Moral protection of children, 1705
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1202
Patriotic fund, 2200, 2202
Penitentiaries, returned soldiers as guards, 1182, 1186
Pensions, 2486
Portland cement, 1225
Quebec disturbances, 455
Rural mail contracts, 2532
Soldiers' land settlement, 2230
Soldiers' votes, 2402
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 521
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1199
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2390, 2394
Unmarried couple registering at hotel as married, 1703
Woman suffrage, 95

Mosher's Bay breakwater, 1158

Mount Royal City, ques. 1480

Moving-picture films. *See* Film
Tax on. *See* Customs

Mowat, Mr. Herbert M. (Parkdale)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 5
Agricultural exhibitions, 2378
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1722
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 825
McCallum, Prof., 1906
Moving picture films, tax on, 1676
Registration of man and woman power, 6
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
Soldiers' vote, omission of candidates' names, 909
Standing Orders Committee, report, 2313
Supreme Court Act Amdt., 532
Union Government, 5
Yukon election, 2090

Mulgrave-Guysborough steamship service, 2212

Munitions, danger from explosion of, 1099. *See* War, Supplies

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 35
Army Medical Corps, ques. 2238
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1838
Bola Pasha, ques. 1071
Canadian Northern Railway, 1926, 2114
Branch lines, 2542
Christian Science Monitor, 37
Civil Service Act Amdt., 153, 696, 698, 717, 1764, 1811, 1819, 1851, 1883, 1899, 2130
Doukhobor lands, ques. 1072
French religious and the war, 43
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 1836
Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208
House of Commons, hours of sitting, 35
Meat inspection, 795
Military service
Bank clerks, 2383
Farmers, 1837
Mines Department, 2217
Ministers, visit to Washington and New York, 1176
Newspapers, payments to, 2128
Ontario Mining Tax Act, ques. 1361
Parliament buildings, new
Decoration, 1103
Heating, 1101
Speaker's residence, 1108
Patronage, 135
Prescott, Marine and Fisheries officials at, 153
Race and religious issues, 36
Rowell, Hon. Mr., 39
Shipbuilding, 345

Murphy, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Sifton, Sir Clifford and Grand Trunk, ques. 2242
Soldiers' vote, 2438
Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480
Supply—interim vote, 84
Titles, 2366
Victory loan
Advertising, ques. 1203
Banks, payments to, ques. 2240
War expenditure, 559, 879
Publicity expenses, 1028
War-time Elections Act, 47
Winnipeg strike, 2385
Yukon Act Amdt., 682

Murphy, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977

Murray Bay wharf, 1165

Myers, Mr. Edward T. W. (Kindersley)
Dominion Lands, homesteading, buildings, 265

Narraway, Mrs., appointment, 1744

National Parks, 2223. *See* Dominion Forest

National Service Commission, 903

National Transcontinental Railway, 1994, 2003, 2188
Quebec shops, ques. 1362

National War Museum, ques. 1979

Naturalization Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 968. 2r., Com., 1077. 3r., 1131

Naval Discipline (Dominion Naval Forces) Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 629. 2r., Com., 723. 3r., 724, 842

Naval Service
Buoy service, Maritime provinces, 366
Department, staff and salaries, 148
Dockyards, 344
H.M.C. SS. Niobe and Rainbow, 358
Life-saving, 357
Northern waters patrol, 357
Ocean and river service, 358, 366
Patrol boats and mine-sweepers, ques. 569
Radio-telegraph service, 354
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 344
Royal Naval College, 344, 357
Steamers
Champlain and Bellechasse, 360
Montcalm and Lady Grey, 359, ques. 466
Wrecking plants, 364

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., 562., Com., 730. 3r., 735. Senate amdts., 2476

Navy, Ottawa enlistments in, ques. 2398

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Canadian Northern Railway, 2119
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1728, 1877, 1885
Gasolene, price of, 2123
Hay, inspection, 1082
Homesteading, dower of widow, 254
Income tax, 2150
Oleomargarine, 297
Parliament buildings, 1109
Patriotic fund, 2205
Soldier candidates, 912
Soldiers' land settlement, 2229
Titles, 2355
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2391
Woman suffrage, 96

Newfoundland, steamship service, 2210

News, official, publisher of, 1976

News service, transatlantic, 356

Newspapers, Government advertising, ques. 115
Payments, 1072, 2128

Newhouse, Mr. P., account of, ques. 1302

Newsprint
Industry, history of, 1526
Inquiry, ques. 1364
Mechanical wood pulp, and, exportation of, ques. 57
Restraint of competition, 1343

New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, ques. 1364

Nichols, Mr. M. E. *See* Director of Public Information

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, ques. 1364

Nicholson, Mr. G. B. (Algoma East)
Alien labour, 981
Canadian Northern Railway, 2119
Children, moral protection of, 1709
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1752, 1770, 1804, 1809, 1818, 1861, 1874, 1892
Employment agencies, 1029, 1036
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Manitoulin Island wharves, 1166
Organized labour, 984
Patriotic fund, 2204
Railway equipment, 546
Railway situation, 2041
Correction of Debates report, 2314
Rural mail contracts, 2531
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1700, 1702
Van Buren Bridge Company, 519

Nickle, Mr. W. F. (Kingston)
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 1749
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1743, 1801
Daylight saving, 170
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, ques. 2478
Flour milling, 2237, 2314
Income tax, 2146
Judges' salaries, 2158
Kingston post office, appointment of Mrs. Narraway, 1744
Milk, sale of, 1214
Oleomargarine, 298
Patriotic fund, 2208
Railway situation, 2049, 2056
Royal Flying Corps, transfer from to C.E. F., ques. 1842
Separation allowance, 64
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 615
Titles; motion, 468, 2355
War, Canada's control of Canadian army, 883
Woman suffrage, 94, 97

Norfolk county, customs inquiry in, ques. 287

Norman, Mark, reported as casualty, ques. 1842

Northern waters patrol, 357

Northrup, William Barton, M.A., K.C., appointed Clerk, 2

Northwest grain trade, ques. 1362

Northwest Territories, government of, 2221

Observatories, 2218

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 199, 633, 800, 1032, ques. 1129, ques. 1202, ques. 1303, ques. 1481

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Oil deposit development, ques. 1479

Oleomargarine. *See* Agriculture

Oliver, Hon. Frank, defeat in election, 17, 23, 47

Ontario
Federal loan to, ques. 742
Flax-growing in, 1236

Ontario Mining Tax Act, ques. 1361

Ontario-St. Lawrence canal, 1967

Orangemen. *See* Loyal Orange Order

Orders in Council
Concurrence in, 12, 2382, 2479
Military Service, 933
Summoning Parliament, 11, 22

Organization and Co-ordination of Employment Offices Bill. Res., 841. 1r., 842. 2r., 1028. Com., 1028, 1046. 3r., 1076

Ottawa
Astronomical observatory, 2218
Naval enlistments in, ques. 2398

Ottawa—*Con.*
Postmaster, 286
Public buildings, 1110, 1152
Rental of buildings by Government, ques. 740, ques. 874, 1112, 1147

Ottawa-Hull bridge, 146

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Mégantic)
Budget, 1593
Food Board, 227
Military service exemption tribunals, ques. 331
Production, 1594
Trade and financial conditions, 1593
Woman suffrage, 644

Panet, Mr. Louis Charles, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3, 329

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 971
Government leasing of buildings at Ottawa, ques. 740
High Commissioner, ques. 971
Incubators, ques. 1301
Newhouse, Mr. P., account of, ques. 1302
Orpington military hospital, ques. 971

Paquet, Mr. J. B., ques. 2238

Paradis, Mr., claim of (Intercolonial). 2186

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1755, 1822
Titles, 2370

Parasites. *See* The Parasites

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Agricultural pamphlets, 2379
Freight cars, Canadian, in United States, ques. 570
Furois, Mr. Philippe, 2375
Income tax, 2148
Military Service Act, ques. 1481
Quebec
Exhibition, 2377
Harbour, 1118
Union station, ques. 1980
Quebec and Saguenay railway, ques. 873
Quebec disturbances, 414
Royal Flying Corps, 931
St. Charles river works, 146
Transcontinental Railway, 2188-2190

Parks, 2223. *See* Dominion Forest

Parliament
Independence of. *See* Salaries Act
Library of, 1767, 2519
Committee, 107, 788
Prorogation of, 2549, 2557
Secret session, 735, 2554
Report of, 832
Summoning of, hour not stated, 2, 11

Parliament Buildings
New
Construction, 737, 1100
Committee on, 335
Decoration of, 1104
Fire protection, 1110
Heating, 1102
Speaker's apartments, 1105
Tower, 1101
Old
Fire claims, 2548

Parliamentary procedure. *See also* House of Commons; Speaker; Deputy Speaker
Adjournment motion for discussion of definite matter of urgent public importance, 380
Bills, printing of in both languages, 2396
Member to vote when in Chamber, 2384
Motions joined for discussion, 973
Privilege. *See that title*
Quorum, proceeding without, 2518

Patent Medicine stamp tax, ques. 871, 1991

Patent Record, 2289

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage, 32, 135, 1666. *See* Civil Service; Intercolonial
Canals, on, 1970

Peace River Crossing bridge, 2543

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Agricultural fairs, 2377, 2380
Automobiles, tax on, 2124
Business profits tax, 2142
Canadian Government Railways, suspense account, 689
Carleton county, railway rights of way, 2169
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1798, 1800, 1806, 1813, 1822, 1824, 1899
Fruit marks, 2247
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 822
Income tax, 2149
Indians, rights of, 1050, 1055
Military service, vote on, pairs, 1475
Moving-picture films, 2127
Parliament buildings, construction, 1107
Postage to soldiers overseas, 2536
Renfrew, customs collector, 1062
Ross rifle, 852
South Renfrew election, 884
Theatre tickets, tax on, 2127
War taxes, and stamps, 1067, 2125
Weighing and measuring, mechanical, 1225

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Daylight saving, 188
Demonstration farms, 2295

Pelletier, Mr. F. J.—*Con.*
Food packages, 1216
Meat inspection, 794

Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 55, 129. 1r., 132. 2r., Com., 1176. 3r., 1205

Penitentiaries, annual report, ques. 2240

Pensions
Bradbury, Hon. Senator, ques. 1128, ques. 2397, 2520
Comparative tables of, 2482
Commissioners, ques. 51
Salaries and contingencies, 2520
Work, ques. 110
Committee, Special, 563, 735, 1071, 1175
Report, 2310, 2480, 2550
Fenian raid, 2519
Labatt, Col., ques. 1201, 1692, ques. 1981, 2520

Perce Rock, sea-birds, 2224

Perry, Commissioner, N. W. M. Police, resignation, ques. 877, 2286

Peterborough East registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100

Petroleum, bounty on, 2263. *See* Mines

Pharmaceuticals, 1991

Pilots. *See* Marine

Pictou-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 68

Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp steamship service, 2215

Player pianos and organs. *See* Special War Revenue

Pointe a Elie wharf, 1167

Porter, Mr. E. Guss (West Hastings)
Soups for army use, 795
Tucker, Mr., apointment of, ques. 331, ques. 873

Port Arthur harbour, 1125

Port Hastings, customs collector, 1063

Port Hood, dredging, 1158

Ports, Lake Erie, on, 1167

Ports, use of for grain export, ques. 1362

Portland cement. *See* Inspection and Sale

Post Office
Deniger, Mr. J. A., ques. 1982
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 2513, 2527, 2548
Leases in Ottawa, ques. 874
Fowler, Mr. Robert, 1744, 1983, 2241
Hamilton, Mrs., ques. 1481
Letter carriers, salaries of, ques. 1302
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 1073

Post Office—*Con.*
Mail contracts
Dorchester county, ques. 115
Fir Grove-Frampton, ques. 2397
Fir Grove-St. Odilon, ques. 2397
Rigaud-St. Redempteur, 742, ques.
Rural, 58-66, 2528-2536
Parcel post for soldiers, 2535
Postmasters
Dorchester county, ques. 113
Dublin Shore, ques. 876
Indian Point, ques. 876
Lethbridge, ques. 1072
Ottawa, ques. 286
Postmaster-General, Hon. Col. Blondin, position of, 2513
Post offices
Granby, ques. 870
Kingston, appointment of Mrs. Narraway, 1744
Sherbrooke, ques. 876
Vacancies, promotion by merit, 2535

Power, Mr. Charles G. (Quebec South)
Army
Commissioned officers at Quebec, ques. 288, ques. 743
Montreal base depot battalions, ques. 332
N. C. O's, promotion of, 865
249th Battalion, ques. 466
Canadian Daily Record, 892, 918
Couillard, Capt., ques. 1841
Demobilization, 629
Grenier, Capt., ques. 1841
Marjeson, Major J. W., ques. 970
Marshall, Mr. James Starrat, ques. 875, ques. 970, ques. 1072
Militia organization, 851, 856, 860, 866
Militia Department, leases, ques. 465
Military Service Act in Quebec, ques. 108-109, ques. 564, ques. 1841
Mindheim, Seifried H., internment of, ques. 207
Quebec disturbances, 422
Quebec bridge, 1975
Returned soldiers
Officers, ques. 115
Employment of, ques. 333
Treatment of on transports, 73
Shipbuilding, 350
Steamers
Courcelette, ques. 286
Montcalm and Lady Grey, 359

Premiers, provincial, conference of, ques. 287

Press censorship, ques. 1842

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Budget, 1442
Election returns, 1450
Farm labour, shortage of, 1448
Food and food production, 1446

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Military service, 1444
Arrests of exempted men, 1130
Trade and financial conditions, 1443
Union Government, 1442
War contracts in Quebec, ques. 115
Woman suffrage, 645

Prices
Cheese and condensed milk, 1129
Fish, 2375
Milk, ques. 872

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 361, 362, 1373
Harbours, 2546
Maintenance of Public Works, 1160
Railway, 1374, 2170

Prince Rupert Journal, Government advertising in, 1360

Pringle, Mr. R. A., K.C., ques. 868

Printing
Government, Editorial Committee, ques. 972, 1099
Joint Committee on, 105
Report, 1691, 2478, 2549

Printing Bureau, appointments, ques. 1978

Private Bills
Miscellaneous, Committee on, 105, 1691
Suspension of rules relating to, 1766, 1845, 1950

Private Bills, discussed
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837, 2195
Brazeau Collieries, 1691
British Canadian Insurance Company. *See under this head,* United Canadian Insurance Company
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, 1950
Fire Insurance Company of Canada, 1950
Gospel Workers' Church in Canada, 1454, 1691
International Bridge and Terminal Company, 1732
Overbeck, O. G. C. L. J., patent, 739
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 1196, 1478
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2313, 2388
Western Power Company of Canada, 178

Private Secretaries, 2273. *See* Privy Council; Johnson, Mr. Main

Privilege, questions of
Blake, Mr.—Hansard report, 1366
Currie, Mr.—Canadian Press Report, 1693
Duff, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 314
Edwards, Mr.—Ottawa Citizen, 1982

Privilege—*Con.*
McQuarrie, Mr.—Ottawa Citizen and Journal-Press, 1910
Manion, Mr.—Hansard report, 632
Mewburn, Major-General—Ottawa Citizen, 1692
Nicholson, Mr. G. B.—Hansard report, 2314
Pedlow, Mr.—Explanation as to pair, statement in Renfrew Mercury, 1475
Read, Mr. Joseph—Ottawa Citizen, 518
Richardson, Mr.—Daily Ontario, 2195

Privileges and Elections, Committee on, 104, 1835, 2067, 2315. *See* Yukon

Privy Council, Department of the
Hunt, Donald, employment of, ques. 1480, 2275
Johnson, Mr. Main. *See that title*
President of, special trains for, ques. 875
Staff and salaries, ques. 466, 2273

Production, increased. *See* Food

Prohibition, 30, ques. 1073
Dominion-wide, ques. 1362
Public revenues, effect of on, ques. 335
See Intoxicating liquors

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Army
Casualty reports, ques. 1842
Dental corps, ques. 1202
Beaufort, Mr. E., ques. 1364, ques. 1840
Civil Service Act Amdt., 714
De Wolf, Mr. Harry C., ques. 1071
Dillon, Capt. Gerald, ques. 568
Egg inspectors, ques. 1201
Farran's Point, canal employees, ques. 568
Gillespie, Lieut. Col. George, ques. 2239
Hay inspection, 79
Imperial Munitions Board, copying of lists, ques. 1201
Labatt, Col., pension to, ques. 1201
Lethbridge postmastership, ques. 1072
McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977
Military service
Cost, ques. 1361
Farmers, exemption of, 1027
Oleomargarine, ques. 1201
Ottawa postmaster, ques. 286
Penitentiaries, officials, 1177
Port Arthur, soldiers' convalescent home, ques. 466
Rural mail contracts, 59
Seduction (Criminal Code Amdt.), 1700
War Trade Board officials, ques. 1977, ques. 2396

Provincial and Municipal Debentures, 115, ques. 287

Provincial courts, jurisdiction in divorce cases, 2065

Provincial premiers, conference of, ques. 287

Public Accounts, Committee on, 105

Public Health, 2289

Public Information. *See* Director

Public Servants and war bonds, ques. 742

Public service. *See* Re-arrangement

Public Works. *See also* Parliament Buildings
Buildings, generally, 1137-1154
Alberta, 1151
British Columbia, 1151
Heating, 1154
Maritime provinces generally, 1139
New Brunswick, 1138
Nova Scotia, 1137, 1138
Ontario, 1110, 1151
Quebec, ques. 113, 1140, 1151
Rents, 1154
Yukon territory, 1152, 1154
Department
Estimates, 1099, 1137
Salaries and contingencies, 141
Dredging
Maritime provinces, 1169
Mattawin river, ques. 568
Ontario and Quebec, 1168, 2546
Port Hood, 1158
See under this title, Harbours and Rivers
Dry docks, 112, 1116, 1173
Harbours, expenditures on, ques. 970
Harbours and Rivers
Alberta, 1168
British Columbia, 1125, ques. 1126, 1168
Generally, 1163
Manitoba, 1168
New Brunswick, 1115, ques. 1126, 1162
Nova Scotia, ques. 1126, 1154, 1158, 2544
Ontario, 1120, 1166
Prince Edward Island, 1160, 2546
Quebec, 1116, 1120, 1163, 2544
Saskatchewan, 1168
Leases at Ottawa for Post Office Department, ques. 874
St. Barthelemi road, dyke at, ques. 569
St. Charles river. *See that title*
St. John harbour, 1115, ques. 1126, 2544
Toronto harbour, 1120, 2544
Slides and booms, 1173
Water storage dams on Ottawa river, 1173

Public Works Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., 562. Com., 733. 3r., 735

Pullman car seats. *See* Special War Revenue

Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 1145
Halifax, 1138

Quebec (city)
Champlain market site, ques. 1362
Commissioned officers at, ques. 743, ques. 288

Quebec (city)—*Con.*
Harbour works, 2544
Champlain dock, 1116
Dredges and steamers, ques. 868
St. Charles river works. *See that title*
Leases of for military service, ques. 564
Post office, ques. 113, 1149
Public buildings, 1142
Sisters of Charity orphanage, 84
Transcontinental shops, ques. 1362, 2188
Union station, ques. 1980

Quebec (province)
Breeding animals, shipments to, ques. 869
Coal, railway rates on, 1973
Flax-growing in, 1233

Quebec bridge, 1973

Quebec disturbances, 236, 284, 336, 378, 380, 680, 737

Quebec and Gaspé Basin steamship service, 2212

Quebec and Saguenay railway, ques. 873, 2543

Radiotelegraph. *See* Telegraphs

Railway situation, statement by Prime Minister, 1994

Railways. *For Equipment, and Stores Account, see Department of Railways and Canals Amdts.*
For Canadian Government Railways, see that title
For individual railways, see their titles
Cars
Canadian, in United States, ques. 569, ques. 570
Observation and private, ques. 335
Refrigerator, for fish, 278
Coal, purchase in United States, ques. 871
Equipment, additional, 32
Ocean terminals, 1126
Rates, coal, Maritime-Quebec, 1973
Removal of rails to France, 727
Special trains for President of Council, ques. 875

Railways and Canals, department of
Estimates, 1963, 2538, 2542
Staff and salaries, 147

Railway Act Amedment Bills
(1) Vessel Rates (No. 31, Mr. Armstrong). 1r., 330
(2) Consolidation (No. 70, Mr. J. D. Reid). 1r., 1247, 1909; Bill withdrawn, 2493

Railway Belt Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 737. 2r., Com., 3r., 835

Railway men's votes, 1193

Read, Mr. Joseph (Prince, P.E.I.)
Budget, 1335
Canadian Daily Record, 930

Read, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Government Railways, revenues, 690
Canadian Northern Railway, 1428
Canal system, abolition of tolls, 1964
Canning factories, inspection, 1058
Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, dredging, 1971, 2546
Civil Service Act Amdt., 710, 1778, 1797, 1823, 1869, 1903, 2137
Customs Department, collections, 1062
Daylight saving, 169
Eggs, inspection and sale, 1209
Farmers, conscription of, 1335
Fishery overseers and inspectors, 274
Fishing bounties, 283
Food production, 233
Fox-fur farming, 2296
Hay, inspection, 78, 1086, 1091, 1136
Imperial Conference, 2557
Income tax, 1690
Labour bureaus, 1044
License system, 233
Marine Department, Halifax Herald criticism, 352
Meat inspection, 796, 1056, 1058
Mining industry, 2311, 2502
Newspaper report, correction, 518
Northumberland, steamer, 69
Oleomargarine, 302
Pilots, 373
Potatoes, 1339
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 361
Public works, maintenance, 1160
Railway, 2170
Quebec disturbances, 460
Railway equipment, 548
Railway rates, 555, 1974
Seduction and age of consent, 1699
Shipbuilding, 353
Tariff reductions by Liberal government, 1336
Titles, 513
Van Buren Bridge Company, 343
Water-powers, 2217
Woman suffrage, 93, 667
Yukon election, 2096, 2339, 2505
Zinc and lead bounties, 2311, 2502

Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875

Re-arrangement and Transfers of duties in the Public Service Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., Com., 83. 3r., 88. *See* Salaries Act Amendment

Reconstruction, Committee on, 2289

Recruiting, 942. *See* Army; Military Service

Red Cross, violation of rules by enemy, 157

Redman, Mr. Daniel L. (East Calgary)
Budget, 1398

Redman, Mr. Daniel L.—*Con.*
Homesteading by soldiers, 256
Quebec disturbances, 448
Soldiers' votes, 910
Trade conditions, 1398
Woman suffrage, 95

Refrigeration Commission, ques. 875, ques. 1072

Registration. *See* Canada Registration Board

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Business of the House, 2382
Canals, estimates, 1963-1972
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, acquisition of, 2176, 2542
Intercolonial, 2539
Minister's annual statement, 2161
Operation, 2548
Patronage, 1904, 2539
Stores account, 829
Suspense account, 683
Canadian Northern Railway, 1920, 1924, 2107, 2111
Fish, refrigerator cars for, 278
Fisheries exhibit at Toronto, 281
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 677, 811-829
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2543
Railway equipment, 538-559, 725-730
Railways and Canals Department
Consulting engineer, 153
Staff and salaries, 147
Statistics, collection of, 830
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, 1196, 1476
Van Buren Bridge Company, 79, 267, 340, 518

Reid, Mr. John Flaws (Mackenzie)
Bank loans to farmers, 1334
Budget, 1333
Canada Food Board, salaries, ques. 335
Farm machinery, 1333
Duties and drawbacks, ques. 465, ques. 872, ques. 1203
Fuel, 787
Grain, milling values of, 2399
Indian lands, 1051
Production, 1333
Rideau canal, ques. 2241
Tomatoes, canned, 1058

Remounts, purchase, ques. 869, 904

Renfrew, South, election, 884

Reports, annual, publication of in French and English, 135, ques. 971

Representation Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 236

Retirement of Aged and Infirm Civil Servants Bill. Res., 1r., 2312

Returned soldiers. *See* Army

Revenue Bills. *See* Business Profits; Customs; Income; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker

Richardson, Mr. R. L. (Springfield)
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company, 1837, 2195
Budget, 1342
Canadian Northern Railway, 1197, 1426, 1920
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1751, 1851, 1857, 1872, 2131, 2139
Daylight saving, 161
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, allowance to, 2527
Newsprint production, 1343
Nichols, Mr. M. E., 704
Overbeck patent, 739
Public ownership of public utilities, 1354
Railway equipment, 555
Railway situation, 1349, 2027. *See, under this title,* Canadian Northern
Returned soldiers, 1888
Tariff reductions prior to 1918, 1347
Tobacco, tax on, 1988
Titles, 506
Amendment proposed, 2347, 2372
Woman suffrage, 640

Richibucto
Breakwater, 1161
Public buildings, 1140

Rideau canal, ques. 2241
Pretoria Avenue bridge, 1964

Rigaud-St. Redempteur mail, ques. 742

Rimouski harbour, 1165

River Port, N.S., customs officer, ques. 1200

Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and North Shore steamship service, 2214

Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay steamship service, ques. 112, 360

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Dairying and feeds, 312, 2298-2306
Food containers, 1212
Food control, 224, 1216
Hay inspection, 1091, 1094
Immigration bulletins—atlas, 2272
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt., 1208
Meat and canned foods inspection, 798
Military service, leave of absence, 1076
Nichols, Mr. M. E., 900
Portland cement, 1225
Power, exportation of, 1070
Privy Council expenditures, 2283
Railway equipment, 539, 727

Ross, Mr. D. C. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 1492
Financial conditions, 1497
Pensions, 2487
Production and free farming implements, 1494
Railway situation, 1493
Remounts, ques. 869, 904
Timber, protection of, 2222
War, taxation, 1498

Ross Ferry wharf, 1158

Ross rifles and factory, 852, 926, 929, ques. 1072, 1360, ques. 2397

Round Table Club, ques. 1841, 2556

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (President of the Privy Council)
Civil servants overseas, civil pay of, 2385, 2388
Civil Service Act Amdt., 696, 701-703
Director of Public Information, 57, 703, 891, 916
French-Canadians and the war, 953
Johnson, Mr. Main, private secretary, 2274-2285
Military Service regulations, 946
Militia Act, power of Governor in Council under, 948
Pensions, 1071, 2310, 2480
Privy Council office, salaries, 2273
Royal North West Mounted Police, 2285
Soldiers' votes, omission of candidates' names from lists, 908
Titles, 500
War
Canada's contribution to, 950
Lecture Bureau, 893
Women in Britain, services of, 951

Royal Assent, The, 104, 700, 2557

Royal Flying Corps. *See* Army

Royal Military College, 1151

Royal Naval College, 357

Royal North West Mounted Police
Army, in, 2285
Commissioner Perry and Assistant Commissioner Wilson, resignation of, ques. 877
Salaries and contingencies, 2285

Rural mail contracts, 2528
Burnham, Mr., motion of, 58-66

Russell, Mr. E. M., ques. 1977

Ste. Anne de Bellevue hospital, ques. 1303

Ste. Anne de la Perade, purchase of land at, ques. 744

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, experimental station, 2290

St. Barthelemi dyke, ques. 569

St. Charles river improvements, ques. 112, 146, 1118, 1567, 1969, 2544
Land expropriation case (Belanger vs. The King), ques. 1479, 2507

St. John Harbour, 1115, ques. 1126, 2544

St. John Dipper Harbour, Chance Harbour and Mace's Bay steamship service, 2216

St. John river and tributaries, 1162

St. Lambert postmaster, ques. 1127

St. Lawrence river ship channel, 367-371, 1169

St. Martin's Railway, acquirement, 2542

St. Nicholas quarry, ques. 868

St. Peter's canal, 1967

Salaries Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 76, 683. 1r., 77. 2r., 844. Com., 846-878. 3r., 1028

Salisbury and Albert Railway, acquirement, 2542

Salt, shortage of, 1983

Salvation Army, members of in Government employ, ques. 1844, ques. 1980

Saskatchewan, federal loan to, ques. 742

Saucier, Captain, ques. 740

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
L'Heureux, Major J. T. N., ques. 2242
Military service
Chicoutimi exemption tribunals, ques. 2397
Farmers, exemption of, ques. 2398
159th and 227th battalions, ques. 2398

Schaffner, Hon. Senator, ques. 2240

Schuster, Capt. W. E., ques. 1074, ques. 1128

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Oleomargarine, 306

Secret Session of Parliament, 735, 2554

Secretary of State, Department of
Staff and salaries, 2512
War expenditure, 902

Securities, provincial and municipal, sale of, 115, ques. 287

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Séguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Foisy, Dr. L. A., pay of, ques. 2238
Kent House, use of as hospital, ques. 1843
L'Assomption-Montcalm returning officer, ques. 1302, ques. 1482
Military service, exemption tribunals, ques. 1838
Printing, Editorial Committee, ques. 972

Senate, 2517

Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Seven Islands steamship service, 70

Sevigny, Hon. Mr., ques. 206, ques. 1618, 1767
Resignation of, 155

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Bran and shorts, 2306, 2309
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1774, 1783, 1786
East Peterborough registration, ques. 1480, ques. 2100
Eggs, sale by weight, 1207
Food prices, 1208
Hay inspection, 1079, 1081
Milk, bottling of, 1215
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2295
Wood, inspection and sale, 1219, 1220

Shawinigan Falls, bridge, 731

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Auditor General, 1753
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1753, 1809, 1815, 1883, 1909
Fruit classification, 2248
Johnson, Mr. Main, 2277
Railway equipment, 540
Toronto harbour improvements, 1121

Sheguindah wharf, 1166

Sherbrooke
Breeding animals at, ques. 870
Post office employees, ques. 876

Shipbuilding, 28, 1116, 1329
Labour for, 1118, 1472
Marine trades strike in Montreal, 2314, 2385
Minister of Naval Affairs, statement, 345-354
Ships' plates for, 347, ques. 744

Sifton, Hon. Arthur L. (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Customs Department
Appointments, 1064
Staff and salaries, 148, 1059
Electric power, export of, 1069
Inland Revenue Department, salaries, 149, 1066
Securities, provincial and municipal, 127
Soldiers' votes, 2470
Titles, 2351
United Canadian Insurance Company, 2393
Woman suffrage, 100

Sifton, Sir Clifford, and Grand Trunk, ques. 2242

Silver money in circulation, ques. 334

Simcoe, Canadian Government steamer, loss of
Compassionate allowances, 366, 376

Simpson, Mr. Thomas E. (West Algoma)
Budget, 1465
Iron and steel industry, development of, 1465
Newsprint situation, 1466
Sault Ste. Marie canal employees, 1971
Taxation of alien enemies, 1467

Sinclair, Mr. J. H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Amherst, regiment at during election, ques. 335
Canadian Northern Railway, claims against, ques. 970
Canadian War Records office, staff of, ques. 2241
Censors and decoders, ques. 874
Civil servants, conduct of, 2278
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1815, 1855, 1871, 2133, 2290, 2535
Experimental farms, 2290
Fishermen, conscription of, 2314
Food control, expenses of, ques. 971
Fruit grading and marking, 2249
Gordon, Rev. C. W., ques. 2240
Government railways, employees, ques. 206
Heatherton, N.S., Indian agent, 2235
Helena, motor-boat, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Ice contract at Mulgrave, ques. 876
Imperial Conference, titles, 2556
Imports and exports, temporary control of, 81
Income and profits, taxes on, 2145, 2147
Intercolonial railway, patronage, 2538
Interior Department, salaries, 2216
Lobster industry, ques. 630
Mail contracts, 2529
Naval patrol boats and mine sweepers, ques. 569
Patriotic fund, 2208
Pensions Board, 2520
Refrigeration Commission, ques. 875, ques. 1072
Returning officers, payment of, 2512
Steamship services, 2212, 2216
Taxation, cigars, 1990
Tea, 2125
Water-powers, 2269
Woman suffrage, 94

Sioux Lookout, 2175

Sleeping car berths. *See* Special War Revenue

Smallpox. 1131

Smelters. *See* Mines

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Animal contagious diseases, 801
British embargo on Canadian cattle, ques. 565
Daylight saving, 181, 249

Soldiers. *See* Army

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, 31, 2515

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Bill. 1r., 56. 2r., Com., 610-629. 3r., 634

Soldiers' land settlement, 32, 2228. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.

South Africa steamship service, 2211

Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480

South Ingonish, 1159

Speaker, (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Election of, 1
Residence, new Parliament building, 737, 1105-1110
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Replacing on order paper, 2313
Withdrawal of, motion for, not debatable, 2493
Business of the House
Proposals for economy in
Parliamentary printing, 562
Returns, avoidable duplications of, 283
Delegations, status of, 1911-1912, 1984, 2550
Interruptions, 2417
Irrelevancy, 70, 380, 384, 1253
Language
Decorum in, 2459
Reflecting on Chair, to be withdrawn, 1619
Members
Mover of resolution exhausts his right to speak, 2131
Right to refrain from voting, ruling reserved, 2385
Motions
Adjournment, for, to discuss definite matter of urgent public importance, 380
Committee report, to adopt, not amendable in form proposed, 2313
Involving charge upon public revenues, 2138
Joined for discussion, by agreement, 973
Negative, ruling reserved, 2070
Seconder may not move amendment, 2137
Supply, amendment to, form of, 2435
Notice of motion, dropping of, procedure in, 2385
Orders in Council, procedure in expressing disapproval by House, 1910
Orders of the day, on, questions and discussion, 1252-1253
Petition, form of, 2550
Privilege, procedure in, 314-316
Returns, avoidance of duplication, 283
Soldiers, impugnment of—no rule covering, 2417

Speaker—*Con.*
Rulings and statement of—*Con.*
Yukon election, special return ordered to be printed, 236

Special War Revenue Act, 1915 Amdt. Bill. Res. 1264, 1679. 1r., 1691. 2r., Com., 1991, 2064, 2121. 3r., 2127

Specie, amount of, ques. 741

Spirit Lake detention camp, ques. 744, 2293

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Westminster district)
Alien labour, 1015
Eggs, inspection, 1206
Hay, inspection, 1087
Seduction and age of consent, 1698
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 628
Titles, 515
Western Power Company, 178
Westminster district, proposed change of name to Fraser Valley, 236
Woman suffrage, 661

Standing Orders Committee, 105

Statistics, 2264. *See* Dominion Bureau

Steamers, and ice-breakers
Bellechasse, 360
Champlain, ques. 112, 360
Courcelette, ques. 286
Helena, ques. 2101, ques. 2241
Lady Grey, 359-362, ques. 466
Montcalm, 359-362, 366, ques. 466
Montmagny, 362
Northumberland, 69

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 2211
Canada
Halifax, Canso and Guysborough, 2211
Magdalen Islands, 67, 283, 2212
Montreal-Gaspé, 66
Mulgrave and Guysborough, 2212
Nova Scotia, 2211, 2215
Pictou-Magdalen Islands, 67
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 2215
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 2212
Rivière du Loup, 2214
Rivière Ouelle-Murray Bay, 112, 360
St. John Dipper Harbour, 2216
Seven Islands, 70
China and Japan, 2211
Great Britain, 2210
Newfoundland, 2210
South Africa, 2211
West Indies and South America, 2211

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Medicinal preparations, tax on, 1991
Oleomargarine, 294
Private Bills, Committee report, 1846

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1771, 1810, 1865
Daylight saving, 185

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Labatt, Col., pension of, 2489
Officers for overseas, medical examinations, ques. 2101
Quebec disturbances, 388
Woman suffrage, 91

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton West)
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 1453
Moving-picture films, tax on, 1682

Strikes. *See* Labour

Summerside breakwater, 1160

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service; Retirement

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, committee of, 84, 133-155, 197-205, 270-283, 343-364, 366-377, 559-562, 829-832, 850-867, 1059-1071, 1099-1125, 1137-1175, 1963-1976, 2161-2194, 2210-2236, 2256-2310, 2375-2382, 2507-2549
For details see titles of departments and subjects

Supreme Court Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 240. 1r., 241. 2r., Com., 520. 3r., 537
Amendment Bill. 1r., 2065. 2r., Com., 3r., 2198

Supreme Court reports, ques. 1980

Surface rights for miners, 242

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1740, 1776, 1802, 1810, 1858, 1887, 2134
Civil Service, Outside service, provisional allowance, 2547
Daylight saving, 182, 247
Fifth division, commanding officers, 1306
Labour, placing of, system in, 1032
Live-stock industry, 2380
Military service tribunals, ques. 630
Oleomargarine, 303
Ottawa naval enlistments, ques. 2398
Pensions, ques. 110, 2520-2521
Rural mail contracts, 1984, 2530
Soldier candidates in election, 910
Soldiers' land settlement, 2231
Titles, 2369

Sydney Mines
Labour difficulty, 203
Wharf, 1154

Sweet, Major Edmund, ques. 2399

Talbot, Col., Ex-M.P., letter to Canada Food Board, 2376

Talking machines. *See* Special War Revenue

Tariff. *See* Customs

Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 111, ques. 1978, ques. 2398

Taxation. *See* Budget, *also titles of taxes and taxation measures*

Taylor, Mr., Indian Agent, 2232

Tea, taxes on. *See* Customs; Special War Revenue

Technical education, 1034. *See* Labour

Telegraphs, telephones and radiotelegraphs
British Columbia, 1174
Government telephones, 1153
Lower St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces, 1174
Navigation, telephones as aids to, 375
Nova Scotia, 1170
Radiotelegraph service, 354
West India cable, 2266

"The Parasites," circulation of forbidden, ques. 1203, ques. 1839

Thompson, Lieut.-Col. A. T., ques. 2399

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Military service, calling out of men in rural districts, 1253

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1785, 1791
Crooked Lake Indian reserve, 2232
Titles, 507, 2365

Three Rivers
Ordnance lands at, 2227
Public buildings, 1149
Public works employees, 141

Timber berths on Dominion lands, 262

Titles, proposed abolition of, 2556
Address to His Majesty, motion for, (Mr. Nickle), 468, 1984, 2065, 2237, 2342
Amendment, (Mr. Richardson), 506
Amendment to the Amendment, (Sir Robert Borden), 2342; agreed to on div., 2374

Tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, snuff. *See* Customs, Inland Revenue

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Belford, Major J. F., ques. 870
Breeding animals, 2301
Shipments of in Quebec, ques. 869
Cigars, tax on, 1985
Military service
Exemptions, ques. 873
Medical examinations, ques. 873
Military service council, barristers employed by, ques. 1202
Minister of Labour, private secretary, 1129
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., ques. 1303

Tolmie, Mr. S. F. (Victoria City)
Alien labour, 1002
Daylight saving, 184
Meat inspection, 791
Portland cement, 1226, 1331

Toronto
Aliens in, 1000
Arms, seizure of by police, ques. 970
Harbour, 1120, 2544

Toronto Secretarial Fund, ques. 875

Tractors. *See* Farm Tractors

Trades unions. *See* Labour

Trade and Commerce
Department
Agents and commissioners, 2257
Estimates, staff and salaries, 343, 2210
Foreign trade, 2257
France, treaty with, ques. 1481
Mail subsidies and steamships, 2210

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Advances, Federal, to provinces, ques. 741
Ontario and Saskatchewan, ques. 742
Banks
Government deposits in, ques. 742
Subscriptions to war loans, ques. 741
Bonds, market value, ques. 335
Budget, 1318
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1826
Conference of provincial premiers, ques. 287
Dominion notes, circulation, ques. 334
Financial conditions, 1321
Gold reserve, ques. 334
Central, banks' deposit with, ques. 741
Loans, due dates, ques. 741
Foreign and domestic, ques. 334
Military service
Arrests, ques. 287
Enlistments, ques. 464
Farmers, conscription of, 1320
Prohibition and revenue, ques. 335
Provincial and municipal debentures, 122, ques. 287
Silver money, ques. 334
Specie, amount of, ques. 741
Treasury bonds, ques. 741
Victory loan committee, ques. 333
War bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
War expenditure, ques. 335, 1322
War purposes, use of deposits for, ques. 741
West, Mr. St. Clair, ques. 1618
Wounded soldiers, return to front, ques. 332
Woman suffrage, 648

Trains. *See* Railways

Transatlantic News Service, 356

Transatlantic telegraph rates, 355

Transcontinental. *See* National Transcontinental

Treasury bonds, ques. 741

Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., ques. 1129

Trent canal, 1964, 1967
Harman, Mr. Charles, ques. 208

Trower, Mr. W. K., ques. 1977, 2400

Tucker, Mr., ques. 331, ques. 873

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Budget, 1293
Caraquet and Gulf shore railway, 2173, 2177
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2141
Conscription of farmers and fishermen, 1296
Farm implements, 1294
Shipbuilding, 1295

Turiff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1861
Patriotic Fund, 2201, 2206
Soldiers' land settlement, 2230
Zinc bounties, 2498

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas M. M. (West Calgary)
Civil servants enlisted, civil pay of, 2315
Civil Service Act Amdt., 713, 1784, 1792, 1891
Customs Department, officers and salaries, 1060
Daylight saving, 187
Fuel, 326
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 678, 816, 825
Indian lands, 1051
Sarcee reserve, 1054
Separation allowances, 65, 602
Soliders' civil re-establishment, 623
Supreme Court, 523
Titles, 2371
Yukon election, 2067

Unmarried couple registering at hotel as married. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

United States. *See* Allies
Exchange rate with Canada, ques. 465
Military service convention with, 33, 52
Munitions, manufacture for, in Canada, 1099

Valcartier camp, 866

Van Buren Bridge Company Agreement Bill. Res., 79. 1r., 80. 2r., 267. Com., 339. 3r., 518

Vancouver harbour, 1125, ques. 1126

Vegetables. *See* Agriculture; Inspection and Sale

Verigin, Mr. Peter, 1950

Verrett, Col. H. B., 864

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Canadian Northern Railway
Directors, ques. 109
Physical assets, ques. 570
Chinese entering Canada, ques. 115
Daylight saving, 186
Fair wage officers, 198

Vice. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Victoria, B.C.
Astrophysical observatory, 2218
Employment at, ques. 1479, ques. 1978
Harbour, ques. 1126
Old post office, 1151

Victory loan, 632
Expenses, 680
Advertising, ques. 1203, 2128
Banks, payments to, ques. 2240
Report on, 1766
Southam Press, payments to, ques. 1480
Special Names Committee, ques. 2398
Special Committee, ques. 333

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Canadian Associated Press, payments to, ques. 631
Canadian Northern Railway, 1921, 1925
Children, moral protection of, 1704, 1708
Demonstration farms, 2293
Farm labour, shortage of, 2306
Military service and enlistments, ques. 1127
Delegation of farmers, 1911, 1936, 1984, 2196, 2550
Quebec disturbances, 440, 2517
Rural drafts, 2315
Militia Department expenditure, 854
Overseas, 881, 926
Ross rifle, 929
Seduction (Criminal Code), 1700
Soldiers' uniforms, etc., prices, 602, 603
War, forces of the Allies, 2194
Yukon election, 2505
Zinc bounties, 2311

Votes for soldiers. *See* Army

War
Allies
Military service arrangements with, ques. 1071
United States, 33, 52, 1071, 2194
Camps and training areas, 866, 867, 1937, 1959, ques. 2240
Canada and, 1951
Canadian Daily Record, 891, 915, 920
Canadian Railway Association for National Defence, 2006
Canadian War Records office, 2127, ques. 2241
Casualties, 34
Consultation with Imperial Government before outbreak of, 928
Contracts
Province of Quebec, in, ques. 115
Deserters
Reward for arrest of, 467
Expenditure, 559, 879. *See also* War Appropriation Act
Statement of by Minister of Militia and Defence, 578

War—*Con.*
Expenditure—*Con.*
Estimate of, for 1918-1919, statement by Prime Minister, 571
Finance
Bank deposits, use of, ques. 741
Bonds, purchase of by public servants, ques. 742
Loans, 335
Bank subscriptions to, ques. 741
Revenue. *See* Special War Revenue
Forces
Canadian overseas, strength of, 576
French Canadian Brigade and units. *See* Army
French religious, part in, 43
German offensive, 83
Statement by Prime Minister as to progress of, 107
Heroism of Canadians, 157, 238
Human energy of Canada
Idleness, prohibition of, Order in Council, 377
Imperial War Conference
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 565
Insurance premiums, ques. 1361
Military Service. *See that title*
Ministers' general summaries
Minister of Militia, 578
Prime Minister, 571
Official news, arrangements for, 1976
Patriot, young, desires to enlist, 1125
Pensions. *See that title*
Permanent militia force, enlisted, pay of, 863, 1737
Railway War Board, 2006
Recruiting, leasing of properties for, ques. 465, ques. 1202
Red Cross rules, violation by enemy, 157
Supplies
Munitions
Danger from explosion of, 1099
Inspection, ques. 465, 1099
On ships, ques. 1128
T.N.T., storage at Beloeil, 1099
Printing overseas, ques. 874
Remounts, ques. 869, 904
Taxation. *See* Budget and Inland Revenue
Transport and freight, 866

War Appropriation Act, 1918, ($500,000,000 for 1918-1919). Res., 463. 1r., 464. 2r., 571. Com., 879, 1027. 3r., 1076

War Council, members of, ques. 2239

War Graves Commission, Imperial, ques. 331

War Lecture Bureau, 893

War Memorial Fund, 1195

War Mission, 31, 54, 905

War Purchasing Commission, 32

War-time Elections Act. *See* Yukon Election; Army; Soldiers, votes for

War-time Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1475. 2r., 2477, 2493. Com., 2494. 3r., 2498
Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 2494,
Amendment, (Mr. Bureau), 2496

War Trade Board, 32, 54,
Officers of, ques. 1977, ques. 2396
McKay, Mr. W. P., ques. 1977
Rean, Mr. W. C., ques. 631, ques. 875
Trower, Mr. W. K., ques. 2400

Water-powers, 2267
Development of, 1069

Ways and Means, Committee of, 85, 1253, 1306, 1368, 1429, 1454, 1482, 1541, 1620, 1674

Wealth, taxation of. *See* Income tax

Webster, Mr. W. V., 467

Welland canal, 1963, 1969
Paymaster, ques. 2397

Wendover wharf, 1166

West, Mr. St. Clair, ques, 1618

West Indies steamship service, 2211

Whidden, Mr. Howard P. (Brandon)
Alien labour, 1003
Titles, 2371

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Military service, ques. 288

White, Hon. Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Absence of, statements by Prime Minister, 50, 55, 736
Return of, to House, 2259

Wigmore, Mr. R. W. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1886
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 826
St. John-Dipper Harbour steamship service, 2216
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 615

Wilkie, Mr. J. H., ques. 1977

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Animal contagious diseases, 802
Civil Service Act Amdt., 1762
Hay, inspection, 1091

Wilson, Miss M., ques. 1302

Wilson, Asistant Commissioner, R.N.W.M.P., resignation of, ques. 877

Winnipeg strike, 2236, 2385, 2546

Wireless telegraphs. *See* Telegraphs

Woman suffrage, 22, 33

Woman Suffrage Bill. 1r., 50. 2r., Com., 91, 364, 634. 3r., 723. Senate amdts., 1691

Woman and the War, 951

Women's Conference, ques. 875

Yamaska dam, 1165

Yeigh, Mr. Frank, ques. 1302

Y. M. C. A., members of in Government employ, ques. 1844, 1980

York and Carleton railway, purchase of, 2542

Yukon
Government of, 2221
Public buildings, 1152, 1154

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 464. 2r., Com., 682. 3r., 834

Yukon Election
Special report of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 236
Referred to Privileges and Elections Committee, 735
Second report, 1835, 2067
Referred back, 2097-2100
Third report, 2209
Adopted, 2315-2241
Recount, report of, 2194
Return of Mr. Thompson, 2382

Yukon Territory Election Bill. 1r., 2383. 2r., 2504. Com., 2505. 3r., 2507

Zinc Bounties Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2310. 1r., 2312. 2r., 2477, 2498. Com., 2498. 3r., 2504

Zwingle, Mrs. Wineas, claim of, 70